

**Meeting Agenda
King County Flood Control District Advisory Committee
Mercerview Community Center, Mercer Island
1:00-3:30 pm
Friday February 24, 2012**

- 1:00 p.m. Item 1: Welcome and Meeting Overview**
- *Agenda Review*
 - *Introductions*
- 1:15 p.m. Item 2: Election of 2012-2013 Committee Chair and Co-Chair (Decision Item)**
- 1:25 p.m. Item 3: Annual State Audit Results (Information Item)**
Kjristine Lund, Executive Director of the King County Flood Control District, will present an overview of the State's annual audit of the District. The full report is available at the link below; a letter in response to a citizen concern is attached.
<http://www.sao.wa.gov/auditreports/auditreportfiles/ar1007235.pdf>
- 1:35 p.m. Item 4: Green River Temporary Levee Removal Options (Decision item)**
The attached issue paper will be the basis of the presentation and discussion.
- 2:30 p.m. Item 5: 2012 Flood Plan Update (Information Item)**
Staff will present an overview of the plan update, including issue papers, updates to the action plans for each basin, and the process for incorporating input. We will also discuss the role of the Citizens Committee established by the Board of Supervisors. For more information in advance of the meeting, please see:
<http://www.kingcounty.gov/environment/waterandland/flooding/documents/flood-hazard-management-plan-update.aspx>
- 3:15 p.m. Next Steps and Upcoming Meetings**
- 3:30 p.m. Adjourn**



**Washington State Auditor
Brian Sonntag**

January 30, 2012

Kjristine Lund, Executive Director
King County Flood Control Zone District
Seattle, WA

Dear Ms. Lund:

Our Office was contacted by a citizen with concerns regarding the King County Flood Control Zone District. We considered these concerns and share the results with you.

To address the concern regarding the Flood Control Zone District's commitment of \$30 million toward the Seattle Seawall replacement project, we evaluated the authority state law provides the District. The District may participate in the cost of flood control in tidal areas. Therefore it appears the District may pay for a portion of the seawall replacement if approved by the District Board.

Regarding a concern that the County Council has a conflict of interest in serving as the District Board, we noted state law directs this governing structure for flood control districts. As an alternative, citizens may petition for the election of Board Members.

We also reviewed a budget and actual expense analysis in the District's financial statements and found the District continues to accumulate large fund balances due to the timing of its work.

| | Revenues | Expenditures | Expenditures | Budget over | |
|-------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
| | Actual | Budget ** | Actual | Actual | Available funds |
| 2008 | \$34,022,423 | \$32,469,376 | \$15,970,343 | \$16,499,033 | \$ 18,923,385 |
| 2009 | \$35,374,015 | \$47,472,083 | \$22,845,942 | \$24,626,141 | \$ 31,727,585 |
| 2010 | \$35,995,613 | \$39,522,953 | \$27,836,510 | \$11,686,443 | \$ 40,189,153 |
| 2011* | \$36,070,313 | \$37,501,232 | \$28,677,268 | \$ 8,823,964 | \$ 46,622,830 |

Notes:

*2011 figures are based on auditor's estimates; expenditures include \$5.5 million in expected transfer payments to Fire Districts.

**Figures from original adopted budget used to determine the amount of property taxes to be levied.

We recommended the District establish more effective monitoring over work progress and completion. It should require monthly or quarterly updates on capital expenditures, progress on individual projects and other relevant performance measurements.

We humbly request that you share this communication with District Supervisors. If you have any questions of us, please contact Audit Manager Carol Ehlinger at (206) 615-0557.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Carol J. Ehlinger".

Carol Ehlinger
Audit Manager

Background and Options for Temporary Advanced Measure Removal on the Green River

Issue: Should the Flood District provide funding to support removal of the temporary flood barriers along the lower Green River?

Background

Damages to the Howard Hanson Dam were discovered by the Army Corps of Engineers in early 2009, and shortly thereafter local governments were informed that there was a 1 in 3 chance that the flow rate from the compromised Dam would exceed levee design flow of 12,000 cfs at Auburn. In response to this drastically increased risk, the King County Flood Control District supported the cities of Auburn, Kent, and Tukwila with their efforts to install temporary advanced measures consisting of HESCO barriers and supersacks along 26 miles of Green River Levees to protect against possible overtopping of the levees.

Current Status

In the fall of 2011, the Corps announced that Howard Hanson Dam was back to full operating capacity and the annual chance that flow would exceed the 12,000 cfs target at Auburn was now down to 1 in 140. Based on the announcement by the Corps, the temporary barriers could be removed as early as spring of 2012. A funding request has been made to FEMA; to date no decision has been made.

The current agreements between King County and the cities of Tukwila, Kent, and Auburn include the following provision in regards to the removal of the temporary barriers:

Upon a determination by the Corps that the design capacity of the Howard Hanson Dam has been restored and the dam is functioning in accordance with its original design, the City shall cause the materials that have been placed on the Levees in accordance with the Work, to be removed and to dispose of them in accordance with any instructions provided by the Corps . . . The City agrees that upon removal of the materials, it shall restore the Levees to their condition previous to the placement of materials, . . . and shall be responsible for all costs associated with such removal and restoration, unless the County determines, in its sole discretion, that additional funds are available and makes such funds available for part of or all of such costs.

Per this agreement, the Green River valley cities have asked King County whether additional funds could be made available to cost-share removal of the temporary barriers and restoration of the trail, which is estimated to cost \$7.6 million. As floodplain management funding decisions are made by the King County Flood Control District (FCD) Supervisors, the request is being brought to the Advisory Committee to help inform the FCD Board of Supervisors.

Costs of Installation and Removal

- Installation and maintenance of the temporary barriers cost the FCD \$5.1 million. Of this amount, \$4.9 million helped fund installation of the temporary barriers in cities, and \$200,000 was spent for barriers around the Black River pump station as well as inspection, maintenance and project coordination. In addition, impacted cities contributed additional funds (approximately \$1.8 million) toward the installation of temporary barriers.
- The estimated cost of removal is \$7.6 million. This includes a contingency that varies by city from (20% to 35%) as well as trail restoration.

Background and Options for Temporary Advanced Measure Removal on the Green River

Issue: Should the Flood District provide funding to support removal of the temporary flood barriers along the lower Green River?

- Costs could be reduced by pursuing external funds, removing any contingency funding, and/or removing costs for trail repair.

Funding Options

The question of whether the Flood Control District should provide funding for removal of the temporary levees is a policy rather than technical question; the members of the Basin Technical Committees have evaluated the impacts of various scenarios to assist with the Advisory Committee’s consideration but are not providing a recommendation.

Options presented below include the status quo based on the existing signed agreements, along with four options that assume some level of Flood District funding. If the Flood District participates in funding the removal of the temporary barriers along the Lower Green River an exhaustive list of options could be considered, ranging from 100% District funding to 0%. The factor that will be adjusted in any funding scenario is the number of currently funded CIP projects that will need to be removed or delayed from the District’s 6 year CIP, depending on how much District funding would be diverted to the removal of the temporary advanced measures on the lower Green River. For the purposes of this analysis, project impacts were assumed to be based on the flood risk score of each capital project.

| | Description | Considerations |
|--|---|--|
| Option 1: Status Quo | Cities of Auburn, Tukwila, and Kent fund removal costs. No FCD funding for removal. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with current signed agreement No impact on FCD CIP • FCD paid majority of costs for placement |
| Option 2: Borrow against future Opportunity Funds for 3 GRV cities | FCD funds contribute to removal; funds are repaid over time using Opportunity Funds for Auburn, Kent, and Tukwila (\$800K in existing appropriation; \$225K/yr for 3 cities combined) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over time, no net effect on FCD funding capacity as loan is repaid with interest • Up to 10 projects delayed 1-2 yrs within 6-yr CIP depend on how much is borrowed, possible impacts are to projects scoring 66%-79%) including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tolt (Lower Tolt Acquisition, Repetitive Loss buyouts) ○ Cedar (Dorre Don, Repetitive Loss buyouts, Herzman, Rhode) ○ SF Skykomish – Timberlane Village ○ Issaquah Repetitive Loss ○ Lake Forest Park FEMA grant match ○ Green Lower Russell Road • Two Cedar delays are to projects that are currently in design, rather than ‘new starts’ (Herzman, Jan Road) • 4 Projects delayed outside the 6-yr CIP that score 66%-71%: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Skykomish buyouts, ○ Tolt Floodplain Reconnection, ○ White-Greenwater Acquisition, ○ Lake Forest Park FEMA grant match, and |

Background and Options for Temporary Advanced Measure Removal on the Green River

Issue: Should the Flood District provide funding to support removal of the temporary flood barriers along the lower Green River?

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to repay funds via Opportunity Funds is approximately 4 years per \$1M borrowed for the three GRV cities |
| Option 3: CIP changes in Green River Only | FCD funds removal costs; funds reallocated from Green River projects | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No impact to other basins • Future appropriations for Upper Russell, Lower Russell, and Reddington are each \$5-\$6 million. Some combination of these projects could be delayed to 2018 to avoid impacts to other basins. • Reddington delays may put existing state grant revenue at risk |
| Option 4: 50/50 Cost share | 50/50 cost share of removal costs (\$3.8M each for FCD and cities, with District share split between the Green and other basins). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigates but does not avoid impacts on other basins • Impacts projects scoring from 66%-76% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Delays Cedar, Issaquah, and Lake Forest Park projects within 6-yr CIP as in Option 2A and 2 projects (Tolt Floodplain Reconnection and Skykomish Home Buyouts) delayed beyond the 6-yr CIP ○ Delay of the Lower Russell/Holiday CIP in the Green |
| Option 5: Cost-share as part of future construction costs | Where FCD intends to rehabilitate levees, include sandbag removal as part of construction costs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces mobilization costs if incorporated into planned construction efforts • Section-by-section removal results in incremental access to trail over several years • Results in delays to other projects by increasing the cost of Green River projects |
| Option 6: FCD funds 100% | Full FCD funding of barrier removal costs, from across CIP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 projects delayed on the 6-yr CIP (see option 2), most likely impacting all basins. • 11 projects delayed outside the 6-yr CIP with scores of 66%-76%-are <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Skykomish buyouts, ○ Tolt Floodplain Reconnection, ○ White-Greenwater Acquisition, ○ Red Creek Acquisition (White River) ○ Lake Forest Park FEMA grant match, and ○ Cedar Rhode levee setback ○ Cedar Repetitive Loss Buyouts ○ Issaquah Repetitive Loss Buyouts ○ Lower Snoqualmie Repetitive Loss Buyouts ○ Jan Road Levee Setback (Cedar) ○ Herzmann Levee Setback (Cedar) |



Legislation Text

File #: FCD11-03, **Version:** 1

Drafter

Clerk 07/08/2011

title

A MOTION relating to the scope of work for the five-year update to the 2006 and 2010 King County Flood Hazard Management Plans and appointing a citizen committee

body

WHEREAS, the King County Flood Control Zone District ("District") adopted the 2010 King County Flood Hazard Management Plan as the official work plan and guiding policy document for the District through FCD Resolution 2010-34 on July 12, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the federal Disaster Mitigation Act and the Community Rating System require updating the adopted plan every five years; and

WHEREAS, the 2006 King County Flood Hazard Management Plan is used to identify capital improvement needs and priorities, provide policy direction and is used to support grant funding requests; and

WHEREAS, the District was created in 2007 to fund flood control projects; and

WHEREAS, since beginning operations in 2008, the District has completed sixty-one levee repair and rehabilitation projects; and

WHEREAS, the 2006 King County Flood Hazard Management Plan needs to be updated to reflect new information and conditions; and

WHEREAS, the Disaster Mitigation Act and the Community Rating System require updated risk

assessments; and

WHEREAS, the District seeks to use the best available information and best practices in its decision-making related to flood hazard management;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE KING COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL ZONE DISTRICT:

SECTION 1. The King County Water and Land Resources Division is directed to:

A. Review and update the 2006 and 2010 King County Flood Hazard Management Plans for consistency with federal requirements to ensure that King County citizens will benefit from federal disaster assistance and national flood insurance programs.

B. Convene a citizen's advisory committee, as described in Attachment A to this motion, to serve as a sounding board at key milestones in the plan update process.

C. Review new information to include at a minimum the economic importance of flood risk reduction for the county and state, including commercial, agricultural, environmental, and residential economic data; current flood and channel migration studies and mapping; damage and changed conditions due to flood events; risk assessment; and the 10-year capital improvement plan.

D. Prepare issue papers and decision documents to facilitate potential policy development and updates by the District on the following topics:

1. Risk reduction standards, appropriate levels of flood protection for each river system, and integrated basin-wide action plans;
2. Levee certification and accreditation;
3. Levee vegetation and PL 84-99 participation;
4. Coastal, small streams, and urban flooding;
5. Social justice and outreach to vulnerable populations in high risk flood zones;

6. Property acquisition and relocation approaches for residential and business properties;
7. Capital project prioritization, sequencing approach, criteria, and scoring;
8. Bioengineering; and
9. Gravel removal and sediment management.

E. Provide the District executive committee with a work plan, including a schedule, for the issue papers by September 9, 2011, and provide monthly updates on plan update progress.

F. Transmit issue papers to the District executive committee in conformance with the work plan and schedule to allow policy deliberations by the executive committee prior to the draft plan completion.

G. Transmit draft plan update to the District Board of Supervisors by July 1, 2012.