

Middle Fork Snoqualmie River Corridor Planning Process Community Meeting Summary

October 30, 2018 (6:30 – 8:30 p.m.) at the North Bend Library
Sponsored by King County Flood Control District

In Attendance

- Approximately 60 community members
- King County Flood Control District (FCD), Supervisor Kathy Lambert
- Mayor of North Bend, Ken Hearing
- King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks staff:
 - Chase Barton, Teresa Lewis, Gus Kays, Olivia Wright, JoAnn Whited, Elissa Ostergaard
- Kellogg Consulting, Tamie Kellogg, Facilitator
- Watershed Science & Engineering, Tim Tschetter, Consultant

Meeting Purpose

1. Share an overview of the project and information on flooding and channel migration risks, and cover next steps.
2. Provide an opportunity to ask questions and share observations and thoughts about the river, flooding and channel migration risks in neighborhoods, and potential risk reduction solutions.

Process

The 2-hour meeting covered:

- Open house before and after the presentation for attendees to ask questions and discuss issues one on one with project staff.
- Slideshow presentation, and two question and answer sessions with attendees.

Introductions

Tamie Kellogg welcomed everyone and introduced the agenda. FCD Supervisor Kathy Lambert welcomed everyone and thanked community members for attending. She let attendees know that the FCD wants to hear their concerns about flooding and get their input on potential solutions to reduce risks.

Presentation

Chase Barton, Snoqualmie Basin Supervising Engineer, welcomed everyone and explained that the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River corridor planning process is an effort led by the FCD to reduce flood risks in communities adjacent to the river. The presentation included:

- An overview of the corridor planning process and status of the Middle Fork Snoqualmie River corridor planning process.
- Middle Fork Snoqualmie River corridor plan goals.
- Existing conditions – flood protection facilities, flood and channel migration hazards, infrastructure at risk.
- Potential risk reduction tools.

- Next steps and preliminary timeline.

There were two breaks for questions and comments to get feedback on existing conditions, potential risk reduction tools, and the project. The following questions and comments were discussed:

- Q: What was the 2009 flood?

A: It was a 25-year flood event at 31,000 cubic feet per second (cfs). Since the mid-70's we have had four 25-year events. We have not experienced a 100-year flood event since river flow gaging was installed in the 1960's.

- Q: What are you doing to integrate climate change issues?

A: We're looking at different types of flows, including up to a 500-year flood flow, to see what could be a future scenario flood event.

- Discussion about causes of major flooding and atmospheric rivers.
- What happens here is influenced by what happens upstream. Are we looking upstream? We are focused on the lower 4 ½ miles as this is where we have flood protection facilities and is where we can work to reduce risks. Our partners are working upstream on issues, such as forestry.
- Discussion about the Mason Thorson Extension levee, the amount of bank erosion, and suggestion to open up and divert flow into the nearby east channel to encourage flow away from the levee.
- Discussion about the modeled 2009 flood event and landowner's personal experiences with the flow on their property.
- Discussion about the difference between the FEMA regulatory mapping and King County modeled flood mapping.
- Discussion about the model's sensitivity to increased development and impervious surfaces.
- Discussion about maintenance of existing King County flood protection facilities.
- Discussion about riverbank erosion near trails and public safety.
- Discussion about project timeline and funding mechanisms.

Common Themes and Suggestions

Residents expressed **support** for:

- Dredging to redirect river flows, increase flood storage, and reduce flooding.
- Removing log jams to divert river flows and improve river recreation safety.
- Trails and public access to the river; recreation on publically owned levees and floodplain.
- Levee setbacks to increase channel size.

- More wood in the river for fish.
- Levee removal, where not needed, to reduce maintenance costs and improve habitat.
- New instream wood structures for fish habitat and a more natural river.
- Creating a small reservoir on WA State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) property to increase flood storage capacity and decrease flow velocities during flood events.
- Elevating Mt. Si Road.
- Raising levees for a higher level of flood protection.

*Residents expressed **concern** about:*

- Impacts of dredging to salmon habitat and need for continual maintenance.
- Impacts to private property for levee setbacks and levee removal.
- New instream structures; enough wood already and recreation safety.
- Levee setbacks create a barrier to property ownership (middle of the river).
- Raising levees in place blocks views and requires larger property footprint.
- Maintaining and repairing existing levees due to long term cost.