

Bear Creek Watershed Plan

Public Meeting #1

Redmond Senior Center Auditorium

Meeting Summary

February 25th, 2016 from 6:30-8:30 p.m.

	<p>Attendees: 35 people attended the public meeting. Included numerous residents from the Bear Creek basin, City of Redmond, Council member Lambert staff April Sanders and various regulatory agencies. (area codes recorded: 98122, 98026, 98104, 98077, 98052, 98072, 98028, 98102, 98503, 98011, 98007, 98108)</p>
	<p>Time was allotted for light refreshments to be enjoyed, an informal tour of poster displays for key Stormwater Plan milestones, a meet and greet with the Project Team and Partners, Q&A with Team Leads and to record questions for further discussion.</p> <p>Poster Board Question: “When it comes to Bear Creek, what concerns you the most?”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Save the trees, don’t increase impervious surfaces!2. Beaver control3. Enforcement4. Pollution, garbage, and all foreign matter in the creek and creek beds.5. Maintain and restore forest cover and wetland groundwater.6. How will we grow sustainably in the watershed?7. How to maintain salmon productivity?8. How to increase Chinook salmon populations?9. Proper forest cover10. How do you plan to protect trees in the watershed in order to reduce runoff?11. Road runoff and pollution12. Stream water temperature13. The plan should translate into policy and protection14. The maps show small patches of rural surrounded by high density. The privately owned sections come to be looked at as public open space and it becomes the landowner’s job to constantly ask people to leave. How do you keep people from climbing over fences to use the property for public use? For example, people going into barns, exploring, cutting fences to ride horses, etc. <p>From the Public Comment Sheet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Good work, so far.2. Enforcement is your problem; the strategies are just recommendations.3. You need more outreach to draw public attention and participation.
Tamie Kellogg, Jeff Burkey	<p>Welcome, Introductions and project overview Brief introductions of Partners and Project Team were provided.</p>
Jeff Burkey	<p>Plan Goals, Objective and Project Overview : Presentation</p> <p>Goals for this specific workshop: Educate stakeholders and public citizens on why it is important to do this planning effort for Bear Creek Watershed-Scale Stormwater Plan and share the following:</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why creating this plan is relevant or important to citizens 2. The process for developing the Plan 3. Who is developing the Plan 4. The Community can share their ideas and input on the importance of the watershed, water quality and health of the environment <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. How to get current information and background information on the Plan b. How to communicate feedback and concerns on the Plan <p>Plan implementation –potential impacts and money</p>
<p>Jeff Burkey</p>	<p>Conditions in Bear Creek now and in the future and possible Strategies under consideration: Presentation</p> <p>Q&A</p> <p>Q: Over the years, I've floated an idea that never gained traction: the closer we get to surpassing impervious and those kinds of thresholds, the more we have to clamp down on development. Is there a sliding scale, where closer we get to the magic numbers, the more we clamp down and require more stringent development standards?</p> <p>Jeff Burkey: There is certainly an evolution of how we understand how the systems respond and how effective mitigation is. You have to keep in mind that a lot of the development happened before much of any type of regulations were in play. As we understand better how to mitigate and protect and restore the system -- and, again, the paradigm has shifted from mitigation and preventing degradation to protection and restoration and those do take more resources and more effort. Is it a sliding scale? I can't say it won't be a sliding scale, but as time goes on there is going to be another design manual in 2016 and there will be another one in 2019 and there might be changes in land use regulations just from other reasons. I can't say that there won't be changes, but one of the goals of this plan is to identify what it will take to actually get to the end point. How long it will take and how many resources will be available to do that will depend on the politicians, decision makers, and residents. It's going to take everyone.</p> <p>Q: Looking at range of actions that might be required and how to get more bang for your buck, you show that one of the targets might be salmon improvement and that's great. But, don't you understand the dangers of putting dollar amounts onto what these projects are going to involve and asking people to come up with these big amounts of money and putting it on the back of the fish - that there is a danger that you might get a backlash for spending all of this money to protect fish that are dying out anyway? I'm worried about what happens when the numbers come out and basically all you're selling it on is the wildlife.</p> <p>Jeff Burkey: It is going to be a big number. One of biggest objectives of the plan is to inform people, so that they can make the decision of whether or not it is worth it to them to support restoration efforts. Because there will be a price tag and numbers attached they can decide if they want to spend that amount or maybe less. The price tag will be expensive, definitely, but I also want to highlight the fact that the plan anticipates that it will happen over 40 to 50 years. So, yes, it's expensive, but isn't going to happen all up front. And, who knows what kind of funding may become available over that span?</p> <p>Tamie Kellogg: That's why this type of public process is important. It asks, "What's important to you? What do you value?" so those things make it to the decision makers.</p> <p>Q: When you talk about different types of forest cover, will this plan show us the differences between sites that haven't been touched in 80 years and one that hasn't been touched in 40 years and on down, so people can see what is lost during development. People don't understand that when you have an old growth forest, you have a much better system than you do when you have a lot of development.</p> <p>Jeff Burkey: In a forested landscape there is a small amount of run-off and as development occurs, there's more run-off and less storage in the system.</p> <p>Comment: Yes, but you have to have pictures so people understand. You must have them.</p> <p>Q: I like the picture they have of looking up at the canopy, because that is the answer. I feel sad because I've been</p>

working on this since 1998 is Snohomish County and the tree ordinance allows clear cutting. When you have that, you have run-off. I'm really offended and feel strongly about it, as we all know that clear cutting is for development. The developers are making millions and millions of dollars and we all know that when they clear cut, the water runs off, they take their money and leave, and the people in the county have to pay for it. We need to stop saying that we're going to restore for the animals (it's also tragic how we're losing birds) and we need to take care of the developer problem. Those trees hold the water. They are the answer. If you guys don't convince people to stop clear cutting this is all for naught. This isn't working.

Jeff Burkey: There has been a positive effect. Bear Creek is in good shape and it's not just luck. The Bear Creek plan that happened in 1990 translated into regulations and zoning codes. There are net effects that do result from a plan.

Q: What's the difference in water chemistry if you have a retention vault type versus run-off through rain gardens versus surface run-off through a buffer?

Jeff Burkey: A vault may have some simple treatment into it and it filters out fines and sedimentation. The rain gardens are bio-filtrations and are designed to filter more of the metals, the fines, and some of the organics. They are shown to be more effective for treatment of the storms.

Q: Have you thought about maybe not stopping clear cutting and, instead preserving more areas of the creek and buffering them?

Jeff Burkey: There are buffer requirements now and it's very likely there will be some in plan. There could be forced retention, as well. Right now, there is some. Is it enough? We will look at that. The goal is to make people aware of what it will take so they can either embrace it, debate it, and make informed decisions.

Tamie Kellogg: That is the type of strategy that will be looked at in the plan, but the project is not in that stage yet. The next time they come out to talk to you, they will have more of that type of information so that you can weigh in on the strategies.

Q: Will the model you are creating get used throughout the County? It seems like every creek is unique and needs this kind of protection. This study is going to take you to 2018 just to get a plan for Bear Creek, but meanwhile you haven't even started on the other creeks in the County.

Jeff Burkey: The models we are using now have been used for 20 years. It's been an evolution in process, because most of the mitigation has been mitigation of degradation and not restoration. We now have a paradigm shift. As far as the other basins go, we have basin plans, but there is a lot of cost and a lot of resources needed. We need everyone to embrace it and that means the residents, too. It makes it very difficult for the policy makers to implement a plan if their constituents don't want it. It's really about making people aware of how valuable these resources are so that they will advocate for these kinds of projects.

Q: You show the map of where there are impervious surfaces. Will your actual model take into account future development plans?

Jeff Burkey: Yes, we will certainly try to -- which means that we will, but it's just a matter of how comprehensive we can be. There may be things we don't know about. One of the certain projections we're using is the Comprehensive Plan, which is based on zoning and also has caps on impervious surfaces. We will look at a worst-case scenario of what happens when all of the zoning is maxed out.

Q: There's models and there is the real world. Do you match up your models to measurements in the real world -- and how are the models doing?

Jeff Burkey: As part of the monitoring, in the modeling we have multiple stream gauges that are measuring continuously. We collect multiple times during storms. We're collecting data on metals, temperature, bugs, etc. We use the real observed data in the modeling.

Q: If get to a more developed situation and tighten the regulations, have you given any thought to regulating the allowed percentage of impervious surfaces in a basin?

Jeff Burkey: Yes. In Bear Creek, there is a regulation like that right now. We need higher standard; we know that from work we have done in Bear Creek.

	<p>Q: I served on the Bear Creek Committee in 1990, so this is exciting to me. I think the biggest disappointment from that project is the issue of enforcement. It's always a subject that never goes anywhere.</p> <p>Jeff Burkey: It's definitely on my radar. Enforcement may be one of the mechanisms that is most cost effective. It takes a lot of resources, but it is effective. This plan won't ignore it, that's for sure.</p>
Tamie Kellogg	<p>Wrap up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Another public meeting will be held in September of 2016• Continued input and involvement in this Stormwater Management Plan is appreciated. Send input or questions to - Jeff Burkey