

**King County  
Flood District Advisory Committee  
Preparation and Discussion Guide  
May 8<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

The May 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of the FCZD Advisory Committee will focus on the proposed work program for 2009 in preparation for a final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors at the May 28<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**FCZD Subregional Opportunity Fund**

At the April 4<sup>th</sup> meeting the Advisory Committee discussed options for allocating the Subregional Opportunity Fund. The Committee held a 'temperature read' vote and unanimously supported the following recommendations to the Board of Supervisors:

- 1) A proportional allocation of funds based on the jurisdiction's contribution to the Flood Control Zone District levy fund, including a proportional allocation of the unincorporated area funds to the PAAs (depending on project availability) and the remaining unincorporated area.
- 2) Flexibility for the jurisdictions in determining the types of projects to fund as eligible under the RCW.
- 3) Flexibility for the jurisdictions in determining where these funded projects should be located.

The May 8<sup>th</sup> meeting will include a final vote on these recommendations.

**Capital Project Evaluation Results**

At the April 4<sup>th</sup> meeting the Advisory Committee discussed proposed project evaluation enhancements to complement the existing flood protection benefit ranking. These 'implementation factors' influence project sequencing, and include such things as project readiness (including landowner willingness), partnerships, leveraging of external fund sources, and other factors. This information is useful in determining how to strategically sequence capital projects. As part of this discussion the Advisory Committee also requested that regional economic benefits (such as impacts to employment centers, regional distribution centers, and freight mobility) be more explicitly reflected in the flood risk reduction priority score.

At the May 8<sup>th</sup> meeting staff will present preliminary results of the refined scoring system. Additional review by the Basin Technical Committees is scheduled between the 5/8 and 5/28 Advisory Committee meetings. By combining flood risk reduction and implementation factors, projects can be grouped and appropriate strategies developed for each set of projects:

- *High flood risk reduction potential, high implementation potential*

These projects are high priority and do not have significant constraints to implementation. Projects should commence in 2009 unless there are reasons (ie partnership opportunities, dependencies with other projects in the District's capital program, etc) that make sequencing further out in the 6-year window advisable.

- *High flood risk reduction potential, moderate implementation potential*

These projects are high priority but face constraints to implementation. In most cases these constraints are due to the need for property interests, either rights-of-way or fee-simple ownership. Many of the Lower Green levee setback and rehabilitation projects fall into this category, and we will describe an approach to address right-of-way and permitting issues so that these projects can be constructed within the 6-year CIP window. Other projects that fall into this category include levee setback and removal projects and mitigation of floodprone properties. For these projects, floodplain buyouts are completed when landowners are willing, and the construction element of the project can proceed once affected parcels are acquired. However, these acquisitions are driven by landowner willingness rather than a projects location on the CIP list. We propose to implement much of the acquisition phase of these projects through a Flood Buyout and Elevation Fund that allocates funds each year to match FEMA and other grant sources. In effect, this approach moves the land acquisition component of levee setback projects forward until sufficient land is available to increase flood storage and conveyance capacity through a levee setback or removal. The Rainbow Bend levee setback enabled through the successful acquisition of the Cedar Grove Mobile Home Park and adjacent parcels over the last several years provides a good example of this approach.
- *Moderate flood risk reduction potential, high implementation potential*

These projects provide moderate flood risk reduction benefits and were previously sequenced further out in, or were just beyond the District's 10-year financial plan. Projects in this category have high implementation potential due to landowner willingness and/or completed project designs and permits, and leverage District funds through external sources. Because projects in this category have moderate flood risk benefits, the Advisory Committee may wish to constrain expenditures in this category in one or more of the following ways:

  - Projects below a specified flood risk reduction percentage should leverage more than two dollars for every District dollar.
  - Projects below a specified flood risk reduction percentage should not exceed \$500,000.
  - The cumulative total of projects below a specified flood risk reduction percentage should not exceed more than a specified percentage of the District's capital expenditures in a given year.
  - Projects scoring below a specified percentage should not be eligible for District funds.

- In weighing whether these projects should be funded, the Advisory Committee should consider other higher scoring projects that may have to be re-sequenced if these projects receive funding.

### **2009 Programmatic Work Program**

While the Capital Program is the majority of the District's budget each year, the programmatic elements play a critical role in assessing hazards, preparing for flood season, maintaining the District's flood protection facilities, coordinating with other jurisdictions and agencies, and leveraging District funds through grants and partnerships. In this agenda item you will hear more about the programmatic elements proposed for the District's 2009 work program. These include the following elements:

- Flood Preparedness, Regional Flood Warning Center, and Post Flood Recovery
- Flood Hazard Assessments, Mapping, and Technical Studies
- Planning, Grants, Mitigation, and Public Outreach
- KCFCZD Implementation
- Resource Management, Annual Maintenance, and Facility Monitoring
- Management, Finance, Budget and General Administration

### **Advisory Committee By-Laws and Chair**

The resolution establishing the Advisory Committee states that the Committee shall adopt rules governing its operations and elect a chair and vice-chair. Margaret will present proposed by-laws and operating procedures for the Advisory Committee for discussion.

## King County Flood Control Zone District Advisory Committee

At the April 4<sup>th</sup> FCZD Advisory Committee meeting, staff presented recommendations from the Basin Technical Committees to refine the capital project evaluation process and incorporate factors such as project readiness, leveraging, and partnerships. During this discussion Advisory Committee members asked that the evaluation process clearly reflect 'regional economic benefit', as this is included in the 2006 Flood Plan policies, along with threats to public safety, damage to public infrastructure, and damage to private structures. In addition, the regional economic benefits of functioning flood protection facilities was frequently cited as justification for approving the Flood District levy. Specific examples of regional economic impacts included employment centers, regional distribution centers, and freight mobility. The Advisory Committee asked King County staff to reinforce the regional economic benefits element of the scoring system, and to provide proposed revisions via email prior to the next Advisory Committee meeting.

We propose that the flood risk scoring system be amended as follows, with an additional 5 points (out of 38 total, or 13%) awarded to projects that meet the following conditions:

The proposed project protects the regional economy by reducing the risk of flooding, erosion, and channel migration to at least one of the following areas:

- a. Major freight transportation corridors identified in the current Washington State Department of Transportation Freight and Goods Transportation Designations Table (FGTS) as category T1 (statewide Strategic Freight Corridor carrying more than 10 million tons of freight per year)  
<http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/3CF227DF-C152-440D-AD0E-4BADDDDB8C470/0/0208FGTS2007Final.pdf>
- b. Highest concentration of employment centers for each of the Puget Sound Regional Council's Regional Employment Clusters mapped categories for 'number of jobs' in each for the Puget Sound Regional Council's Regional Employment Clusters (see maps on page 77+ of [http://www.prosperitypartnership.org/strategy/v2\\_pt3.pdf](http://www.prosperitypartnership.org/strategy/v2_pt3.pdf))
- c. Central Puget Sound Manufacturing and Industrial Center, as identified by the Puget Sound Regional Council  
<http://www.psrc.org/publications/pubs/trends/e13mar03.pdf>

We have discussed this proposal with each of the Basin Technical Committees and asked for their comments. We believe that this proposal is responsive to the Advisory Committee's request, and addresses the regional economic benefits from protecting employment centers, distribution centers, and freight corridors from flooding. Further, the proposed evaluation criteria use existing information from the Puget Sound Regional Council and the Washington State Department of Transportation that is already in use by each of the jurisdictions for other purposes.