

Meeting Minutes



*Six South 2nd Street
Suite 903
Yakima, WA 98901
Phone (509) 457-4009
Fax (509) 457-4072*

Meeting: Flood Management Advisory Committee Meeting

Project: Redmond Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan
Otak Project No. 30759

Meeting Date: September 5, 2007

Meeting Time: 12:00 to 2:00 PM

Location: City Hall Conference Room

Attendees: Ray Anspach, Marie McEwen, Howard Harrison, Leon
Hussey—Community Members
Kim Dietz, Steve Hitch—City of Redmond
John Knutson, Laurie Wood—Otak

Minutes By: Laurie Wood

Redmond Flood Management Advisory Committee Meeting

The focus of this advisory committee meeting was to review and discuss Redmond's CFHMP flood hazard management alternatives and to finalize the selection of the preferred alternative.

Introductions

- Steve Hitch, Stormwater Engineer for the City of Redmond (City), began the meeting by welcoming the committee members.
- Steve stated that representatives from King County, Priscilla Kaufmann and Nancy Faegenburg, and Chuck Steele from the Department of Ecology would not be able to attend.
- Steve mentioned that this was the last scheduled FMAC meeting.

Review Minutes from Previous Meeting

- Steve Hitch asked if there were any comments and/or edits to the Minutes of the June 6, 2007 meeting.
- No comments and/or edits were requested. The minutes were accepted as written.

Review and Discuss Redmond CFHMP Alternatives

- John Knutson, Otak Inc. (Otak), led the review discussion of Redmond's CFHMP alternatives.
- John stated that typically CFHMP alternatives include capital improvement projects and floodplain management activities. Since no significant flood damages have occurred within the City in the recent past, Redmond's flood management needs related to floodplain management activities and not flood control projects. As a result, only two alternatives were developed for

Meeting Minutes

September 5, 2007

Page 2

the CFHMP. The first alternative, called the “No Change Alternative,” involved continuing with the existing City floodplain management program. The second alternative, the “FMAC Alternative,” involved a list of recommendations that were developed from a review of the flooding problems and needs identified by the FMAC, the floodplain management related recommendations listed in previous studies, and the recommendations discussed during the development of the CFHMP goals and objectives.

- A copy of the FMAC Alternative Table was distributed to the committee members listing the recommendations. John mentioned the rest of the meeting would be spent reviewing and discussing these recommendations.
- John stated that the recommendations in the table were grouped under the CFHMP goal they addressed, categorized as Structural or Non-Structural measures, and assigned a type (Policy, Regulatory Standard, Educational Activity, Additional Study, Project, Funding Effort, and/or Intergovernmental Coordination).
- The recommendations were then reviewed one by one.
- Steve questioned what King County wastewater treatment plan Recommendation 5.4 referred to. Laurie Wood, Otak, stated that this recommendation referred to a problem discussed at a previous FMAC meeting. At that meeting Nancy Faegenburg of King County mentioned any Redmond restoration project on the east bank of the Sammamish River across from Willows Run Golf Course might conflict with a proposed sewer line from a future King County wastewater treatment plant. Laurie suggested she contact Nancy for clarification.
- At the end of the discussion, John stated the edits to the recommendations would be incorporated into the final “Redmond FMAC Alternative” Table. Committee members would be able to review the table when the final draft of the CFHMP is available on the Redmond website.
- Ray Anspach requested a hard copy of the document for review. Steve said he could send him a copy.
- John mentioned the evaluation process of choosing the preferred alternative was based on input from the FMAC and how each alternative met the established goals and objectives of the CFHMP. The FMAC Alternative was developed using this criteria. The FMAC agreed with the selection of the FMAC Alternative as the preferred alternative.

Next Steps for the FMAC

- John stated that a final CFHMP chapter will be developed describing strategies to implement the recommendations of the FMAC Alternative. A draft copy of the Implementation Plan will be available on the Redmond website in about a month. The committee members are asked to review the draft chapter and provide comments.
- John mentioned that the adoption of the CFHMP paves the way for implementing the CFHMP recommendations.
- Steve and Kim Dietz, City of Redmond Planning Department, described how the CFHMP adoption process might proceed within the City of Redmond. Steve said the CFHMP would have to be reviewed by the Public Works Department. Kim mentioned that the CFHMP would

Meeting Minutes

September 5, 2007

Page 3

have to pass through the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission would also schedule a public hearing. Study sessions would also occur. Technical committees may also need to review the document. Finally, the city council would vote on whether to adopt the CFHMP.

- John mentioned that the CFHMP adoption process varies by jurisdiction. The impact of the adoption of the CFHMP on city staff's job responsibilities also needs to be evaluated.
- Laurie also mentioned that draft SEPA (State Environmental Policy Act) documentation must be completed and distributed for review with the draft CFHMP. The CFHMP must also be approved by the Department of Ecology, in consultation with the Departments of Fisheries and Wildlife, before the city council vote.
- Steve stated that the approval process could take longer due to the approaching election of a new mayor and the hiring of a new Public Works Director.
- Kim said she thought the process would take at least nine months to complete.
- John mentioned that it is important for the FMAC members to continue to stay involved in the adoption process of the CFHMP. The committee members input at public meetings, open houses, etc. is crucial. Committee members understand the decision-making process that was involved in developing the CFHMP. Committee members can comment that the CFHMP goals, objectives, and recommendations were developed through a public/agency participation process.
- Steve stated that he will continue to send e-mails to the committee members to notify them of the events occurring that relate to the adoption of the CFHMP.
- Steve and John thanked the FMAC for their time and input during the development of the CFHMP and for their continued involvement during the upcoming CFHMP adoption process.