

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM
CITY OF SHORELINE, WASHINGTON

AGENDA TITLE:	Sound Cities Association Policy Issues Committee Policy Position Discussion – King County Flood Control District
DEPARTMENT:	CMO
PRESENTED BY:	Scott MacColl, Intergovernmental Relations Manager
ACTION:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance <input type="checkbox"/> Resolution <input type="checkbox"/> Motion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussion <input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing

Councilmember Roberts, as the City's representative to the Sound Cities Association's (SCA) Public Issues Committee (PIC), is seeking Council input regarding the King County Flood Control District 2014 Budget. The SCA caucus of the King County Flood Control District Advisory Committee (FCDAC) is seeking information and/or direction on issues to raise prior to approving the 2014 FCD budget. This is the opportunity for our Council to provide any input to Councilmember Roberts to relay at the July PIC meeting.

The SCA's PIC committee includes representatives of each city that is a member of SCA, and the intent is that an individual city's representative is representing the will of their respective Council. Positions supported by the PIC are not final until voted on by the SCA Board of Directors.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council provide direction for Councilmember Roberts.

Approved By: City Manager **DT** City Attorney **IS**

INTRODUCTION

Councilmember Roberts is seeking Council direction for the next PIC meeting regarding the King County Flood Control District (FCD) 2014 Work Program and Budget. The PIC generally discusses an initial policy position at one meeting, with an actual vote at the next meeting to allow for PIC members to brief their Councils and receive policy direction. This item was discussed at the June 2013 PIC meeting, and will be on the PIC July 10, 2013 agenda. In this instance, however, the SCA Caucus of the FCDAC is seeking input from SCA cities regarding concerns or policy direction prior to the advisory committee approving the proposed 2014 FCD budget.

BACKGROUND

The King County Flood Control District was established in April, 2007 to protect public health and safety, regional economic centers, public and private properties and transportation corridors. The district was formed to address the backlog of maintenance and repairs to levees and revetments, acquiring repetitive loss properties and other at-risk floodplain properties, and improving countywide flood warning and flood prediction capacity. Shoreline citizens pay in approximately \$850,000 per year to the district.

The King County FCDAC is charged with providing the Flood Control District Board of Supervisors (the County Council, who also acts as the board) with expert policy advice on regional flood protection issues, including annual recommendations on the District's work program and budget. The FCDAC addresses policy priorities for district funding.

Ten cities, cities prone to flooding (Tukwila, Auburn, Kent, Renton, Snoqualmie, North Bend, Carnation, Seattle, and Bellevue), have their own permanent seats. The remaining twenty-nine (29) cities in the county are represented by four (4) members (and four alternate members) appointed by the SCA. SCA appointees are looking to benefit all cities. However, since many SCA cities do not receive much FCD funding and/or do not have rivers or significant flooding problems, they are not as familiar with the KCD issues.

SCA staff has noted that there have been philosophical questions raised concerning whether each basin should receive a set amount of funding or projects should compete district-wide. Originally, the FCD was formed to manage flooding from six major river systems. However, since then, funds have been shared with non-river projects such as the Seattle Seawall. The District has not exercised its full taxing authority; therefore, there is a great deal of interest from various agencies in increasing the District's mission. As an example, the Water Resources Inventory Area (WRIA) program was moved from the King Conservation District to the King County Flood Control District.

King County Flood Control District 2014 Work Program and Budget

At the June 12, 2012 meeting of the PIC, SCA staff requested that members share a list of questions from the May 30, 2013 Flood Control District Advisory Committee meeting with cities prior to the July meeting of the PIC. Responses to these questions will help

SCA caucus members address key policy issues the Advisory Committee has been debating this past year.

SCA is seeking any additional information/direction from cities that would be helpful for caucus members to raise prior to approving the FCD budget. One identified issue is that the Advisory Committee is expected to approve the budget; however, a significant amount of policy input/direction has already been provided to the Board of Supervisors (King County Council) by a Citizens Advisory Committee and the Basin Technical Committees, thus bypassing the Advisory Committee.

To date, SCA staff reached out to city staff that regularly attend KCFCDAC meetings, as well as King County Water and Land Resources staff. Feedback was fairly limited, however as a starting point for discussion purposes, here is the feedback received to date:

- 1. If we are doing a corridor planning effort should we commit funding to specific capital projects in advance of completing the planning effort? Under what circumstances can actions move forward in advance of the larger planning effort?**

City Response: There will always be exceptions to the rule; the primary factors that should be considered include the risk of failure if a project is delayed and the severity of consequences if a flood protection structure fails. Regarding structure failure, it is critical to know how much damage is expected, how ready is the project for repair, and if local funds have been expended to advance the technical assessment of the risk. These projects should be brought to the Advisory Committee for consideration.

County Response: In 2012, as part of the scope of work for the Flood Plan update, the King County Flood Control District Board of Supervisors directed King County to prepare a number of issue papers to facilitate potential policy development on a number of topics including Capital Project Prioritization. Those issue papers were presented to the Citizens Committee. The Citizens Committee was established to serve as a "sounding board at key milestones" during the flood plan update. Members were identified by the King County Flood Control District Board of Supervisors and included floodplain property owners as well as professionals in the field of floodplain management. This policy question will be considered by the Board.

- 2. Should new projects be considered for the CIP at this time and if so how do other jurisdictions submit new project ideas for consideration? If yes, are coastal projects eligible for funding? What about urban streams and stormwater?**

City Response: New projects should be considered for the CIP when, based on new knowledge, it is apparent that if we do not act, the probability of a flood control feature failing is higher and the consequences of failures are significant. The District has already developed scoring criteria by which we evaluate risk. It would seem that we can apply such criteria on an annual basis as our knowledge of the threat allows us to be aware of an increased threat. Some believe we should wait several years for the update of the Comprehensive plan for each basin before adding new projects. There is

some logic in this approach; however, the first priority of the District is to protect the communities where there is flooding. While planning provides a long term perspective on how to invest in long term flood protection measures that are consistent with other district goals, if we know that a structure protecting a community is failing the Advisory Committee should have an opportunity to consider the project annually, if not sooner.

Coastal projects rarely have anything to do with protecting a community within the District; however, if a case can be made that coastal flood could damage a business or residence then it should be studied to determine the best way to mitigate damages.

County Response: The King County Water and Land Resources Division were directed to not solicit new project proposals for 2014, and that new projects should come out of planning efforts rather than the budget process. The Board may of course change that direction, but that's what they've been working under since receiving direction on March 26, 2013. This approach was shared with the Basing Technical Committees at their joint meeting on April 3, 2013.

Regarding Coastal Flooding, the Board has identified this as a policy issue and received comments from the Citizen Committee. This policy question will be considered by the Board.

3. Should FEMA accreditation be a policy priority for District funding?

City Response: Yes, certification & accreditation should be a goal for each flood control structural improvement where it is feasible to meet the FEMA certification requirements and obtain accreditation. There is a huge economic development component which should be prioritized.

County Response: The Board has previously (2011, via motion FCD11-02) adopted a policy statement regarding District support for FEMA accreditation. The policy describes the conditions under which the District will take on the long-term operations and maintenance responsibility necessary for levee certification and FEMA accreditation. To date, levee certification for FEMA insurance mapping purposes has not been established as a policy priority for construction funding. The Board has identified FEMA accreditation as a policy issue and requested Citizen Committee input. This policy question will be considered by the Board.

For the Green River, accreditation and the appropriate level of service for levee design is also part of the scope for the System-Wide Improvement Framework (SWIF).

4. Should we have predetermined allocations for each basin from year to year, or adjust the CIP across the entire county?

City Response: Suggest we keep it simple – this could distract from the mission of the district. It may be appropriate to review the districts mission statement and include “Flood protection based on a risk based assessment”.

County Response: Since the formation of the District, priorities have been evaluated across the county without predetermined allocations for individual basins. Any project

under-expenditures are assumed to return to the overall fund balance to meet countywide needs, rather than being reserved for a specific basin.

5. Should the 2012 resolution approving the sandbag removal expenditures on the Green be amended?

City Response: Not necessary.

County Response: No response.

6. How do we make sure that the CIP reflects the highest priority needs across the county?

City Response: By having county and Basin Technical staff develop and bring to the Advisory Committee a uniform scoring of projects based upon risk of flooding and the severity of potential flooding consequences. County staff should develop the project list and scoring based upon the existing district criteria and Basin technical staff should review the scoring for quality control and equitable considerations for presentation to the Advisory Committee. To get started we should first review the capital project scoring criteria with the Advisory Committee to assure we have agreement and consensus.

County Response: No response.

The next step in the process after the PIC meeting is a FCDAC meeting on July 18, 2013. Recommendations will be forwarded to the King County Council with a full explanation of each of the vote categories (pro, con, undecided), so that the Council can derive full benefit from the nature of the debate.

Committee members will review and edit these recommendation submittals prior to their being forwarded to the King County Council. A report must be transmitted to the Flood Control District Board by August 31, 2013.

Tonight's Council discussion will center around whether Council has opinions on the questions and answers identified thus far and if there is any additional information they would like to add. Councilmember Roberts will take any direction provided by Council to the PIC meeting on July 10.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that Council provide direction for Councilmember Roberts.