FINAL Meeting Minutes
Stillaguamish River Comprehensive Flood Study
Planning Advisory Committee Meeting
April 24, 2001, 2:00pm – 4:00 p.m.

Attendees
Mike McCallister, Snohomish County Dept. of Emergency Management
Bill Blake, City of Arlington
Laurie Bergvall, Washington Department of Natural Resources
James Yapp, Snohomish County, Parks Department
Mike Chamblin, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Terry Skorheim, USDA-Forest Service
Duane Weston, Pilchuck Tree Farm
Norma Arnold, Clean Water District Advisory Board
Kelvin Joergenson, Stillaguamish River basin farmland owner
Si Butler, Snohomish County, Planning and Development Services
Vaughn Collins, Snohomish County, Surface Water Management
Toni Turner, Snohomish County, Surface Water Management

Forest Practice Issue Paper
After introductions, Toni reviewed the following edits to the paper:

1. References: A complete reference list was distributed to the committee.
2. Table 3: Land Cover Type by Jurisdiction within Commercial Forestland by Subbasin. The federal land considered mature forested in the Gold Basin Drainage is 29% (not 1%).
3. Page 6, the paragraph after Figure 1, the sentence reads: In unlogged, forested areas, branches intercept snowfall and effectively reduce the volume of snow that reaches the ground because the intercepted snow *melts (was "evaporates")* at a higher rate.
4. Page 7, second paragraph: sentence reads: Harr & Coffin (1992) further showed that when air temperatures and wind speeds were relatively high, *soil moisture content increased, which can lead to increased streamflows (was "leads to significantly increased streamflows")*.
5. Page 8, second paragraph: A question was raised by Washington Department of Natural Resources as to the validity of referencing the Amaranthus et. al (1985) study because the research was conducted between the mid-50's and the mid-70's when forest practices were significantly different than they are now. In addition, WDNR staff believed that the terrain used in the study is significantly different than that of the Stillaguamish River basin, which they believed rendered the results unrelated to the Stillaguamish River basin. This request in under review.
6. Land Cover type: As mentioned in the issue paper, Snohomish County Surface Water Management staff will do a comparison of land cover type and ortho-photography to validate the mixed forest land cover type. Any revisions will be included in the next draft.

Additional comments:
1. Bill Blake requested a comparison of the results of the land cover type data with the watershed analyses conducted by the USDA-FS. This comparison will be completed and provided in the next draft.
2. Bill also asked about the definition of the mixed forestland cover type. By definition, this land cover type does not contribute large woody debris to the river system. The question raised was whether hardwood species, which are part of the mixed forestland cover type, were considered to contribute to LWD. He pointed out that the river floodplain forest was 60% - 70% hardwoods and when the channel migrated, contributed a significant amount of LWD to the river system.
3. Bill raised concerns that some private forestland owners have conducted illegal operations (e.g., logged through creeks providing no buffers) in Tributary 80 and Koontz Creek. This practice significantly impacts water quality and destroys habitat. Duane stated that although these illegal practices may occur, they are conducted by a very small percentage of the private forestland owners. The private forestland owners were reported to the WDNR.
4. On page 21, the road mileage referenced by the North Fork Watershed Analysis (USDA-FS 2000) is not consistent.

<u>Inventory of Parks, Flood Control Structures, and Other Infrastructure on the Floodplain of the Stillaguamish River Basin Issue Paper.</u>
A draft of the second issue paper was distributed to the committee. This paper documents county park lands, flood control structures, roads, and bridges within the floodplain of the Stillaguamish River basin that are either impacted by flooding or may impact habitat. It also includes a list of the 26 works projects completed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which are located on the mainstem Stillaguamish River.

In addition to the document, the committee was provided maps on which locations of the items in the inventory were provided and plans and specifications of repair work completed in the mid-90s on the Whitehorse Trail and of the Town Tavern Dike reconstruction work currently underway. The structures identified in this document will be evaluated and prioritized based on the goals, objectives, project evaluation criteria, and problem prioritization.

Following are the comments received on the draft document (additional comments due to Toni by Friday, May 11):
1. Add USDA-Forest Service and Washington State roads and bridges. Include Forest Service parklands that are located in the floodplain as well.
2. Smokes Farm arrow is pointing to the wrong structure.
3. Add Corps diversion dam located on Cook Slough.
4. Dike Road Dike should be evaluated for split flow. This structure is believed to be the highest risk for a potential breach on the mainstem.
5. Add Tin Bridge, located just downstream of Cloverdale Park as it experiences debris and sediment buildup. Multiple other railroad bridges exist on the Whitehorse Trail that will be added to the inventory.
6. Add that Black Creek debris build-up due to splash dam 300 meters upstream.

7. The upstream end of the old channel cut-off by Burlington Northern Railroad (BNRR) on North Fork is currently being assessed for restoration by WDFW.

Flood Hazard Regulatory Issue Paper

Vaughn is drafting the issue paper in which flood hazard regulations will be address. Currently the County is rewriting the Critical Areas Regulations, Chapter 32.10 of Snohomish County Code, in which Title 27, Flood Hazard Regulations, is referenced. This paper will address the current regulations and identify areas for improvement. Some of the regulations that will be addressed include:

1. Zero-rise: This regulation will address loss of floodwater conveyance due to obstructions to flowing water, which can lead to increased flood levels and consequent damage upstream. It would require that all development in the floodplain not cause any rise in water level. Under current county codes, based on FEMA, water levels increases up to one foot are allowed.
2. Compensatory Storage: This regulation will address the loss of flood storage due to floodplain fill or levees. This loss can lead to increased flood levels and consequent damage downstream. It would require that all fill or other losses of floodplain storage be mitigated by increasing storage nearby through excavation or other means.
3. High Hazard Erosion Zones: Public safety is compromised when development is allowed in areas that are at high risk of flood-caused erosion. This includes areas within the floodplain where the river can easily meander or avulse (Channel Meander Zone), and uplands adjacent to river channels or floodplains that may be above flood levels but are still at risk of erosion.
4. Other: Ensure flood hazard regulations are flexible enough to address true flood risks, allow the use of alternate information sources, and can easily handle changing floodplain conditions to augment the current approach.

Uplands Stormwater Issue Paper

Vaughn is also drafting an issue paper that will describe current county regulations that address development on uplands. In addition to documenting the regulations resulting from the Clean Water Act, the committee requested the paper include relevant work from the Tri-County and Marine Resource Council Service. Si Butler commented that he has information from the City of Snoqualmie and King County that may help in the development of the paper.

Draft Goals and Objectives

The committee was asked if they had any additional comments on the draft goals and objectives. Following the Clean Water District presentation on April 26, Snohomish County management will be asked to review and finalize them. The committee will then be asked to finalize the problem prioritization and project evaluation criteria, after which tasks can be evaluated and prioritized to include as recommendations in the plan.

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held Tuesday, July 24, 2001, from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. at the Boys and Girls Club at 18513 59th Avenue NE in Arlington. The tentative agenda for this meeting will be to finalize the project evaluation and problem prioritization criteria and review edited issue papers (i.e., forest practices, inventory of flood control structures) and new issue papers (storm water and regulatory). The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.