

To Whom It May Concern: I am writing in response for public comment on the FCZD plan which appeared in the January 5 edition of the Wenatchee World.

To begin with, I think that it has not been explained thoroughly to the people of Chelan County that this plan and any monies it collects or is matched by FEMA, is only for property within the County Right of Way. This does not include any private property. I've spoken to many on this subject, and much of the response is "...well I don't live in a flood prone area". Well, you live in the county, so you pay.

And pay we do, much to the dissatisfaction of many Chelan County residents. I was part of the Monitor Council meeting when the commissioners came to initially present the plan. Our response was a resounding dissent to more taxes. Especially those that do not directly benefit the whole population with respect to whom is paying into the Plan.

Nevertheless, the commissioners passed, without a vote of the people, to levy additional property taxes among the entire Chelan County population.

One of the reasons the commissioners explained why this was necessary, was that the County budget could not contain the costs in the event(s) of flood damage. Regardless of whether or not any events occur, this money is collected and held by the County. This is a clear indication that the commissioners have no idea what the scope of costs may be and are unable to predict with any certainty how much will be needed in the event of flood reparations. Furthermore, it presents a clear picture of how Public Works cannot manage their budget properly and forecast budgetary needs accordingly.

Therefore, I would like to request a report of the financials of money collected. This should include totals collected annually, any matching funds received from FEMA, funds disbursed from this account to the County, and how much it cost to hire Tetra Tech to provide the Comprehensive Flood Management Plan.

I would also like to see prediction and forecasts for the needs of this collected tax. To maintain this program just to receive matching funds from FEMA and the inability of the PW to manage their budget, are not valid reasons. The public deserves to know the status of this and whether or not the collection of taxes should have a near-future sunset.

Sincerely,
Gene Robinson
2595 Easy St.
Wenatchee, WA 98801
509-679-8991
robinsong369@hotmail.com

Hi.

Thank you for giving us an opportunity to review and provide input into the draft Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan.

We have a home on Nason Creek off of Butcher Creek Road- Forest Road 6910.

We have carefully reviewed the draft plan and have the following recommendations:

As an attachment, a proposed action timeline for the implementation of the plan sectioned out by all stakeholders.

Also, Nason Creek was NOT on the Repetitive Loss Area or designated as a potential flood loss area but a year ago last December and two years prior to that we had major flooding with the loss of our road to three homes as well as major damage to FS Road 6910 near the bridge which we individual home owners had to repair and pay for.

The Forest Service said they were not responsible nor had the funds and neither would the County.

We have had a home in the area since 1982 and have had to repair Butcher Creek Road numerous times due to high water/washout.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Nye

206-842-3654

PO Box 11374

Bainbridge, Washington 98110

Paul K. Gray
25723 White River Road
Leavenworth, WA 98826
31 January 2017

RECEIVED

FEB 02 2017

CHELAN COUNTY
PUBLIC WORKS

Flood Control Zone District
c/o Chelan County Public Works Department
316 Washington Street, Suite 402
Wenatchee, WA 98801

RE: Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan

First:

The nearly annual flooding of meandering streams that cause streambed relocation are a natural part of the ecology of an often rain soaked and snow covered coastal mountain range. It is the frequent violent flooding that has made the streams and rivers of the Cascade Mountains prime salmon spawning habitat. The best way to deal with natural flooding is to not build in flat bottom valleys that have the potential for flooding, and to restore the marsh lands and forests. AND, if we must build in a flood zone, build flood tolerant structures that do not redirect or obstruct the natural flow of the flood water.

Second:

I see the proposed Chelan County '**Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan**' as creating new bureaucracy that is to be built with tax dollars the people of Chelan County are not going to be willing to pay.

Third:

We already have a splatter shot of Salmon recovery plans, promoted by a plethora of bureaucratic agencies and organizations that are making expensive attempts to repair man's damage to the salmon spawning streams in Chelan County. We have Chelan County's compliance plan for the Shoreline Management Act. We have ongoing Growth Management Act compliance. And, hanging over the whole river management question is the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Fourth:

Much of the flood plain restoration work that needs to be done could be achieved with guidance from the Chelan County Natural Resources Department and the Chelan Douglas Land Trust. Another aspect could be tax incentives to encourage property owners to make on the ground corrections. The permitting process for flood plain restoration should be as simple and straight forward as possible. And, with careful negotiations and small incentive payments, arrangements might be made for adjacent private property owners to make flood plain restorations on public lands.

Last:

Looking at the list of people on the 'Stakeholder Committee' that put the **Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan** together there are too many people who appear to have an employment connection to Chelan County Government or the Government of one of the Cities in Chelan County. In short, the property owners in the various river drainages that will be affected by this plan are not represented on The Stakeholder Committee.



Paul K. Gray
Voice Phone: 509-679-1334
E-mail: whtrvrrd@nwi.net

Tom Wachholder
136 S Emerson Ave
Wenatchee, WA 98801
Twachholder1@gmail.com

Chelan County Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan Comments

- There is inconsistency with acronym declaration. For example, some acronyms are declared once and some are declared but still spelled out at times.
- Page 1-1, paragraph 4, 3rd sentence: “Data suggests...” I recommend a citation to support this claim.
- Page 1-3, section 1.3.3, arrow bullets: there is a list of specific areas; however, the last arrow bullet states “Floodplain reconnection” is this an overall goal/general statement or a specific area?
- Page 2-11, section 2.7: “Table 2 3” appears to missing a hyphen.
- Page 3-3, section 3.2.1, subsection “Climate and Stream Flows:” The start of sentence one, “Watershed’s...” Should this be singular?
- Page 3-5, subsection “Topography and Soils”, second paragraph: Do you have a citation to support geologic characteristics?
- Figures 3-4 and 3-5: Is it possible to enlarge the populated areas? (e.g., Cashmere, Wenatchee, Chelan). I think it is relevant and important to compare historic flooding areas to locations of these critical facilities; therefore, have maps with finer scales.
- Page 3-14, section 3.4: Do you have a citation to support research related to people living below the poverty line and disaster effects?
- Page 3-17, section 3.4.3, first paragraph: Do you have a citation to support research related to minorities and disaster planning?
- Page 4-9, section 4.2.2 title: Consider spelling out Ecology (e.g., Washington State Department of Ecology Grants).
- Page 5-1, section 5.2.1: Methodology description lacks detail. What are the 57 questions asked? Are the questions tied directly to the County’s capability assessment criteria? Provide in appendix?

- Figure 7-1: Remove the SR 285 label, it blocks a good portion of Wenatchee (or include finer scale maps) → same comment for all map figures.
- **General Comment:** I feel the background information prior to discussing plan implantation lacks scientific support in places. There is reference to disadvantaged groups of people, but how does the plan specifically reach out to that specific group? Was there consideration to analyze more economic impacts relating to catastrophic flooding events, such as, lost wages? Finally, will there be a methodology developed to measure the effectiveness of the plan long-term?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the plan,

Tom Wachholder

To: The Flood Control Zone District, c/o Chelan Country Public Works
From: Dave and Nancy Bartholomew, residents, White River Rd, Leavenworth
Subject: Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan Comments
Date: February 2, 2017

Introduction:

This document serves as our input on the Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan. It is organized by topic, from the general to the specific.

General Comments:

Living where we do, we have seen numerous government-related projects proposed. We have tried to be responsible by educating ourselves, being involved, and giving input when it is sought.

The result of this, we are sorry to say, is that we have become cynical about the sincerity of such projects. From the perspective of a citizen, it seems as though our input is sought only because it is required, and that decisions have already been made. Frankly, in previous projects, we have been deceived; we have been told things that may not have been lies, but were not the full truth either.

Thus our first input to the proposed flood management plan is to be honest with us: Do you really intend to listen to us? Will you filter what you hear and only adjust the plan in ways that support the preconceived direction? Do you only tell us enough to get our endorsement but withhold that which might cause alarm? Do you respect the citizens' property rights? What are the real motivations behind this project, both initially, and at this point of its development?

Comments specific to the draft plan

Incorrect Listing of Clients and Stakeholders

On page xii of the document, there are lists of Clients and Stakeholders. In neither case were the citizens of Chelan County listed. This is, in itself, revealing. The document should reflect the best interest of the citizenry and the environment. To start off the document by excluding us from these lists is, in our opinion, incorrect and should be corrected.

Executive Summary

The Executive Summary is not included. Please advise us when it is so we can give input on it.

Purpose of the Plan

Under the section titled “Why Prepare this Plan?” numerous points are made, but the precise purpose of the plan is not overtly stated. We suggest that a concise statement be provided. Based on what we find within the paragraphs of this section, it likely should be something like:

“The purpose of the Chelan County Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan is to reduce or alleviate the loss of life, personal injury, and property damage that can result from flooding through long- and short-term strategies.”

Yes, this is included in the first paragraph of this section, but having it as a clear, stand-alone purpose statement is important.

For one thing, if this is in fact the purpose of this document, all of the plan’s contents need to be evaluated based on this statement. Will the actions being proposed reduce or alleviate the loss of life, personal injury, and property damage?

If this statement of purpose is not the purpose of the plan, then please state so in clear terms.

Conflicts within the plan document

In projects like this, there is an ongoing and ever-present balance between what is “natural” and what the community desires. For example, flooding can be entirely natural, but sometimes we must overrule nature to make for an environment safe for humans. Similarly, some wetlands are natural, some are induced.

Even within the term “natural,” there is conflict: At what point in history were things “natural?” Five years ago? Fifty? Five-hundred?

Conflicts with other plans

In reading the long list of “Relevant Programs and Regulations,” it would seem that there are no possible actions that could be taken that would not violate or conflict with at least one of these many programs or regulations. In the execution of the plan that is ultimately approved, how will this be reconciled?

For example, about two years ago, we were asked for input on a project to add “engineered log jams” to the White River. (Incidentally, as far as we can tell our input was all dismissed). One of the intended purposes of that project was to promote horizontal water migration. In the subject draft flood management plan, it mentions controlling horizontal water migration. While this is not necessarily a conflict, it is easy to foresee circumstances that the goals of these projects are in conflict. We expect that other such conflicts exist.

On the surface, it would appear we are spending vast sums of money on one program to promote horizontal water migration, only to have another program developed to reduce it.

In reading the draft plan, it is obvious that there is a vast matrix of interrelated, overlapping, and often conflicting policies, regulations and laws. We are concerned about the viability of wisely and legally choosing actions to take.

Specific Concerns

White River Valley

Many decades ago, a road was built that crosses the White River Valley toward the Little Wenatchee Valley. Like so many other roads built in that era, they paid little attention to the effect on the environment, specifically, the hydraulics of the area.

We have been told that in the 1970's the Army Corps of Engineers rebuilt the road, and that the supervisor of the project unilaterally decided to increase the altitude of the through-pipes, thus effectively creating a dam. While the valley tended to be wet before then, the new dam effectively created wetlands, which now many people want to protect. As a point of reference, early settlers to the White River Valley farmed the land upstream of this road, now made impossible because of the human-induced wetlands.

But as mentioned earlier, how far back do you go to determine what is natural?

From a flood management perspective, this road would promote flooding upstream, and perhaps reduce flooding downstream. Do note that, between this road and Lake Wenatchee, there are virtually no homes. Upstream from this road, there are numerous homes impacted by this damming. As landowners upstream, we would like to see new through-pipes installed to reflect the conditions of 100 years ago. A neighbor has investigated and determined cost-effective means to accomplish this.

Errors in the Plan

Error Section 3.2.2: The document states that "Chelan County sits between the Cascade Mountains to the west and the Columbia Plateau to the east." In fact, a substantial portion of Chelan County is in the Cascade Mountains.

Error page 66:

- To identify and implement flood hazard management activities in a cost-effective and environmentally **contentious** manner

Conclusion

- We are unclear about the motivations and purpose of the plan
- We are suspicious about the process and its ability to gather and incorporate citizenry input
- It is not clear to us how this plan will be implemented while being in compliance and cooperation with other plans, programs and regulations
- We are in favor of protecting human life and property.
- We are in favor of protecting and restoring the natural environment.
- We are not confident in this plans ability to effectively and positively impact either of these.