

Meeting Date/Time/Location	Wednesday, March 23, 2016 from 1PM-3PM Confluence Technology Center, 285 Technology Center Way, Wenatchee, WA
Subject	<b>Flood Hazard Mitigation Comprehensive Plan Participatory Stakeholder Committee Meeting #8</b>
In Attendance	Jason Detamore, Eric Pierson, Lauren Loeb sack (CCPW), Tim Larson, Dan Frazier (CCPUD), Jason Peterson (USFS), Mark Botello (City of Cashmere), Don McGahuey (City of Wenatchee), Herb Amick (City of Leavenworth), Michelle Gilbert (DOE), Mike Cushman (CCD), Patricia Robinson, Rob Flaner (TetraTech), Bob Whitehall (City of Entiat), Kirk Holmes, Christina Woleman (Perteet), Matt Leonard (City of Wenatchee), Katherine Rowden (NWS), Melanie Doubroff, Don Lan, Renae Lan, Kelsay Stanton (Public)
Summary Prepared By	Lauren Loeb sack
Quorum	Yes

Item	Action
<p>Welcome &amp; Introductions</p> <p>Bob Whitehall called the meeting to order and asked for introductions, and all around the table shared their name and the organization they are representing. The agenda was reviewed and there were not additions from the committee.</p> <p>There was one member of the public at the beginning of the meeting, she introduced herself as Kelsey Stanton. She worked at Wenatchee Valley College and is interested in our ongoing discussion. (Others joined later, see "In Attendance").</p> <p>Risk Assessment Update</p> <p>TetraTech now has available data for the Risk Assessment, however during construction of the model the software crashed, likely due to the size of the study area. TetraTech is working to break the size down to workable pieces. This may require a patch or the use of older information such as census data from 2000, to create a workable model.</p> <p>Survey</p> <p>There was a jump in responses to the survey since the wet weather, with flash flood and post-fire debris flow still being the highest rated concerns for residents of this area. There are now responses from every demographic region in Chelan County, including all the cities, however, 48% of responses are from within the City of Wenatchee. Rob's assessment of the responses is that comments from the survey demonstrate savvy response and a realistic idea of what the FCZD, County and cities are capable of accomplishing. He also stated that the survey responses aligned with the consideration the group analyzed during the SWOO exercise. A substantial percentage of respondents were supportive of the enhancement of regulations that allow for building in flood prone areas.</p>	<p>Dan Frazier moved to the accept summary. Jason P. seconded it and the motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>Jason D. will discuss with the City of Wenatchee what information they are interested in from this data.</p>

Educating the public is an important part of this process; providing information about how they can protect and mitigate against damage will help reduce the impact of flooding to private property. With work, the County can educate the public to help be eyes and ear in the field, reporting high water marks, capturing photos of debris flow and damage, as well as other information that can contribute to a better understanding of flood in certain areas.

The maps and information that have been and will be gathered as part of this work may also be collected into a database for the public to access when purchasing a home. It can provide all the information that has been collected about flooding, as well as other property impacts. This is something that is required to be disclosed when a home is purchased, but those policies do not have teeth, and often homeowners are left without knowing the full extent of certain risks, including flooding, when they purchase a home. A database could offer opportunities for home buyers to verify that information themselves. Concern was expressed about the liability of such a database.

Using “NextDoor” (neighborhood social media app) may also increase the survey responses.

At this point in the meeting, a member of the public that had joined the meeting asked to speak. She reported that her historical home suffered about \$10K of damage due in the recent rain event. She reported that her insurance would not cover the issues and that she was told she could not purchase flood insurance. She stresses that a priority should be made to properly maintain and upgrade inadequate drainage systems. She also feels that it is the responsibility of the FCZD to acknowledge that these flooding issue are now occurring outside of the flood plains and canyon drainages.

It will be necessary to wait on the open houses until the HAZUS model is complete.

### Mitigation Actions

The committee will recommend the action plan, but the County will determine, ultimately, what actions are taken.

Rob reminded the stakeholder group that mitigation is about reducing risk over time and is not reactive but rather, proactive. Mitigation can be broken out into 6 categories, covered in the “Hazard Mitigation Categories” document. Example: sandbagging is reactive to flooding, and is not considered a mitigation action.

These actions will be different between what can be done with new and existing development; it is important not to overlook existing and infill development.

RCW 86.12 requires consistency throughout this plan, including with the municipalities inside of the County. TetraTech ran an analysis of codes

through proprietary software called BATool™ and found very little consistency between the cities or the County as far as relevant codes. The County actually had the highest score through BATool™, but the cities inside were varied. How then can consistency be found in the program between such differing requirements? It depends on how the plan defines consistency. “Consistency” can be defined as “above NFIP standard” which is recommended.

Michelle G. stated that she will be able to provide guidance to the cities and County on this issue as she is currently working with the County and several cities on CAV. The County can define and then potentially develop a model ordinance for cities to adopt.

Mark B. stated that he would need to see the options and take them back to the city council and community prior to signing on. Herb A. agreed that he would need to do the same thing.

As discussed before, flood plains are dynamic and do not “response” jurisdictional boundaries. The ideal would be for this plan to not create piecemeal responses but rather address the issue; in this way concurrency is vital.

Rob stated he will work with Chelan County’s Public Works and Community Development to further this conversation. “Consistency” could be the action toward which the district works.

Mapping was a general consensus from the survey. Addressing this interest is the question, as mapping is expensive and does not have immediate dividends other than reference. Addressing the issues of cost and usage of maps is necessary. Mapping discussion involved identifying known flood areas for mapping, the earmarking of FCZD dollars for mapping of these areas and establishing a protocol of capturing high water marks during flooding.

A mitigation effort specific to private property owners could be that the County provides support as the grant agent for willing participants who want to sell their repetitive loss properties. The FCZD was established to protect and pay for the impact of floods to public infrastructure. Anything relating to private property would be strictly education and support, as the program cannot afford to fund private effort or a buy-out campaign.

Rob again reiterated the possibility of parcel information being provided as a report for interested parties, as there is no required real estate disclosure, only seller disclosure. The concern again was for liability, if something didn’t make it to the report. Rob stated the report could be a “resale report” and even potentially be required by local ordinance—simply all the information available about a particular property. It would be considered a “risk report”.

Christina W. stated that Kittitas County implemented this report on building permits and it is available to the public. The option of collecting a fee could also be implemented so that the service is at least income neutral.

EMS preparedness and recovery plans will follow from this plan.

With a small, fixed income, capital projects will be challenging to fund but still important. It will be important to determine how much is spent and how much should be saved to best be prepared but also best leverage local funds for grant funding of capital projects.

Adjourn

There will be no meeting in April. Next meeting will be Wednesday, May 25, 2016 at 1PM.

Bob W. adjourned the meeting.



Chelan County  
FCZD Participatory Stakeholder Meeting #8  
March 23, 2016 at Confluence Technology Center

	SIGNATURE
Lauren Loeb sack	Lauren Loeb sack
Mark Butell	Mark Butell
Jason Detamore	Jason Detamore
Bob Whitehead	Bob Whitehead
Christina Wolleman	Christina Wolleman
Kirk Holmes	Kirk Holmes
Michelle Gilbert	Michelle Gilbert
ERIC PIERSON	ERIC PIERSON
Don McGAHEY	Don McGAHEY
Petera Rubin	Petera Rubin
Mike Cushman	Mike Cushman
Herb Amick	Herb Amick
Don Froben	Don Froben



NAME	SIGNATURE
TIM LARSON	Tim Larson
Melanie Dubroff	(illegible)
Matt Leonard	Ma Am
Katherine Rowden	KRowen
Don Lay	Don Lay
Renae Lay	Renae Lay
Kelsey Stanton	Kelsey Stanton
JASON PETERSON	Jason Peterson