



King County

Water and Land Resources Division

Department of Natural Resources and Parks

King Street Center

201 South Jackson Street, Suite 600

Seattle, WA 98104-3855

206-477-4800 Fax 206-296-0192

TTY Relay: 711

Cedar River Council DRAFT Meeting Notes

July 28, 2020 – 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm (scheduled)
Meeting/Conference Call via Zoom (King County account)

I) Call to Order / Welcome

Chair Max Prinsen called the meeting to order at 6:38 pm. He reported he and Larry Phillips spoke recently with *Seattle Times* environmental reporter Lynda Mapes, who is “very interested” in the CRC’s sockeye concerns and work. They expect to hear from her soon. Mr. Phillips also continues to follow up with Governor Inslee’s office on a response to the CRC’s earlier letter to the Governor about sockeye recovery.

II) General CRC Announcements / Information (Open to all Attendees):

There were no announcements made during this period.

III) Cedar River Public Safety Q & A with King County Sheriff’s Office

This presentation will likely be rescheduled to September, due to absence of the Sheriff’s office representative tonight. Nathan Brown agreed to forward any CRC questions to his contact at the Sheriff’s office.

IV) Cedar River Flood Damage Repair Updates – *Chris Brummer, KC DNRP Rivers Section*

Mr. Brummer is a supervising engineer for the Cedar River basin in King County DNRP’s River and Floodplain Management Section (RFMS). RFMS staff are the service provider for the King County Flood Control District (FCD). Their role after the February flood was to assess conditions and damages along the river, characterize the level of risk associated with any damage and make recommendations to FCD.

The February 2020 flood event on the Cedar, a few CFS higher than the 2009 flood event, lasted twice as long and caused widespread damage through the valley. In February, two emergency actions were authorized: one near Byers curve and another at Cedar River Trail Site 2 near the avulsion into Cavanaugh Pond. In March, RFMS staff inspected all 68 facilities on the river, and assessed damages from minor to severe. April was spent assigning risk ratings to the damages, with recommendations made to FCD in May. FCD responded in June. On the Cedar River, there were 11 facility damages in need of repair, 4 in need of further assessment, and 11 identified for enhanced monitoring.

Mr. Brummer reviewed a County iMap of the Cedar River basin, which he noted is publicly viewable online. He explained the County categorizes damages to be addressed thus:

- Repair in current year (2020) – i.e., the two emergency repairs;
- Initiate a project in 2020 for 2021-22 repair or incorporation into an existing capital improvement project (CIP);
- Create a new CIP (if damage is beyond a simple one-year repair);
- Needs further assessment; or
- Enhanced monitoring.

All categories are assessed as high, medium, or low risk. Medium risk can include lands such as agricultural and non-critical industrial areas; high risk includes infrastructure and residential areas. Mr. Brummer said risk is evaluated with the following factors from Appendix K of the 2013 Flood Hazard Management Plan update: current land use; type of repair; severity; urgency; and how likely it is that conditions will worsen. Damage levels are assessed from high to low based on scope: regional would be high/medium; more localized is

considered low. Urgency is assessed by asking if damage will likely occur/worsen during the current flood season, or in a later season.

He reviewed several facilities identified for repair or incorporation into existing CIPs:

- Taber Crowall: A steep embankment, with high risk to SR 169. This was ranked as a new CIP due to complexity of damage and needed repair.
- Brodell: Located at the downstream end of the Maplewood neighborhood, this area saw spotty damage.
- Camp Freeman/Bucks Curve area: This is downstream from the Cedar River Trail (CRT) #2 facility and Herzman Levee. The river channel migrated about 80 feet into a gravel bar, depositing gravel on the opposite bank. Some trees fell into and now span the river channel. The plan is to combine the needed repairs into the Herzman CIP to expedite design and implementation.
- Cavanaugh Pond: A levee breach here affected the Riverbend Upper, Lower, and Extension facilities. These facilities will likely be removed as part of the Riverbend project. Discussion with the Riverbend project team continues on whether to incorporate removals/repairs into this project or another one.
- Belmondo: Three engineered log jams (ELJs) were constructed here, one in 2010 and two 2013. There is now a bit of scour and are fallen trees near the 2010 ELJ. Repairs here are needed because the damage threatens the CRT and the fiber optic line running under it.
- CRT #7: Repairs here are being considered for incorporation into the Jan Road levee project.

Four other projects remain in need of further assessment:

- ELJ #6: This is in the Cedar Rapids project area. High flows eroded the ballast (fill) from the top of the structure and sheared off a pile. RFMS staff need to look further here and make recommendations; structure repair is needed to prevent future overtopping.
- CRT #5: This is in the area of the Jones Road/State Highway 169 intersection. Some rock was lost.
- CRT #5B: A small slump located between the major power lines and transmission towers was noted here.
- Dorre Don: The RFMS team has recommended to conduct a hazard assessment, since river flow is now going down a new side channel. They are also looking at bank erosion. A consultant, geomorphic assessment, and perhaps hydraulic modeling are needed to determine any changes in flood and erosion hazard status due to the sediment changes in the river.

Eleven facilities remain under “enhanced monitoring” status, with others deferred into existing capital projects but still being monitored. Under monitoring status, if things change, some rankings could elevate, resulting in more sites being recommended for repairs. Some assessments have already begun, with data being collected this summer. The permitting and construction timelines depend on individual circumstances. Some small repairs might be achieved next year, but more complex repairs will likely take 2-3 years.

There were many follow-up questions for Mr. Brummer raised by CRC members and others present:

- Q: Why did the area near State Highway 169 and Cedar Grove Road flood?
A: This was due to hillside drainage, not the river. The problem was a blocked culvert, and several days of rain. King County Parks took a lead to get an HPA from WDFW to unclog the culvert. It wasn't until the rain stopped that the water finally receded. Fortunately that culvert will be replaced with a large box culvert that is scheduled for construction next summer.
- Q: Any other updates on Brassfield Levee or Riverbend?
A: Brassfield was inspected and ranked as “high risk” in terms of land use but not in other factors, and thus placed in “monitoring” status. Riverbend is a separate effort, not FCD, though FCD provided some funds for acquisitions and demolition of the mobile home park. Riverbend's team decided to delay removal of a rock revetment and building a setback until next summer; this would allow the river to migrate when done. A proposed side channel excavated through the former mobile home park site is also expected to take a lot of stress off of Brassfield revetment. The permitting timeline does not allow for repairs this year, but RFMS can make/elevate repair recommendations to FCD pending the outcome of monitoring.
- Q: Residents at Dorre Don are moving large rocks in the river; is this problematic?
A: Our staff have looked at the site and, while we don't like the disruption of natural processes and habitat, high flows and gravel transport will likely undo it.

- Q: What about the logs spanning the river near Landsburg?
A: We have coordinated with the Sheriff's office; they are the lead in assessing risks and recommending what to do with the wood. The County would need permits to move the wood, which is not an overnight process. Signs have been put up at Cedar Rapids, and we are scheduling visits near Landsburg. There are currently no plans to remove the trees.
- Q: Several Cedar Rapids residents are very concerned about Brassfield levee, as there are large sections with no rock at all. There are several fallen trees which may hold flows up to several thousand CFS, but we are still very concerned about the winter ahead and want our properties protected.
A: I remember meeting with you, and would be happy to come back out with an engineer to come up with a plan. We're assessing Brassfield as part of Riverbend, so it wouldn't be hard to do more assessment and hear your concerns.
- Q: The falling trees near Landsburg are definitely dangerous to people. If trees get caught in a logjam, the river can become permanently un-boatable.
A: We agree. We looked at those trees with the Sheriff and are working on a site visit with co-managers.
- Q: When classifying projects, is there the possibility of an "enhanced flood response," where a response is pre-planned/staged to be ready once a location hits flood stage?
A: Yes, that's what we think of as an adaptive management plan. We still need to notify regulatory agencies first, then we can do the work, and get permits after the fact and probably some mitigation. We like to be proactive so we're not working during the flood, which is costly and requires lots of mitigation. I can start this conversation about adaptive management planning with my managers. We would need to get authorization from FCD during the flood as well.
- Q: Is there a plan to replace the Williams gas pipeline? It looks like it may go over or under the river.
A: I haven't heard, but I can look into it.

V) Asphalt Plant Update

Nathan Brown reached out to King County's Department of Local Services for a status update on the Lakeside Industries asphalt plant. Their reply stated the plant's permit is held, pending submission of further information from the applicant by September 1, 2020.

VI) CRC Updates (As Needed)

- **WRIA 8:** Corinne Young said the most recent Salmon Recovery Council meeting largely covered legislative priorities and their budget, work plan, and funding board/grant recommendations.
- **Fish Habitat Conservation/Restoration (Sockeye):** Mr. Prinsen spoke on this at the start of the meeting.
- **Cedar River Watershed:** There were no updates.
- **CRC Member Updates:** There were no updates.
- **Riverbend Project:** Jon Hansen said full construction is on target to begin this year. A County permit is needed, but the Cavanaugh Pond avulsion needed to be addressed first. The project team opted for a phased project, wanting to see what changes would occur at the site before spending money and not getting desired results. A bid has been placed for construction on the setback and demolition to remove remaining infrastructure. There will also be more protection along the Cedar River Trail. The Riverbend and Herzman project teams are working together to assure their work is mutually supportive. Some construction will occur this summer, and on the CRT in September. The Riverbend team is working with WSDOT to address road barrier and traffic concerns.
- **Fish Returns:** Mr. Brown spoke recently with Frank Urabeck, who reported that recent fish returns are actually slightly higher than expected, about 20,000.
- **Next CRC Meeting:** There is no scheduled August meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for September 22 from 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm via Zoom virtual conference call.

VII) Public Comment Period

There was no public comment during this period.

VIII) Adjourn

The meeting adjourned ahead of schedule, at 7:35 pm.