

# Scriber Creek Advisory Committee

## DRAFT Meeting Summary

April 21, 2014, 5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.  
19200 44<sup>th</sup> Avenue West, Lynnwood, WA 98046  
Lynnwood Library

### Action Items

---

	Action Items	Person Responsible
1.	Send out timeline graphic to Advisory Committee members.	Triangle
2.	Develop template for recommendations memo for Committee review.	Triangle

### Welcome/Introductions

---

The purpose of the meeting was to identify and describe site specific problem areas and identify and discuss the Advisory Committee's goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria related to the Scriber Creek Flood Reduction Study.

### Attendees

Advisory Committee	Project Team
<b>Josh Brower</b> , Representing Great Floors Owner	<b>Robert Victor</b> , City of Lynnwood Project Manager
<b>Nora Chin</b> , Citizen	<b>Jared Bond</b> , City of Lynnwood
<b>Ed dos Remedios</b> , Citizen	<b>Jeff Elekes</b> , City of Lynnwood
<b>Brian Harding</b> , Edmonds School District	<b>Mark Ewbank</b> , Herrera, Consultant Project Manager
<b>Larry Ingraham</b> , Citizen	<b>Mike Giseburt</b> , Leidos
<b>Chris Nyhus</b> , Park View Plaza Business Owner	<b>Cynthia Carlstad</b> , Triangle
<b>Matt Pease</b> , Business Owner	<b>Shanese Crosby</b> , Triangle
<b>David Plodwick</b> , Citizen	
<b>Roz Smith</b> , Casa Del Rey	
<b>Eric Whitehead</b> , Casa Del Rey	

### Opening

---

Mayor Smith (City of Lynnwood) opened the meeting and thanked everyone for participating in this process. Cynthia Carlstad (Triangle Associates) then reviewed the agenda and work plan, and led the Committee in a round of introductions.

### General Business

---

There were no comments on the operating protocols or the meeting summary. Committee members can send any suggested comments to Shanese Crosby (Triangle Associates). Meeting summaries will be posted online, with addresses removed.

## Identification & Discussion of Flooding and Drainage Problems

Advisory Committee members identified site specific issues and commented on when flood events have occurred in the neighborhood.



*Comments organized by site location (green boxes):*

**Site 1:**

- In 2012, flooding of the garage and above the finished floor occurred.

**Site 2:**

- In 2006, flooding up to the back of the house was observed.

**Site 3:**

- Portions of the channel in the vicinity of the 190th St SW crossing are armored with rock. On occasion, some rocks have been observed to be picked up and carried downstream.

**Site 4:**

- The parcel was flooded above the finished floor in 2006. The adjacent intersection floods more frequently.
- Creek flooding has not affected the three parcels at the west end of Brookmore Estates.

**Site 5:**

- There is a storm drain emanating from the west that directs flow toward the creek with an outlet along the north side of the Edmonds School District stormwater pond. When it rains hard, that storm drain “shoots” flow out of it under pressure. When there is a flood event in the creek, the flow coming out of that storm drain goes overland around the stormwater pond (between creek and stormwater pond) and does not enter the creek until it gets closer to Casa Del Rey. The pond outflow combined with overbank creek water and the aforementioned storm drain flow sheet flows over the floodplain toward Casa Del Rey.

**Site 6 (Casa Del Rey):**

- The road on the south side of Casa Del Rey was overtopped during the 2007 event.
- Casa Del Rey residents expressed that they do not think the school district detention pond is working like it is supposed to.
- When the creek is running high, the zig zag alignment approaching the Casa Del Rey fence line gets bypassed and the flow takes a wide diagonal swath/approach to Casa Del Rey.
- Casa Del Rey didn’t experience overbank flooding in Nov 2012.

**Site 7 (Business Park – Great Floors & Park View Plaza):**

- The creek flooding has not been above the Great Floors finished floor elevation.
- The building west of Great Floors has not been flooded above the finished floor, but has been subject to sanitary sewer backups.
- Upstream of the old bridge, during high flows the creek jumps out of the bank and into the Great Floors detention pond and heads to the street.

**Site 8 (Just Downstream of Park View Plaza):**

- A high water mark up to the 2<sup>nd</sup> board of the old bridge was observed during the 2007 event.
- Old 196<sup>th</sup> street is inundated very frequently and not just during big storms.

**Site 9:**

- There is frequent sediment build-up in the lower section of the creek around the old bridge crossing, including the short section of upstream channel.

**Site 10:**

- Between the old bridge and the culvert under 196<sup>th</sup> street (where the creek flows west), there was mitigation planting done along the channel for the upstream regional detention project. The planting is overgrown and there is concern that it negatively affects the stream conveyance.

**Site 11:**

- The upstream end of the culvert crossing of 196<sup>th</sup> street may have settled and this culvert may be at reverse grade and negatively affecting conveyance.

**Project Goals, Objectives, & Criteria**

The Advisory Committee broke into two groups to discuss five questions related to the members’ goals, objectives, and preferred evaluation criteria. A one-page handout on goals, objectives and example criteria was provided (see **Attachment 1**). The remarks from each group’s report-out are shown in the tables below.

<b>Question #1: Other than flood reduction, what do you need to see at the end of the project to consider it a success?</b>
Create a more natural/sustainable area along 196 <sup>th</sup> and along the Creek.
A commitment from the City to maintain whatever is constructed.
Maintenance of corridor/channel.
Partnerships for culvert and channel maintenance.
Aesthetics (improved aesthetics along 196 <sup>th</sup> ).
High probability of success.
Reducing obstacles along creek (culverts, pinch-points, such as the culvert by Casa Del Rey).
Other uses – education, etc.
No bad impacts downstream.
Alleviate perpetual standing water on roadway (Great Floors, CDR).
Holistic functionality of corridor.
Easier regulatory hurdles (e.g. use of a long-term permit with set guidelines).

<b>Question #2: Looking at the example criteria, what’s missing?</b>
Time to design/permit/construct (schedule – how quickly will the project be successful?)
Selection of proper plantings where applicable.
Removal of invasive species.
Financing/funding (who is paying for it – increase for rate payers?)
Removed from designated flood zone (change flood zone designation).
25-year flood protection.
Partner with school district, community college, and parks and education opportunities.

<b>Question #3: In your opinion, what is the most important criterion the City should consider?</b>
Implementation of plan.
No WDFW.
Maintenance and ease (e.g. pre-approved rules).
Use of volunteers to assist with maintenance.
Reduced sediment transport.
Effects on humans.
A feasible, buildable alternative that can be maintained over the long term.
Assurance that it will work.
Manage future development to control impacts to the creek/environmentally sensitive areas.
Financing.

<b>Question #4: The example criteria lists “social impacts/benefits” as a criterion. What does that mean to you?</b>
Financial impact of owning property near the Creek.
Sensitive to private property.
Increase property values.
Removal of invasive plants and replacement with native plants.
Operate corridor as a utility.

<b>Question #5: What do you think are the biggest obstacles/constraints that may affect the project’s success? What are ways to address these constraints?</b>
Regulations.
Agencies.
Cost.
Cost and permitting.
<i>Solution: Partnerships.</i>
<i>Solution: Local Improvement District (LID) or Flood District.</i>
<i>Solution: Define responsibilities of the City, Property Owners, DOE/State, Edmonds School District.</i>

### **Follow-up Requests from Meeting #1**

The City of Lynnwood presented information on two follow-up requests from the March Advisory Committee meeting.

#### *Lift Station 16*

The Lift Station is currently at the 30% design stage. The City has found a contractor, who is expected to finalize the design in July/August 2014. The City anticipates construction beginning in September/October 2014, with the station up and running 12 to 18 months after construction begins. Upon completion, the sewer system will be repaired and sewer backups should no longer be an issue.

#### **Questions**

*City/Project Team answers are designated in italics.*

- How far is Lift Station 16 to the next closest lift station?
  - *Lift Station 16 will not connect with the closest lift station. It will connect with Lift Station 12 in Edmonds. The sewage will be pumped up 196<sup>th</sup>, across Scriber Creek Road, until it eventually hits a gravity line that transfers the sewage to Station 12.*
- Where is the Station located?
  - *Lift Station 16 is located upstream of the School District at the Old Lynnwood City Hall site. It will pick up the sewer line at the school district site.*
- Will the design take care of the issues associated with significant rainfall?
  - *Yes, because the Lift Station is a peaking pump station. The City has been assured by the engineers that there will not be a sewage back up again associated with this system.*
- Can the pump have enough influence to lower the water table?
  - *No. It only takes what's in the sewer pipe. There will be a new sewer bypass point at the manhole upstream of Casa Del Rey.*
- Will the pump have axillary power?
  - *Yes, it will have a diesel generator in case of a power outage. Lift stations are considered a critical facility, like a hospital or City Hall.*

### *196<sup>th</sup> Street SW / State Route 524 Fill*

Historical photos were displayed to illustrate how the road fill supporting the modern-day 196<sup>th</sup> Street SW was constructed and how its characteristics affect potential flood reduction solutions. Importantly, because a “raft” of logs was placed for hundreds of feet of length to spread the weight of the road fill on the soft, wet soils, it will be difficult to realign the creek, as it would require boring through the logs. The City commented that, even considering this difficulty, Creek realignment is on the table.

- The original “Old 196<sup>th</sup>” roadway (which included a bridge that is still is there) was constructed in 1932 as a two lane highway.
- In 1960, the State determined that the two-lane highway could no longer support traffic volumes and expanded the bridge to a four-lane highway. The road footprint was extended in the direction of Scriber Lake, so the north edge of the lake, which formerly extended close to “old 196<sup>th</sup>”, was filled in. During construction, the weight of the new road fill caused major lateral displacement of the soft soil beneath it, creating what has since been known as the North Lagoon as the displaced soil formed a raised mound on the north side of the lake (south side of the lagoon) that partially isolated the low-lying ground amidst the lagoon area.
  - The large-scale soil displacement into the Lake reduced the Lake’s water storage capacity by 50%.
- After the failure, the City decommissioned the old wooden bridge. The financial resources to reconstruct the bridge for vehicular traffic make reconstruction an infeasible option, especially considering that the bridge is a wooden structure at the end of its life.
- Now, the bridge is used for pedestrian traffic and for utilities.

### **Next Steps**

---

The next meeting will be May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014 from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

## Attachment 1 – Goals, Objectives, & Evaluation Criteria

This document provides example goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria for the Scriber Creek Flood Reduction Advisory Committee to consider as the Committee develops their own goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria for flood reduction solutions related to Scriber Creek.

### Goal

A goal statement reflects what the project is working towards. An example for the Scriber Creek Flood Reduction Study is:

“With a comprehensive approach for defining and evaluating alternatives, it is expected that the study will result in recommendations for a suite of feasible actions to reduce flooding to desired levels. Community support for the recommendations should be accomplished via implementing a robust public and stakeholder involvement process. It is critical that these recommendations include accurate predictions for the costs to implement them.”

### Objectives

Many times objectives fall out of the goal statement. Objectives should be “SMART” (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound). In this example, objectives for the Scriber Creek Flood Reduction Study could be:

- Comprehensively define and evaluate potential flood reduction alternatives that can be funded in entirety within 10 years of study completion
- By April 2015, develop a recommended suite of feasible flood reduction alternatives that, when implemented, will reduce flooding to desired levels
- Meaningfully involve the community in the decision-making process
- Accurately predict costs for potential flood reduction alternatives

### Evaluation Criteria

Engineers use evaluation criteria to determine which potential solutions meet the project’s goals and objectives. Criteria should be specific and measurable (ranging from a direct measurement to a scale, such as high, medium, low). For the Scriber Creek Flood Reduction Study, potential criteria include:

- Potential to **reduce flooding** in study area
- Effects on **flooding downstream** of Scriber Lake
- **Social impacts/benefits** (this includes aesthetics, odors, mosquitoes, etc.)
- **Public safety** considerations (e.g. could a solution have some potential concerns for safety, like creating a drowning hazard?)
- Effects on **stream and riparian habitat**
- **Implementation** feasibility (from design and construction standpoint)
- **Land ownership/easements** (potentially affects complexity, cost, timing)
- **Permitting requirements** (Is the project readily permissible? Is expensive environmental mitigation likely?)
- **Construction costs**
- **Operation and maintenance requirements** and costs (post-construction, long-term costs)