

Scriber Creek Advisory Committee DRAFT Meeting Summary

June 16, 2014, 5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.
19200 44th Avenue West, Lynnwood, WA 98046
Lynnwood Library

Action Items

	Action Items	Person Responsible
1.	Triangle to finalize Recommendations Memo by July 3 rd .	Triangle
2.	Committee members to sign Memo signature page the week of July 7 th . The signature page will be available at the front desk of the Lynnwood Civic Center (19100 44 th Avenue West) from July 7 th to the 15 th .	Committee members
3.	The City will provide monthly email updates to Committee Members on the Study's progress.	City of Lynnwood

Welcome/Introductions

The purpose of this meeting was to confirm prioritization rankings of flood reduction alternatives, finalize content for the Recommendations Memorandum, and determine next steps.

Attendees

Advisory Committee	Project Team
Josh Brower , Representing Great Floors Owner	Robert Victor , City of Lynnwood Project Manager
Miran Che , Eunia Plaza	Jared Bond , City of Lynnwood
Nora Chin , Citizen	Mark Ewbank , Herrera, Consultant Project Manager
Ed dos Remedios , Citizen	Mike Giseburt , Leidos
Dave Gilbertson , Parks Board	Cynthia Carlstad , Triangle
Larry Ingraham , Citizen	Shanese Crosby , Triangle
Chris Nyhus , Park View Business Owner	
Matt Pease , Park View Business Owner	
David Plodwick , Citizen	
Roz Smith , Casa Del Rey	
Eric Whitehead , Casa Del Rey	

General Business

There were no comments on the May meeting summary. Committee members can send any suggested comments to Shanese Crosby (Triangle Associates). The March and April meeting summaries are now available online, with addresses removed.

Review Compilation of Evaluated Alternatives Worksheet

Advisory Committee members reviewed the Compilation of Evaluated Alternatives Worksheet to ensure the alternatives that scored highest were the alternatives the Committee wanted to recommend to the City for further evaluation (see **Appendix A** for completed worksheet). The Committee recommended making the following changes:

- The “culvert realignment beneath Casa Del Rey access road” alternative was expanded to include improvements to the creek channel between Casa Del Rey and 196th to help resolve some of the flow regime and sediment deposition issues that occur within this stretch of the creek.
- “Raising the road at 188th” was moved to the “green” category to help address flooding upstream and in the middle area of the study corridor, paying close attention to impacts on upstream properties.
- “Raising the road at 196th” was moved to the “green” category to address the elevation dip that allows for debris and sediment to collect in the area. Additionally, the Committee added the option of “removing old 196th bridge” which may be more effective than raising the roadways.
- The “sediment removal” alternative was combined with “channel stabilization” and moved to the “green” category in an effort to reduce the source of sediment deposits and establish an ongoing sediment maintenance program.
 - *The City commented that establishing an ongoing sediment removal program is difficult as there are many competing opinions on whether or not the City should take on that liability. Committee members felt strongly this should be a recommendation, and that the responsibilities of the City and private property owners should at least be delineated.*

Questions & Comments

During the review of the Compilation of Evaluated Alternatives Worksheet, Committee members asked the following questions. City answers are in *italics*.

- Will the City and the technical consultant be looking at the most appropriate sequencing for implementing these alternatives?
 - *Yes. During Phase 2, the City will look at the sequencing of the alternatives to determine what makes most sense so that flooding is not worsened anywhere in the creek corridor (including downstream of Scriber Lake).*
- How difficult will it be to get the downstream alternatives approved because of the high cost associated with these projects?
 - *The most expensive project will likely be outlet control at Scriber Lake, followed by building a regional detention pond, and then addressing the drainage issues around the old 196th bridge. It may be a possibility for the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to help fund addressing the issues around old 196th as WSDOT has a mandate to make stream culverts they have jurisdiction over more fish passable.*
 - *Part of Phase 2 will be identifying funding sources.*
 - Has the City contacted WSDOT at this time?
 - *Yes, and WSDOT asked the City to again reach out to the Agency once the City is further along in the process.*
- How difficult is the analysis to determine if 188th can be raised efficiently?
 - *It wouldn't be too complicated. Enough engineering needs to be done to figure out how much the project would cost, and roadway design standards would need to be considered.*
- If 188th was raised, how would this increased water storage affect the park? Could it enhance the area or will it be a deterrent?
 - *The area is currently a wetland. 188th overtops during a 10-year storm, so there is some existing storage there already.*
 - As part of this project, invasive species could be removed and a walking path could be added.

- Has the habitat restoration project near Brookmore Estates led to a decrease in sediment entering the creek?
 - *The City completed this project in December 2013. There is no requirement or provision for follow-up monitoring related to this site.*
- Are there any opportunities to address tributary inflow?
 - *This gets into incentives, which are difficult to get started. The City is also bound to development cycles, and often times property owners' buildings are grandfathered in.*
- What is the possibility of having the Committee's recommendations trumped by one of the Councilmembers?
 - *Having community support for projects goes a long way.*
 - One Committee member stated that during the presentation to the Council, the Committee can mention that they spent a combined 120 hours looking at this information.
- Are there any other kinds of projects being implemented in surrounding jurisdictions that could potentially be considered in this study that the Committee has not talked about?
 - *The types of projects being considered by similar jurisdictions are accounted for in the alternatives brainstormed by the Committee.*
- Committee members have seen a lot of debris, specifically from the 7/11, in the lower reaches of the creek.
- The Recommendations Memo should highlight a comprehensive suite of alternatives to evaluate to help ensure that the problem is resolved appropriately.

Review Recommendations Memo

The Committee briefly reviewed the contents of the Recommendations Memorandum. The schedule for finalizing the Recommendation Memo is as follows:

Activity	Due Date
Triangle to send out updated Recommendations Memo based on June 16 th meeting feedback to the Committee.	Monday, June 23 rd
Committee member feedback due to Triangle	Monday, June 30 th
Final Recommendations Memo to Committee	Thursday, July 3 rd
Signature Page available at City of Lynnwood Civic Center (19100 44th Ave W)	Monday, July 7 th – Tuesday, July 15 th
Committee Presentation to City Council	September

All Committee members are invited to present the Committee's recommendations to City Council. The City anticipates that the presentation will occur in September. Matt Pease (Park View Plaza) volunteered to help present the Committee's recommendations.

Next Steps

This was the last scheduled Scriber Creek Flood Reduction Advisory Committee meeting. The City anticipates re-convening the Committee during Phase 2 of the Flood Reduction Study and potentially holding a public meeting. The Committee recommended the following next steps:

- A minimum of monthly email updates from the City on the Study's progress (more when appropriate).
- Evaluation of the process.

Appendix A – Compiled Responses:

The below table ranks by average score the flood reduction alternatives brainstormed and individually scored by the Committee. If an alternative is highlighted in **green**, this means the average score was above 4.0. If the alternative is highlighted in **yellow**, this means the alternative scored between 3.0 and 4.0. If an alternative had an average score of less than 3.0, it is highlighted in **red**.

Language in **red** designates changes made by the Advisory Committee during the June 16th meeting.

Flood Risk Reduction Measure	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6*	#7	#8	#9	Average
Regional Storage Site at Edmonds School District Property.	5	5 – This is something that will have future benefits at little additional cost.	3	3	5	5	4	5 – Combines many of the ideas/ benefits discussed by creating a regional solution on a large site with a single property owner, thereby reducing time, cost, and complexity compared to negotiating with tens or hundreds of property owners. Also, the educational benefits are an added bonus.	5	4.4
Culvert Realignment – realign culvert beneath Casa Del Rey access roadway and improve the channel between Casa Del Rey and 196th .	5	5 – This would help grow the relationship with the property owners.	4	5	4	4	5	4 – Provides real time/ immediate benefit by eliminating a choke/pinch-point.	4	4.4
Scriber Lake Outlet Control – increase storage, re-do inlet control.	4	5 – I like this idea.	4	4	5	5	5	2.5 – While this is a good idea, the real problem is not the outlet from the Lake but the inlet, which runs uphill, thereby causing backups/flooding on the other side of 196 th . So long as water has to flow uphill to get into the Lake, changing the outlet will not significantly reduce upstream flooding.	5	4.4
Use modeling to evaluate flood prone properties at a specified level of	2	4	5	3	4 – Important to know	5	5	4.5 – Modeling is an excellent	5	4.3

Flood Risk Reduction Measure	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6*	#7	#8	#9	Average
service (e.g. 25-year level of service). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Model where these properties are both with the existing culverts and if the culverts were replaced Consider buy outs of flood prone properties Incorporate distributed detention/storage ponds where possible, such as locating small storage ponds on the properties that may be bought out, or other available properties such as the school district open area (also described as a separate measure below). 					where these properties are, but not in favor of any “buy outs” without the “Zoning review.”			idea and a necessary tool in that it will provide much needed data that can be used throughout the basin to evaluate and design other solutions/fixes. Also, while it may not be possible to buy-out all of the identified properties, modeling should help focus on the high-priority/high-benefit properties that could be prioritized for purchase.		
Culvert Replacements – replace culverts under 196 th .	4	4 – Hard to see how the City can avoid this. Will the State help? How about raising the roadway so that the creek could flow without the need for culverts?		5	3	3	5	5 – Essentially removes the “cork” in the dam and would facilitate better drainage throughout the entire basin and would use an existing “storage” facility (the lake in the park) instead of requiring a new storage facility. One way to reduce cost and increase storage might be to tunnel underneath the log fill and create an underground storage facility that would act as a siphon into the lake.	5	4.3
Zoning Review – Identify undeveloped areas and see where building may occur. Are setbacks adequate?	5	5		3	5	5	2		2	3.9
Raising Roads – raise road at 188 th and possibly excavate upland areas around the wetland to create more storage. Do not upsize the culvert,	4	4	4	4	3 – More an accommodation than long-term solution.	4	5	3.5 – This creates an “early win” by solving a perennial problem with a simple fix.	4	3.9

Flood Risk Reduction Measure	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6*	#7	#8	#9	Average
thus creating a sort of taller dam to impound more water in the upstream wetland.								Also, providing more storage in the wetland should provide additional upstream benefits.		
Raising Roads – raise portions of old 196 th and driveway access of Park View Plaza and Great Floors. Look at raising and/or removing the bridge.	3	2 – Don't feel this would work without culvert improvements under new 196 th .	5	5	3 – More an accommodation than long-term solution.	4	4	4 – Creates an "early win" by solving a perennial problem with a simple fix.	5	3.9
Channel Stabilization – to control erosion. COMBINE with Sediment removal.	4	4 – I see this as a good thing once the creek flooding is diminished.	3	4	5	4	5	4.5 – Bigger benefits (both habitat and educational, etc.) for the buck and addresses the long-term problem with a natural, habitat-based solution.	2	3.9
Underground storage vaults – possibly at School District site. • Can reduce public safety concerns surrounding above-ground detention facilities.	4	5 – Many East coast regions have been doing this for years with good success.		2	5	2	3	3 – Good for a limited number of potential target sites that might provide system-wide benefits.	5	3.6
Stormwater pump stations – could potentially increase storage in Scriber Lake and have a short pump station under 196 th .	3	1 – This feels like passing the problem to another location.		5	4	3	4	3.5 – May help alleviate localized, short-term flooding in the lower basin but does not address the input-issue of upstream impacts.	5	3.6
Increase storm drain pipe sizes to enable in-pipe flow control when completing future road projects to support corridor flood management.	4	4 – Seems this should be two items. One for new road projects and a second for retrofitting existing pipe.		4	5	3	5	2.5 – Too complex, too much potential maintenance, too much up-front cost, and will take too long.	1	3.6
Increase creek channel size – where possible, potentially near 188 th .	3	4 – Must consider effects on downstream & upstream properties.		4	5	3	3	3 – Should be combined with some form of flow/release control to mitigate downstream impacts.	3	3.5
Sediment Removal at problem areas (such as Casa Del Rey and others); could include volunteer participation.	3	4 – Sediment removal could	3	5	5	3	2	3 – This only makes sense if it	4	3.3

Flood Risk Reduction Measure	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6*	#7	#8	#9	Average
Needs to be a continuous program (before, during, and after construction).		be on a regular schedule ongoing.						can be done on a regular basis (e.g. annually, bi-annually, etc.) because sediment transport/build-up will reoccur over time.		
Levees/berms at north end of corridor – near Eunia Plaza/Flynn’s Carpet.	3	5	4	2	5	4	3	1.5 – Not really solving downstream problems.	2	3.3
Enlarge Scriber Lake by removing hill between Scriber Lake and smaller body of water.	2	4 – My guess is that the hill is manmade from fill from some other years ago project. If so, might be easy to remove.	3	2	2– More an accommodation than long-term solution.	5	4	3.5 to 4 – Only if coupled with inlet fix discussed above.	4	3.3
Incentives for stormwater retrofits – Incentives for landowners to retrofit to retain stormwater on-site, such as through reduced surface water utility rates.	3	2			5	2	3	3.5 – Could actually be a high-benefit alternative if the City focused on a few properties that could provide large benefit/ greater return on investment instead of trying to get hundreds of smaller properties involved. One or two large-scale facilities in well-placed locations could provide basin-wide benefits.	4	3.2
Regional Storage Site at empty lot south of 188 th on 55 th Ave.	4	2 – Future development could be impeded by having a pond on the property.	4	1	5	4	2	2.5 – Only if it provided controlled-release upstream storage to mitigate and control downstream effects.	2	2.9
Address tributary inflows to the creek. This could be stormwater retrofits to reduce inflows to Scriber Creek.	2	2 – All new developments need to do this at their cost.	4	1	3	3	3	3.5 to 4 – In general, this is a great approach because source elimination goes a long way to addressing flooding impacts. The problems/	4	2.85

Flood Risk Reduction Measure	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6*	#7	#8	#9	Average
								drawbacks are that it will be time consuming, expensive, complex, and may depend on waiting for subject-property redevelopment in order to be implemented on a parcel-by-parcel basis.		
Water reuse through stormwater retrofit incentives for businesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incentivize businesses to retain their water like PCC in Edmonds. Tax incentives for stormwater retrofits. 	2	5 – Would need to educate the property owners about how this works.		1	5	3	1	1.5 – Probably unfeasible in the current regulatory regime/climate and would only produce benefits from big source/user properties and not small-scale residential properties.	3	2.7
Flood proofing – elevate structures so they are not damaged by flood waters.	2	1	5	2	2 – More an accommodation than long-term solution.	1	1	1 – This is an expensive and probably unfeasible measure because it is difficult if not impossible to lift and elevate some of the impacted structures (i.e., large, multi-family housing units or large commercial structures). While it may help certain single-family dwellings, it is a Band-Aid, not a long-term solution.	5	2.2
Earthen Levees – spot solutions throughout corridor.	3	1 – Expecting resident cooperation might be too much to ask.	2	1	2	4	4	1.5 – Just a Band-Aid, not a solution because they do nothing to slow the discharge or eliminate/alleviate downstream flooding impacts and instead just focus and funnel flow downhill.	1	2.2
Sediment Deposition Ponds	3	1		1	5	1	3	1.5 – A Band-Aid since they do not address the source of	2	2.2

Flood Risk Reduction Measure	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6*	#7	#8	#9	Average
								sediment and instead just deal with a problem instead of fixing/eliminating the source.		
Diversion channels	2	1 – No immediate impact.		1	3	1	3	1 – Just moves, not solves, the problem.	3	1.9

* This individual commented that alternatives that support flood reduction, enhance habitat and open spaces, result in park improvements, and have educational benefits and opportunities to get the community involved are preferred. These types of alternatives are consistent with the City’s Lynnwood Community Visioning document. Alternatives that support and enhance a future streamside trail system leading from Scriber Creek Park to Lund’s Gulch and Puget Sound are supported.