



**KING COUNTY  
FLOOD CONTROL  
DISTRICT**

516 Third Avenue • Room 1200 • Seattle, WA 98104  
206.296.1020 • info@kingcountyfloodcontrol.org  
www.kingcountyfloodcontrol.org

<u>Date</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Materials</u>
November 6, 2019	A Resolution authorizing the chair to enter into a contract for professional services to prepare a programmatic environmental impact statement on the Lower Green River Flood Hazard Management Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. FCD Resolution No. FCD2019-12</li><li>2. Contract Exhibit A – Scope of Work Exhibit B – Rates Exhibit C – Invoice Form</li></ol>

**BOARD OF SUPERVISOR’S ACTION REQUESTED**

The Executive Committee at their, September 25, 2019, meeting recommended approval of a professional services contract with Parametrix for the next phase of work on the Lower Green River Corridor Flood Hazard Management Plan programmatic environmental impact statement (PEIS). The Board of Supervisors by approval of this resolution would:

- **Authorize the chair to enter into a contract with Parametrix not to exceed \$1,226,426.82.**
  - Previously authorized services with Parametrix included work to assist the SEPA Official process over 600 scoping comments received from the public and agencies. *(That contract was for \$94,027.83)*
  - Parametrix bid on this contract through a selection process conducted in 2016-2017. *(ESA was the consulting firm who performed the first phase of the scoping process. They elected to end their contract with the District in January 2018 and Parametrix was retained to conclude the analysis of scoping comments.)*
- **Authorize a contract duration of November 7, 2019 – August 30, 2020.**
  - Following this contract phase, the next phase to be negotiated through a contract amendment will be the impact analysis of the alternatives to be considered.

- The impact phase is not included at this time because the number of alternatives to be analyzed and the environmental methodologies to be used are to be determined by the outcome of the contract tasks before the Board today.
- **The District Board of Supervisors would be asked to adopt the final Lower Green River Corridor Plan after the EIS process is completed and the Final EIS is issued.**
- **The scope of services for this contract is to:**
  - Determine revisions or additions to alternatives to be considered in the PEIS;
  - Develop discipline-specific methodologies for evaluating the potential impacts that may result from these alternatives;
  - Gather information on the affected environment and existing conditions, and
  - Provide policy and communications support during this process.

## **TASK 2 DETAIL– ALTERNATIVES, METHODOLOGIES, AND AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

### Task 2.1 – Project Management

### Task 2.2 – Scoping Comment Tracking

The Consultant will prepare a spreadsheet for internal use by the project team and the district. As a starting point, the Consultant will use the comment catalog prepared for the Scoping Summary Report. The purpose of the spreadsheet will be to ensure that comments are considered in determining revisions or additions to alternatives and methodologies for evaluating impacts.

### Task 2.3 – Opportunities, Constraints, and Methodologies

The purpose of this task is to provide discipline-specific insights that can confirm and inform the identification of the study area (upstream and downstream limits), questions for the local jurisdiction or other agencies with authority, and potential revisions and additions to the alternatives under consideration.

#### Task 2.4 Intergovernmental Communication Support

Several comments received during scoping make specific suggestions to modify the existing or planned use of areas near the Green River for flood management and/or improved habitat. Other scoping comments ask the District to collaborate with other governments (local jurisdictions and regulatory agencies) to explore meeting the goals and objectives of the Flood Hazard Management Plan by means other than construction and maintenance of flood control structure or infrastructure. Such comments pertaining to alternatives being considered may raise matters outside of the Districts' authority and could benefit from formal communication with jurisdictions or agencies with established authority related to components or aspects of the Flood Hazard Management Plan. The purpose of this task is to support, if needed, correspondence or discussions with other governments as part of the basis for the District establishing the alternatives that will be evaluated in the PEIS. This task will also allow identification and definition of the resources that will be analyzed within the study area and the consideration and review of the appropriate level of evaluation for a PEIS.

#### Task 2.5 – Alternatives

The purpose of this task is to document development of the alternatives for evaluation in the draft PEIS. The Consultant will draw from information developed under task 2.3 and the interagency discussions under task 2.4 as well as information received during scoping to revise alternatives 1, 2, and 3 and potentially propose additional alternatives. *(Up to five alternatives are budgeted. There is no obligation to develop five alternatives. Budget unused is not owed to the consultant.)* In addition to refining and possibly proposing new alternatives for consideration by the SEPA Official, the Consultant will identify features or measures suggested by others that are not reasonable based on likely effects, effectiveness, consistency with the Districts' policies, the plan's purpose and need, or other factors.

#### Task 2.6 – Affected Environment

The purpose of this task is to develop discipline-specific descriptions of the affected environment that will be included in the EIS. Each discipline lead will also gather information on the affected environment and existing conditions for their subject. Future conditions for each subject within the projects' 30-year planning horizon will be described using established data and current scientific understanding.

Task 2.7 – Aerial Image Acquisition and 3D Modeling

The purpose of this task is to obtain aerial imagery of the study area that will help with evaluating alternatives and in displaying project information for the public. The use of aerial imagery will reduce the labor for field work and provide adequate information for the PEIS. The imagery will be georeferenced and suitable for adding overlays of project related features or information.

Task 2.8 – Communications Support

The purpose of this task is to support the District in communicating with the public and stakeholders interested in the flood hazard management plan.

Task 2.9 – Communications Specialist

The purpose of this task is to provide the District with strategic support in communication with various organizations on multiple topics related to the Plan. Support will also be provided for digital and social media communications.

Task 2.10 - Hydraulic Modeling Peer Reviews

Understanding the response of the river to different flood management alternatives is foundational to all other impact analyses. The purpose of this task is to ensure the hydraulic modeling used for the analysis is robust and accurate. The Consultant will provide peer reviews of the hydraulic modeling of Lower Green River PEIS to be performed by the District and its consultant, Northwest Hydraulic Consultants (NHC).

Management Reserve Task

The purpose of this task is to provide a means by which the District can authorize additional analyses to better meet the District's objectives and communications support if needed to keep the public and stakeholders informed. That work could include, but is not limited to, an extension of the study area into the middle Green River for the purpose of:

- Mitigation of impacts resulting from flood facilities in the lower Green;

- Consideration of additional enhancements in the middle Green River that meet the District's objectives for a balanced, multi-benefit approach;
- Flood control measures or facilities in the middle Green River that help manage the risk of flooding in the lower Green River;
- Additional hydrologic modeling of existing conditions and up to two alternatives to determine the flood benefit of actions in the middle Green River and peer review; or
- Additional public scoping to accept comments on actions or improvements in the middle Green River.
- For purposes of quantifying the extent of the possible inclusion of the middle Green River in the analysis, the river mile limits are 32 to 61.

This work does not include considerations of actions beyond the authority of the District such as modifications to the Howard Hanson Dam. This work further assumes the purpose of the flood hazard management plan as established by King County Flood Control District Motions FCD18-01.1 does not change. Including the middle section of the Green River could extend the duration of this phase of work by up to four months.

Work under management reserves will require the preparation a detailed scope and budget and approval by the SEPA official. The sum of all efforts under this task shall not exceed the amount approved in the budget. Unused balances are not owed to the consultant.

## **BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

The Lower Green River Corridor Flood Hazard Management Plan ("LGRCP") is a follow-up plan to the System-Wide Improvement Framework ("SWIF") submitted to the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) for acceptance in, February 2016, and accepted by the Corps on, March 31, 2017. The final SWIF was accepted by the Corps in 2019. The SWIF maintains eligibility for flood damage repairs under the federal PL 84-99 Program but does not include projects to extend flood protection beyond the PL 84-99 levees, nor does it address multiple benefits.

During the SWIF process the District Board of Supervisors ("Board") through Resolution FCD2014-09.1 adopted provisional levels of protection (LOP) for 43.7 shoreline miles of the Lower Green River. The Board set the provisional LOP for most urban areas to a median flow of 18,800 cubic feet per second (cfs), plus three-feet of free-board - a 500-year LOP. FCD2014-09.1 also identified areas of the Lower Green River that would require additional technical analysis before the Board could determine a proposed LOP.

In 2016, the District Board of Supervisors ("Board") passed Resolution FCD2016-05 which determined that the broader objectives supported by stakeholders who participated as SWIF advisors could best be achieved through a long-range planning process that included a State Environmental Policy Act ("SEPA") programmatic environmental impact statement ("EIS") that could analyze cumulative impacts and reasonable alternatives for accomplishing the objectives of flood protection, economic vitality, equity and social justice, habitat restoration, housing, recreation, salmon recovery, water quality, and other issues to be defined through the environmental impact statement scoping process. The Board directed the District Executive Director to prepare a work plan and budget for a LGRCP and to initiate a request for proposal for a consultant to prepare a SEPA programmatic EIS for the LGRCP.

Also, in 2016, the Board adopted SEPA procedures through Resolution FCD2016-04. Section 4 of FCD2016-04 states that the District Executive Director shall be the SEPA responsible official for

all proposals on which the District is the lead agency and the responsible official shall make the threshold determination, supervise scoping, prepare any required EIS and perform any other functions assigned to the lead agency under FCD2016-04. Section 5D states that the District shall be the lead agency for the LGRCP. Section 6 states that the responsible official shall begin any required environmental review at the earliest point in the planning and decision-making process when the principal features of the proposal and its probable environmental impacts are reasonably identified.

In the fall of 2017, the Board through resolution FCD2017-06 authorized the Chair to enter into a contract for professional services with Environmental Science Associates (ESA) to prepare the programmatic EIS and to conduct the public involvement process.

On, August 26, 2017, the Executive Committee received a briefing on a draft motion to set forth the goals and purposes of the Lower Green River Corridor Plan. The Board initiated the planning and environmental review process for the Lower Green River Corridor Plan on, April 30, 2018, through Motion No. FCD18-01.2.

The scoping period for the PEIS began on, November 28, 2018, and the District extended the scoping deadline to, May 1, 2019, to expand opportunities for public input. The outreach strategy met SEPA notification and outreach requirements.

A total of 632 comment items were received during the scoping period. Of the 632 items, 581 items were substantively identical emails that all used the same template. The remaining 51 items were comprised of 24 letters, 3 emails, 21 comment forms (including online), 1 written comment, and 2 oral testimonies. Of these 51 items, 24 items were received from the public and 27 items were received from agencies, jurisdictions, affected tribes, businesses, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).

The 192 individual comments submitted during the scoping period included approximately 85 comments regarding impacts, 65 comments regarding alternatives, 18 comments regarding policy, 5 comments regarding mitigation, and 19 additional comments. Comments were further categorized using elements of the built and natural environment, as described above. There

were approximately 13 comments that were not categorized according to the “Elements of the Environment”, including those which were administrative in nature or expressed preferences for certain alternatives. *(The Final Scoping report includes a comment catalog in Appendix D and a summary in Appendix E. Copies of the items received are provided in Appendix F.)*

The themes of comments received are summarized below:

#### Natural Environment

There were approximately 85 comments whose subject was related to the natural environment. Of these comments, there were approximately 2 about air (climate change), 19 about water (surface water and floods), 63 about plants and animals (habitat, unique species, and fish passage), and 1 about the general natural environment. Within these totals, three of four items in the substantively identical emails were focused on the natural environment.

#### Built Environment

There were approximately 94 comments whose subject was related to the built environment. Of these comments, there was approximately 1 about environmental health, 40 about land and shoreline use (land use plans, housing and businesses, recreation, historic/cultural preservation, agriculture), 1 about transportation, 45 about public services and utilities (parks and recreational facilities, maintenance, water and stormwater, sewage and solid waste, other), and 7 about equity and social justice. Within these totals, one of the four items in the substantively identical emails was focused on land use.

#### Alternatives

There were several comments which expressed support for or opposition to specific alternatives, including suggestions for an additional alternative to be studied in the PEIS. Most comments that proposed a fourth alternative recommended that the additional



alternative have a more multi-objective approach including more robust salmon habitat protection and enhancement than the three scoping alternatives.