

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Additional Flood Protection below SR24 Bridge		
• No modifications to existing levee (No Action).	6	6
• Strengthen existing left riverbank levee but maintain its current elevation.	9	3
• Raise existing left riverbank levee to provide 100-year protection, extending 2000 feet downstream of SR24 bridge.	6	6
• Raise existing left riverbank levee to provide 100-year protection, extending approximately 10,000 feet downstream of SR24 bridge.	4	8
• Construct a 100-year setback levee along Blue Slough, extending approximately 2,500 feet downstream of SR 24.	9	3
• Following gravel extraction, restore floodplain area to enhance fish habitat and floodplain storage.	10	1
• Private action, no County involvement.	4	8

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
<p>Yakima Beech Street Gravel Pit Levee, and East Selah Gravel Pit Levee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow gravel pit operation, protection, and reclamation to continue with existing regulatory rules and public involvement (No Action, private issue). • Actively review and comment on each gravel pit reclamation plan (or mitigation action plan for East Selah Gravel Pit) to ensure that they fulfill the objectives of the CFHMP, future land use plans, and other local management plans. • Develop a surface mining advisory committee to work with gravel operators in developing reclamation plans that fulfill the objectives of this CFHMP, future land use plans, and other local river management plans and regulations. • Develop a long-term gravel management plan for the County. • Conduct a study of the river’s hydraulics, hydrogeology, and geomorphology to determine the relationship between gravel removal quantities and potential increased flood protection benefits. Documenting increased flood protection by gravel mining could decrease gravel royalty rates. In addition, the study would determine proper gravel pit location, design, and operation to limit the potential for adverse impacts on groundwater, fisheries, and the natural ecological and hydraulic functions of the Yakima River. The study could result in a long-term gravel management plan for the County. 	<p>5</p> <p>10</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p>	<p>6</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
<p>Development near Riverside Road, Hartford Road, and in Pomona, East Selah, and Selah Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow development to continue in these areas (No Action). • Strictly enforce the requirements of Chapter 5 of the Critical Areas Ordinance to any future development in these areas. • Expand the Flood Overlay Zone (FOZ) to include the entire floodplain. This designation should be similar to the FOZ found in the Yakima Urban Area Zoning Code and would require additional review of future development within floodplain areas. • Develop consistent ordinance requirements in the floodplain for all jurisdictions (see issue RW5 - Revision and Consistency of Critical Areas Ordinances). • Monitor cumulative impacts of subdivisions in floodplain. If warranted, develop review procedures to reduce cumulative impacts of such development and amend the procedures to the existing subdivision ordinance. • Monitor land use changes following adoption of the GMA comprehensive plan. Ensure that future plan amendments are consistent with overall CFHMP goals and policies, as well as recommendations pertaining to these specific locations. • As part of future comprehensive plan amendments, consider adopting the CFHMP as a comprehensive plan element. GMA requirements for internal consistency will then apply to land use recommendations across both documents. 	<p>4</p> <p>10</p> <p>10</p> <p>12</p> <p>9</p> <p>11</p> <p>10</p>	<p>8</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>0</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Floodplain Mapping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accept FEMA’s revised preliminary revised floodplain maps (No Action). • Obtain high water elevations from the February 9, 1996, flood throughout the County floodplain. High water elevations should be taken at FEMA-defined cross-sections or at COE high water elevation points. This information could be used to verify they hydraulic model used to define floodplain boundaries. • Obtain accurate topographic data for the Gordon Lake levee, left bank levee, and floodplain downstream of SR24 bridge, I-82, and the floodplain near East Selah. This information could also be used to verify they hydraulic model used to define floodplain boundaries. • Prepare conceptual flood control improvement designs that support removal of these areas from the regulatory floodplain as appropriate. Designs should incorporate environmental mitigation strategies. • Submit certification forms to FEMA to obtain Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR), Letter of Map Revision (LOMR), or Physical Map Revision (PMR), as appropriate. • Request that FEMA produce a digital floodplain map that combine maps for all jurisdictions. 	<p>5</p> <p>12</p> <p>11</p> <p>10</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p>	<p>7</p> <p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Consistent Land Use and Zoning		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to enforce existing zoning in flood hazard areas until it is replaced by development regulations resulting from land use recommendations in <i>Plan 2015</i> (No Action). • Add a flood hazard overlay zone to the County’s zoning code to include the entire floodplain, requiring all new development to be constructed in accordance with Chapter 5 of the Critical Areas Ordinance, in addition to the requirements of the underlying zone. • County and City land use plans and development regulations should be revised to ensure that urban areas within the floodplain are dedicated to long-term open space or low density development with structural mitigation. • Revise the County’s land use plan and develop regulations to remove rural transitional and urban areas from the floodplain. • Develop a County policy describing how highly flooded areas will be redeveloped. 	<p>6</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>11</p>	<p>6</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Public Disclosure of Floodplain Status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Let existing and future floodplain residents determine the risks associated with residing in the floodplain (No Action). • Perform a direct mailing to residents residing in the floodplain describing flood hazards, flood insurance, and options available to reduce flood hazards. • Promote a County service to determine floodplain status of property. County floodplain information could be provided to Realtors for inclusion on property transaction disclosure forms (RCW 64.06.020). • Require disclosure on all newly created parcels in subdivision ordinance . 	<p>4</p> <p>11</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p>	<p>8</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p>
Protection of State and County Roads <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to respond to future flood-related road damage without integrating any mitigation (No Action). • Develop a river stage / road closure database and that identifies the river stage which roads should be closed and emergency routes as river stage rises. • Implement road damage mitigation measures in order of priority, based on available funding. Road enhancements should be focused on ensuring access to critical facilities and limiting closure of critical transportation routes. 	<p>4</p> <p>11</p> <p>11</p>	<p>7</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Channel Migration, Bank Erosion below SR24, Erosion of Agricultural Land <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action (private action). • As bank erosion areas are identified, implement bank protection projects following established guidelines (for example, King County guidelines). • Provide guidance in implementing private bank protection projects. Local residents should continue to fund and implement bank protection projects on an as needed basis for their property. During project review, the County should support bioengineering methods to address the hydraulic nature of bank erosion. • Limit development in rapid channel migration areas by promoting the Open Space Taxation Program in a public awareness campaign (see issue RW10 - Acquisition / Preservation of Floodplain Open Space). • Adopt design standards, such as on-site detention, to limit or mitigate increased erosion potential resulting from new development. 	<p>4</p> <p>10</p> <p>12</p> <p>11</p> <p>11</p>	<p>7</p> <p>2</p> <p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Diversity of Opinions Relating to River Management, and County Policy on Flood Hazard Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to respond to river management issues after problems occur (No Action). • The County should continue CFHMP Advisory Committee meetings on an ad hoc basis to discuss river management issues with interested parties. • Adopt the CFHMP as part of <i>Plan 2015</i> to ensure consistency of land use recommendations and provide goals and policies to direct future flood hazard management decisions. • Expand the CFHMP to include the entire County, as funding becomes available, to provide consistent floodplain management across the County. • Ensure CFHMP consistency with other plans, such as the Yakima River Watershed Management Plan currently being prepared by the Yakima River Watershed Council. The County should participate in other river management planning processes, and invite personnel from other river interest groups to future CFHMP Advisory Committee meetings. 	<p>4</p> <p>11</p> <p>11</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p>	<p>8</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p>

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Flood Hazard Ordinance; and Revision and Consistency of Critical Areas Ordinance		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to enforce existing floodplain regulations (No Action). 	2	10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify existing floodplain ordinances for consistency throughout the floodplain. 	11	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify existing ordinances to provide additional flood hazard reduction through the following enhancements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Require all new construction and substantial improvements, regardless of land use, to be elevated to or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE). – Require all new construction and substantial improvements, regardless of land use, to be elevated to a higher standard, such as at least 1 foot above the BFE. – Require all new construction behind approved levees to be elevated to at least one foot above existing grade. – Require location of critical facilities to be outside the limits of the 100-year floodplain, or, if no feasible site is available, require the lowest floor to be elevated to three feet or more above the BFE. – Integrate new floodplain information into floodplain ordinances as it becomes available (e.g., revised floodplain maps). 	11	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Require all new construction and substantial improvements, regardless of land use, to be elevated to or above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE). 	6	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Require all new construction and substantial improvements, regardless of land use, to be elevated to a higher standard, such as at least 1 foot above the BFE. 	6	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Require all new construction behind approved levees to be elevated to at least one foot above existing grade. 	4	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Require location of critical facilities to be outside the limits of the 100-year floodplain, or, if no feasible site is available, require the lowest floor to be elevated to three feet or more above the BFE. 	10	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Integrate new floodplain information into floodplain ordinances as it becomes available (e.g., revised floodplain maps). 	9	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop an inter-local agreement that creates a floodplain ordinance that applies across all jurisdictional boundaries. 	10	1

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
<p>Increased Flood Elevations near Union Gap</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow flood damage to continue near Union Gap (No Action). • Collect data to support flood hazard management, such as, a high water elevation database to evaluate changes in river channels and trends in high water elevations. The database could include flood elevations over time at a specific location, historical aerial photographs, changes in surveyed river cross-sections, and the historical record of flood damage areas. • Adopt and follow the proposed <i>Plan 2015</i> County policy “protect the hydrologic functions of natural systems to store and slowly release floodwaters, reduce flood velocities, and filter sediment.” Protecting the natural storage function of the Yakima River floodplain will reduce the potential for increased flood elevations near Union Gap and in the Lower Valley. • Add compensatory storage requirements to the County’s CAO. This requirement is a method of reducing the effects of filling in the floodplain. Whenever fill material is added, the area the fill occupies is removed from the potential flood storage area. Under compensatory storage requirements, an individual placing fill in the floodplain must excavate an area of equivalent volume to eliminate the effects of the fill on flood storage. 	<p>3</p> <p>11</p> <p>11</p> <p>9</p>	<p>8</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>3</p>

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Use of Nonstructural versus Structural Flood Control		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to control the Yakima River with structural flood control, such as levees (No Action). 	4	8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt CFHMP as part of <i>Plan 2015</i> and follow the CFHMP objective of giving preference to nonstructural flood control measures. 	11	1
Loss of Fisheries Habitat and Riparian Areas		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action 	2	13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and specifically list fish habitat enhancement areas (“wish list”) that are consistent with comprehensive floodplain management planning and could be quickly acted upon as funding becomes available. Available projects include restoration of gravel pits, riparian planting, placement of large woody debris, and removal of old borrow pit levees. 	13	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit a letter of intent for participation in the COE 1135 program to obtain funding for fish habitat restoration along the COE levee project 	12	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate fish habitat enhancements or mitigation into future flood hazard management projects and gravel pit reclamation by using backwater channels, riparian planting, and placement of large woody debris. 	17	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage private property owners and public groups to improve existing habitat by providing information on habitat enhancement programs that they can implement as community enhancement projects. 	17	0

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Existing Structures in the Floodplain		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a public education program on floodproofing and flood insurance 	13	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perform a detailed flood audit of floodplain structures that determines the structures elevation relative to flood elevations and recommends specific flood damage reduction alternatives for each structure 	17	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in cost share program (voluntary program as funding becomes available) to floodproof existing floodplain structures 	16	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively pursue funding through the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program for structure acquisition 	13	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow floodplain structures to be continually damage during flood events (No Action) 	8	8

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Operation and Maintenance of Flood Control Facilities		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue using historical operation and maintenance procedures (No Action) 	7	8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidate and update maintenance requirements into one document by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updating the flood control works inventory Developing specific vegetation maintenance requirements Revising the 1955 O&M manual Combining maintenance requirements into one document Standardizing County inspection forms 	17	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt a written policy that requires all new flood control projects to define maintenance responsibilities and a funding source for operation, maintenance, and repairs before acceptance by the County. 	16	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct and maintain a flood control facility inventory database to document current conditions of each flood control facility. 	17	0

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Acquisition/Preservation of Floodplain Open Space		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action 	1	14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to operate and promote the Open Space Taxation Program. A public awareness campaign should be conducted to promote the program, especially to property owners in the middle reach of the floodplain. General information of the program can be distributed with the floodplain information mailing recommended in issue RW7 -- flood insurance and public education. 	16	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate undeveloped County owned floodplain parcels as open space or integrate these parcel into the Yakima Greenway master plan. 	16	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply design standards of the Greenway Master Plan during Class 2 review of developments within floodplain or greenway overlay zones. 	14	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend greenway overlay zone beyond the Yakima Urban Area to include conservation, recreation and natural areas designated in the Greenway Master Plan. 	12	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pursue funding through state and federal programs to purchase high hazard floodplain properties or development rights for open space use. Acquisitions should be focused on repetitive loss areas near Pomona Road and Naches Avenue East and initiated on a voluntary basis. 	15	1

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Flood Warning and Emergency Response		
<i>Short-term</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formalize procedures for dispatching field teams and volunteers to critical locations along rivers and creeks to manually collect real-time river information 	11	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain and compile from the BOR time delays in flood peaks between locations along the Yakima River for various flood magnitudes 	17	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and compile information on past flood events to create a database that correlates road closures with river stage and discharge 	17	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and communicate to the public a policy on sandbag distribution during flood events 	16	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff a public education officer to manage a public education program as described in issue RW7-Flood Insurance and Public Education 	11	4
<i>Long-term</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a flood inundation map for distribution to the public 	17	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install real-time, automatic gauging stations within the upper watershed of tributary creeks 	10	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a Community Alert Network (automatic telephone notification system) for use at the Emergency Operations Center 	12	4

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Flood Insurance and Public Education and Community Rating System <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action • Staff a public education officer to manage a public education and Community Rating System (CRS) program • Immediately enroll in the CRS using a "short form". The purpose of the short form is to quickly assist a jurisdiction that has at least 500 credit points to achieve a Class 9 rating and realize immediate savings on policy premiums. The full application containing additional detail may be completed at a later date to realize additional savings. • The County should submit the full set of required documentation to update its CRS rating following adoption of the CFHMP. Full application will provide the largest benefit when many of the structural and non-structural recommendations of the CFHMP have been implemented. Many of the CFHMP recommendations would receive CRS credit. 	<p>5</p> <p>10</p> <p>12</p> <p>16</p>	<p>11</p> <p>4</p> <p>4</p> <p>0</p>

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Use of Geographical Information System (GIS) Data		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action 	5	10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain the best available digital flood hazard map from FEMA that meets accuracy, completeness, accessibility, and community review objectives described in Chapter 8. 	17	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assemble GIS coverages documenting closed and damaged roads from historic flood events discussed in the CFHMP. Analyze spatial trends in this data relative to stream stage levels to build relationships between flow rates and road closures. 	12	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain flood damage GIS coverages for recent and historical floods from FEMA as they become available. Observe privacy act requirements for reporting this data. 	12	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct a GIS permit review tool that generates reports for pre-application conferences. 	11	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue standard GIS data updates 	16	0

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Continued Flood Damage Outside the CFHMP Study Area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow damage to continue outside the CFHMP study area (No Action) • Expand CFHMP planning to other areas within the County on a watershed basis. Planning should be concentrated on high damage areas such as Ahtanum, Bachelor, Wide Hollow, Wenas Creeks and the Upper Naches and Lower Valley. Planning should begin now by documenting flood issues from historical floods and during future flood events. • Adopt the Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan to reduce localized flooding in the Yakima urban areas. 	5	11
	13	4
	17	0

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Right Bank Yakima River Levee near Boise Cascade Pond and: Flood Damage to Greenway Path near Boise Cascade Pond		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not rebuild pathway (No Action) 	2	15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise the existing pathway to FEMA's freeboard standards 	11	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relocate the pathway to an area that has lower potential for overtopping and erosion 	15	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install culverts within the damaged pathway to minimize overtopping potential and construct an overflow channel 	10	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construct the pathway for overtopping by decreasing top elevation near the breach areas and construct an overflow channel 	13	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rebuild the pathway using higher design standards such as bigger rip rap 	9	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rebuild the pathway to pre-flood conditions 	8	8

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Spring Creek Backwater Flooding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action • Integrate floodproofing techniques into the City of Union Gap’s pump station. • Promote floodproofing and flood insurance to Union Gap residents that experienced damaged during the February 1996 flood. • Limit additional development within the Yakima, Ahtanum, Wide Hollow, and Spring Creek floodplains. • Construct the Wide Hollow Creek high flow bypass as recommended in the draft Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan with the knowledge that severe flooding on the Yakima mainstem will continue to flood this area. Prior to final design, maximum flow through the low flow channel should be determine using Yakima River flood stage as a boundary condition and integrating considerations for a temporary closure structure near the mouth of the low flow channel. • Conduct a comprehensive drainage study for the Ahtanum Creek watershed as recommended in issue OSA1 - Continued flood damage outside the CFHMP study area. 	<p>6</p> <p>17</p> <p>16</p> <p>12</p> <p>15</p> <p>17</p>	<p>10</p> <p>0</p> <p>1</p> <p>4</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
KOA Campground Levee		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action 	3	12
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen the damaged section of levee by adding additional rip rap as needed. 	14	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspect spur dike during low flow and repair as needed. 	1	0

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Flood Damage to Robertson and Harlan Landing and, Inundation of Elks Golf Course <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action • Floodproof repetitively damaged structures (vault toilets, etc) by moving them to a higher elevation or installing flood walls or sealants. • Rebuild Greenway pathways to a higher design standards such as using higher erosive resistant embankment protection • Establish a maintenance budget to provide funding for future flood damage that will inevitably occur. • Establish flood response teams to remove temporary structures (picnic tables, garbage cans, etc) prior to an impending flood event. • Educate Greeway users on flooding by installing interpretive signs near damaged sites that describe floodplains, floodways, effective floodplain management, and how various actions can aggravate flooding and flood damage • Continually monitor cumulative effects of development in the area to limit the potential of aggravating flood damage. 	<p>1</p> <p>15</p> <p>12</p> <p>15</p> <p>15</p> <p>17</p> <p>17</p>	<p>12</p> <p>0</p> <p>4</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.

APPENDIX E
Advisory Committee Members Voting Results on Flood Hazard Reduction Alternatives

Flood Issue / Proposed Alternatives	Acceptable	Not Acceptable
Funding for Flood Control Work and Restorations Projects		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Action — Continue with limited County funding for flood control maintenance (\$30,000 per year) and flood facility emergency repair (\$30,000 per year). 	6	8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt the CFHMP as part of <i>Plan 2015</i> and incorporate CFHMP funding requirements into the financial portion of <i>Plan 2015</i>. 	14	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund river improvement projects through external sources such as state and federal grant programs 	16	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund river improvement programs through county administered options such as using county revenues, developer contributions, establishing a surface water utility, or improvement districts. 	14	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund river improvement programs by establishing special districts in areas that experience substantial flood damage such as Ahtanum Creek and the Upper Naches. 	15	0

Note: Some alternative did not receive votes from all committee members.