



Floodplain & Hydrology Technical Committee

March 31, 2015
1:30 PM – 3:00 PM

Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Gordon Cole, Corstone, LLC
Gary Brandstetter, Marshland Flood Control
District
Angela Day, Citizen
Dan Huntington, Citizen

Eric Johnson, Washington State Department of
Transportation (WSDOT)
Andy Sics, City of Snohomish Engineering
Andy Shadoan, Business Owner
Keith Stocker, Business Owner

Consulting Team:

Colleen Cummins, Jviation
Renee Dowlin, Jviation
Hilary Fletcher, Jviation

Donna Taylor, Jviation
Kenny Booth, Watershed
Hugh Mortensen, Watershed

Harvey Field:

Kandace Harvey, Owner
Cyndy Hendrickson, Airport Manager

Introduction:

Hilary opened the meeting with a brief introduction of the master plan process and an overview of the various other focus groups meetings that were being held (pilots, business, and noise). The focus groups are being held to obtain more targeted information from each group.

Hilary noted that Jviation was chosen as the consulting firm to conduct the Harvey Field master plan which will result in a 20 year plan. The Master Plan was kicked-off in fall 2014 and we are wrapping up what is known as the investigative phase - airport inventory, aviation forecast, and facility requirements. A community open house will be held tomorrow at 6:30 PM at the Airport and it would be greatly appreciated if you can make it and spread the word as we are greatly interested in getting feedback from the community. Prior to the open house the second Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting will be held.

Introductions were made by each attendee.

Hilary informed the group that this session is meant to be a listening exercise as we are interested in hearing your concerns and, as we begin to develop alternatives, we want to ensure we have captured your comments.

A participant inquired when the Master Plan would be completed.

- The goal is to have it wrapped up by spring/summer 2016.

Background:

A background of the floodplains, hydrology, and wetlands of the area was given by Kenny and Hugh from The Watershed Company. Main topics/points are bulleted below.

- A wetland delineation study was conducted during the months of January and February 2015. The area delineated is located between Airport Way and Springhetti Road.
- Wetlands were found and were determined to be a Category 3 wetland. Category is based on a rating system from Department of Ecology where 1 is the highest quality and 4 is the lowest.
- Floodplains are an existing known constraint in the area as mapped by FEMA. The entire valley is within the 100-year floodplain (1 percent chance in any given year) and 500-year floodplain (0.2 percent chance in any given year).
- Snohomish County regulates floodplain development.
- The airport and surrounding area are located within a subset of the 100-year floodplain known as the density fringe area. This area has particular development standards, i.e. amount of fill; other constraints that might displace floodwater.
- The floodway area follows the main river channel; the airport does not fall within this area; more heavily regulated.
 - Is there a reason why the floodway is not included near Pilchuck Park?
 - Good question, this information comes directly from FEMA so not sure why they did not include. I don't have an answer.

Discussion:

Following the introduction and background, participants moved into a discussion about issues and concerns regarding the hydrology and floodplain areas.

- What is elevation difference between road and wetland area?
 - Not sure, but know road is higher and wetland area is lower. There will definitely be a topographic survey done during design.
 - When will we know and when will something be shown as far as building/development?
 - Alternative development is next in master plan process and from that process a preferred alternative will be selected.
- If area is raised higher it may obstruct water that needs to flow through the railroad trestles that are located east of Springhetti Road near river.
- Is the elevation of the existing Runway 33 the same elevation from north to south?
 - No, the Runway 15L has an elevation of 15.4 feet where the Runway 33R end is 21.6 feet.
 - FAA standards allow grade changes and maximum change over runway length is two percent.
- It is understood that any changes to the runway will need to take hydrology into consideration but it is hard to comment when we don't know what is being proposed.
- If dirt were to be taken out of the wetland or its buffer that were described would it fill with water?
 - Yes, it probably would as water table is very close to ground level.



- Could you effectively make negative storage?
 - Yes, negative storage is possible and is considered compensatory mitigation when dealing with floodplains.
- It was asked if the runway could be extended and follow existing code.
 - Yes, anything designed and constructed would need to meet both FAA regulations/standards as well as floodplain code standards.
 - It was noted that the draft facility requirements showed only a couple hundred feet of additional runway is needed to meet the existing needs of aircraft using the airport and those that would be using it in the future.
 - One of the biggest concerns is the current location of Airport Way which reduces the useable portion of the existing runway due to required safety areas.
- It is important to explain plan to deal with development and floodplain mitigation.
 - Once alternatives are developed they will be analyzed to see if able to meet mitigation requirements.
- It was noted that the existing wetland area was previously under water (1959 on). Hanson Slough, where wetland lies, is higher than Batt Slough which doesn't drain until river lowers. If changes occur in those areas it will impact how the water flows and may redirect. It was also noted that modifications to the dikes and tide gates connecting the sloughs have changed the amount and depths of water over the past several years.
- What is the Airport's exact long-term goal?
 - Long-term goal is always a safe and efficient airport. The development needs have been drafted as part of the facility requirements and right now, based upon FAA requirements for type of aircraft using Harvey Field, a 2,850 runway that is unobstructed is suggested. However, as with any development you find your starting point and make changes based upon constraints.
- Can the existing runway serve the aircraft that operate here safely?
 - Yes, but pilots make adjustments to how much they carry (fuel, passengers, etc.) in order to operate safely.
- So would a longer runway accommodate a larger aircraft at less than full gross weight?
 - First, we need to be clear that we are not designing for a different group of aircraft than currently operate here; thus, we did not evaluate the runway length for a larger aircraft. However, it is possible that a larger aircraft could operate here based upon pilot's discretion.
- How may Cessna Grand Caravans (18 passenger) are operating at this airport today?
 - Only one, which is the skydiving plane. A typical Cessna Caravan does not hold 18 passengers. The one used for skydiving can hold that many due to seat removal and other modifications.
 - Also, the changes/modifications that will be suggested are not solely for the Cessna Grand Caravan but for other aircraft in the same category.
 - How many of these other aircraft can carry 18 passengers or more?
 - The other aircraft have 10 seats or less.
- Asking these questions because the newspaper stated that the skydiving operation is using a larger plane than before. Can one of options be that they use a smaller plane for skydiving?
 - Yes, but other aircraft use airport that are driving the need for changes. We are addressing a class of aircraft and not just one single aircraft.



- Do any of the aircraft besides the Grand Caravan need the runway to be extended?
 - Yes, as the need is being driven by the class of aircraft using the airport.
- Why do we need to make changes if aircraft are using runway as exists?
 - Mainly because the existing runway is highly obstructed and regulatory guidelines would prefer the runway be clear of obstructions which would enhance safety for both pilots and people and property on the ground.
 - A large part of what makes airports and roads safe are standards.
- I am flying into Salt Lake City and Juno this summer and have been told they have restrictions as well due to mountains, etc. It is necessary to be trained in order to fly into those places. When doing the study and looking at alternatives they need to cover the whole spectrum including if nothing changed at Harvey Field. Pilots need to be aware of the idiosyncrasies of flying into the airport as exists.
- If it is determined that not all requirements/recommendations will be met will considerations be given to smaller development?
 - Yes, most definitely.
- Kandace Harvey noted that the hydrology question is the biggest one to address. All of you live in this valley, so what specifically would you like to see us address? Please note we will be modeling alternatives as part of the process.
 - The prior Master Plan showed a lot of development to the west of the runways which needs to be addressed in this process as it would have a significant impact on hydrology.
 - Development on the west side will be reviewed and there is a good chance it will not remain as currently depicted. However, any development will be analyzed for floodplain impacts and would be required to meet all mitigation requirements.
 - When Airport is built out what happens to neighboring properties? If the Airport is placed above the floodplain the water will go elsewhere so need to consider cumulative impacts.
- My business is successful because of the traffic that goes by it and if the road is moved I will have an economic impact (aware this has nothing to do with hydrology).
- What is consideration for traffic if Airport Way moved?
 - Road would be relocated to meet demand and current design standards.
- Another business noted they would love to expand but are constrained due to the two percent rule. I think issue of fairness and equity will be brought up by others in the valley if Airport is expanded.
- The code is very general and what is really going to be necessary is that Harvey Field demonstrates that their development will not have unintended impacts to others.
 - Yes, when complete hydrology impacts for alternatives they need to be clear and understandable to community.
 - Has a project recently been done that would be a good example?
 - No, not many significant projects.
- FEMA regulations state you can build in a floodplain if you don't raise 100-year floodplain by more than one foot. So could extend runway by 200 feet but how does that impact flow of water?
 - Alternatives will be modeled to show any raise and flow of water.
- The Centennial Trail is proposed in floodplain and would remove some trestles.

- Gary, Marshland Flood Control District, noted that would be an issue as the trestles act to direct water. The Flood Control District would definitely have to evaluate.

The meeting was wrapped up and participants informed that another would be scheduled during the alternative analysis process. Hilary thanked everyone again for coming and reminded them of the open house scheduled at 6:30 PM on April 1st.