

From: [Mike and Glenda Smell](#)
To: [Scott Boettcher](#); cdodd@cityofnapavine.com
Subject: Kirkland Road Project Meeting 1-31-17 statement
Date: Wednesday, February 1, 2017 2:17:58 PM
Attachments: [Kirkland Road Project Meeting 1-31-17.rtf](#)

1:21 p.m. 1 February 2017

Hello: Attached is my statement from the subject meeting as requested.

For Napavine: I was going to have you go to the USGS site and then go through 3 screens to get to the 3 gages on the Newaukum River. The pathway has been changed and the end result doesn't give you the required information. Here are the long versions of the 3 gage websites:

Near Chehalis is

waterdata.usgs.gov/wa/nwis/uv?cb_all_00060_00065=on&format=gif&period=7&site_no=12025000

Forest is

waterdata.usgs.gov/wa/nwis/00060_00065_00045=on&format=gif_default&period=5&site_no=12024400

Onalaska is

waterdata.usgs.gov/wa/nwis/00060=on&cb_00065=on&cb_00045=on&format=gif_default&period=7&site_no=12024000

Also, the NOAA River Predictions website is another very good one. It can be reached at: waterweather.gov/ahps2/forecasts.php?wfo-sew

By, on, and in the Newaukum River

Michael L. Smell

Kirkland Road Project Meeting

31 January 2017

Thank you again for including me in the meeting. Listed below are my comments on the project.

From the Introduction to the report, it says “As the flooding impacts undeveloped areas, it is important to the city that the flood impacts be mitigated so that these areas may be developed in the future.” This is a red flag for me for why the project should not be completed.

I have been over the entire project 4 times. I came away with flushing the water downstream. This is contrary to what I heard at 2 CRBFA meetings when local projects came up as a topic. I heard at these meetings that the CRBFA would not contemplate any projects that “just flushed water downstream”. I questioned this project in 2013 when it first came up and had a meeting with Napavine’s Mr Ashley. I said I would wait and see what came up. When the \$40K was approved for the study, I questioned the project to the Local Projects Committee of the CRBFA and the answer was, “It is just a study.”. Now that the study is initially completed, I still question the project. The study states that a lot of places in the study area were developed with impervious surfaces and with no retention ponds. The exception was noted that in 2013 Starbucks had a retention pond. Drive by Starbucks and tell me where the retention pond is. A larger culvert was installed at that time under Rush Rd on the north side of Starbucks to a vacant parcel on the west side of the road.

The Newaukum River USGS gage 12025000 is located 4 miles downstream of the project area. I live 3 miles downstream of I-5 Exit 72 and 1 mile upriver of the gage.

The study lists the Lewis County flood stages. The Newaukum River starts to flood 100 yards from my house. When it is at say Phase II here and ready to enter my lawn, what level of flooding is occurring at I-5 Exit 72? The same thing with all the other Phases. I cannot get out, so I do not know the answer but it would be interesting to know. In 2015, there were 4 floods noted at the gage, one was the 6th highest flood and one was the 4th highest flood. What kind of flooding occurred at I-5 Exit 72?

Did anyone think about raising Kirkland Road so emergency vehicles could traverse during a flood? Did anyone think about the impact on fish the larger culverts and ditches would have? At what flood stage do the culverts and ditches start to take effect? I cannot find anything in the study to show the volume or flow rate that will go through the culverts and ditches at different flood stages.

In the Conclusion section, it states, “flood waters may inhibit future development.”. This is another red flag for me.

The map showing the extent of flooding does not indicate at what flood phase it happens. If you look at it, you will see that only 5 undeveloped parcels and 1 developed parcel are affected out of approximately 17 parcels in the study area.

The detention pond idea is interesting. It would temporarily hold 4.106 acre feet of water during a flood event. One acre foot equals 325,851 gallons of water. So, the retention pond would retain a lot of water and not just flush it downstream. Neither the Basin Area nor the parcel number(s) where it would be located were identified.

I question why this project which is still in a study mode was included in the CRBFA Priority II 2017 – 2019 Local Projects request. I thought a study was completed first listing the pros and cons and then a decision was made whether to go forward or not. Even being included as a Priority II implies to me that the decision was already made.

Thank you again for including me at the meeting. By, on, and in the Newaukum River