

Draft Wahkiakum County
Comprehensive Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan
~~February-April~~ 2024

DRAFT

Wahkiakum County Comprehensive Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan
2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Introduction</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Goals and Objectives.....</u>	<u>86</u>
<u>Inventory and Characterization</u>	<u>108</u>
<u>Habitat</u>	<u>2321</u>
<u>Flooding Issues.....</u>	<u>3129</u>
<u>Past And Present Flood Hazard Management Practices And Facilities, Programs And Regulations.....</u>	<u>3634</u>
<u>Established State and Federal Flood Hazard Mitigation Guidance.....</u>	<u>4038</u>
<u>Recommendations</u>	<u>50</u>
<u>Introduction</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Goals and Objectives.....</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>Inventory and Characterization</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>Habitat</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>Flooding Issues.....</u>	<u>27</u>
<u>Past And Present Flood Hazard Management Practices And Facilities, Programs And Regulations.....</u>	<u>32</u>
<u>State and Federal Flood Hazard Mitigation Guidance</u>	<u>36</u>
<u>Recommendations</u>	<u>43</u>

- Formatted:** Default Paragraph Font, Check spelling and grammar
- Formatted:** Default Paragraph Font, Check spelling and grammar
- Formatted:** Default Paragraph Font, Check spelling and grammar
- Formatted:** Default Paragraph Font, Check spelling and grammar
- Formatted:** Default Paragraph Font, Check spelling and grammar
- Formatted:** Default Paragraph Font, Check spelling and grammar
- Formatted:** Default Paragraph Font, Check spelling and grammar
- Formatted:** Default Paragraph Font, Check spelling and grammar

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION TO COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD HAZARD MANAGEMENT PLANNING

Comprehensive flood hazard management emphasizes non-structural flood hazard reduction methods and ecological restoration to reduce flood risks while achieving multiple community goals. Non-structural flood hazard reduction methods accommodate nature's flooding to reduce flood damages. Examples include property transactions, structure or infrastructure relocation and elevation, floodproofing, land use and zoning practices, flood risk studies and mapping, plans, and flood warning systems. Comprehensive flood hazard management is based on the following fourteen principles.

Principle 1: Focus on Non Structural Alternatives and Ecological Restoration

Using non-structural flood risk reduction methods, ecological restoration, and in some cases traditional structural flood controls should result in more flood risk reduction and less impact to natural resources than relying on traditional structural flood control alone.

Principle 2: Respect for Rivers' Natural Processes

Comprehensive flood hazard management works with a river's natural processes to achieve better, more cost effective, and environmentally beneficial results. Structural flood protection is appropriate in some cases, and in others allowing the river to change its course with some limitations is more effective. Comprehensive flood hazard management minimizes impacts on natural processes in order to avoid unintended consequences in other parts of the river system.

Principle 3: Focus on the Cause of Flood Damage

Comprehensive flood hazard management attempts to alleviate the results of flooding, but also attempts to reduce flood risk by affecting the conditions that cause flooding in the first place.

Principle 4: Integrated Floodplain Management

Integrated Floodplain Management (IFM) is a collaborative approach to reduce flood damages, increase salmon runs, and preserve farms and open spaces. It brings together stakeholders to create local visions, strategies, and actions that deliver multiple benefits.

Principle 5: Consideration of the Entire Watershed, Not Just Local Conditions

Tides and streams and the complex natural systems that they are a part of cross jurisdictional boundaries. Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management considers the interrelated causes and effects of flooding throughout watersheds.

Commented [GP1]: Who pays? Add a description of funding sources

Commented [GP2]: Planning Commissioner comment thar section on comprehensive flood hazard management planning confuses county and state goals, and that this information is available from state resources so doesn't need to be repeated in the plan.

Principle 6: Public Participation and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Flooding disproportionately affects vulnerable populations. For example, people with less income are more likely to live in floodplains and are less likely to have the resources needed to recover from flooding. Participation processes for Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plans proactively include vulnerable populations.

Principle 7: Coordination among Public Works, Planning, and Building Departments and Other Department Activities

Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management uses the expertise and input of multiple departments within county government that can affect flood risk and related community goals.

Principle 8: Interagency and Stakeholder Coordination

Outside of the county government, many agencies have expertise and resources that can help manage flood risk, and interests that can be impacted or benefit from flood risk mitigation projects or programs, so Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management includes these agencies in the planning process.

Principle 9: Planning Process-oriented Examination of Issues

Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management planning processes examine the causes of flooding, and evaluate alternative solutions to achieve objectives and goals.

Principle 10: Consideration of Future Conditions

Floodplains change and are influenced by various factors. Future flood hazards depend on factors like climate change and development. Climate change will increase river flood risk and sediment transport, while development will lead to more flood damage. Ignoring future conditions in a flood plan leads to higher costs and flood hazard.

Principle 11: Consideration of Tribal Rights

Floodplain management impacts tribal rights, specifically salmon productivity and harvests. Floodplains are vital for salmon recovery and healthy habitat. Current regulatory frameworks inadequately protect tribal treaty resources, including salmon. Flood control infrastructure harms salmon populations. Better floodplain management is necessary to safeguard tribal resources. See Chapter 6 for more on tribal rights.

Principle 12: Consideration of Environmental Justice

For fair flood hazard management, environmental justice must be considered. Flooding has enduring impacts on communities, as seen post-Hurricane Harvey. Low-income and minority groups face greater post-flood difficulties. Including local communities and recognizing diversity can improve public engagement and accountability and help lift communities out of environmental justice vulnerabilities.

Principle 13: Integration with Other Flood Hazard Management Programs and Grants

Jurisdictions face a complex web of mitigation programs (e.g., NFIP, FEMA grants, Ecology's Floodplains by Design), so effective flood planning should fulfill multiple goals and funding requirements.

Principle 14: Incorporation of Comprehensive Planning Solutions

~~Flood management planning includes various tools to meet environmental, public, and private objectives such as land use planning, zoning, infrastructure development, acquisition of flood sensitive areas, forestry management, and stormwater management planning. It also fulfills requirements for land use planning, critical area protection, and participation in the NFIP. Additionally, it supports lands acquisition, recreational planning, and stormwater management.~~

AUTHORITY, PURPOSE, & SCOPE

This plan was prepared under the authority of Revised Code of Washington (RCW) Chapter 86.26 and Washington Administrative Code (WAC) Chapter 173-145, and it is an update to the 2005 Wahkiakum County Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan.

The 2005 plan was created in response to increased frequency of floods and associated flood hazard risk in Wahkiakum County. The plan identified goals, objectives, and action items. It used a watershed approach, considering interrelated issues throughout the county's watersheds, The plan locally introduced concepts of non-structural flood control and erosion control methods, and multi-benefit projects to reduce flood risk while improving ecological functions.

The intended uses of the plan are to guide County investments, partnerships, or regulations related to flood risk reduction, and document flood risk reduction needs and priorities for project funders, such as state agencies.

The geographic scope of the plan is all of Wahkiakum County, including the sole incorporated community, the Town of Cathlamet¹. The plan is intended to guide the County's flood risk reduction efforts for approximately ten years, however the plan emphasizes improving flood risk information and doing so should result in new flood risk understanding and priorities on a shorter time frame.

Flood hazards considered in this plan primarily include flooding resulting from rivers overtopping their banks, and riverbank erosion and channel migration.

PLANNING PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY

This plan update included a review of flood risk data and other local conditions, a review of literature on best practices in comprehensive flood risk management, and new public and stakeholder input. The plan was updated to reflect the new information from this process.

Commented [GP3]: Find a way to preview a little more about the causes of flooding here, and the issues related to dike and gate maintenance. Make this reflect that this is a working landscape with an established culture and economy. Look over the whole plan with this entitlement in mind. Look at the 2014 published Fins of Grays River Area. There is about 75 pages, and lots of similar documents in the Naselle Archive. It documents the historical building of the dikes, who did it and what year it was done, logging history, commercial fishing, navigability up to Duffy's. Finnish American historical society of the west. Hard copies are at the Apalo archives right next to Hunter's Inn in Naselle. Part of the pioneer series.

¹ Wahkiakum County includes unincorporated communities such as Altoona, Dahlia, Deep River, Eagle Cliff, Eden, Family Camp, Grays River, Nassa, Oneida, Puget Island, Rosburg, Skamokawa, and Waterford.

The planning process occurred ~~in 2022 and 2023.~~ Between 2022 and 2024. The process was led by the Wahkiakum County Building and Planning Department, and their consultant the Columbia River Estuary Study Taskforce.

Public and Stakeholder Involvement

Public and stakeholder input was obtained using the following tools and methods:

Stakeholder Advisory Committee

A diverse sample of stakeholders were invited to participate on the stakeholder advisory committee. Invited stakeholders included local residents, local government representatives, diking district representatives, port district representatives, conservation district representatives, a conservation land trust, subject matter experts, and an Indian nation representative. The committee was invited to convene for a kickoff meeting to provide guidance to the plan outline, goal formation, public involvement methods. ~~Invited stakeholders were also encouraged to complete interviews with staff and consultants to understand their perspectives in more depth than the advisory committee meetings would allow for.~~ The Stakeholder advisory committee will be invited to convene and provide feedback on this initial draft plan as well as was invited to a meeting to provide feedback on the draft plan, and was invited to a final meeting to provide feedback prior to presenting the plan to the Planning Commission. ~~Invited stakeholders were also encouraged to complete interviews with staff and consultants to understand their perspectives in more depth than the advisory committee meetings would allow for.~~ Finally, advisory committee members were invited to complete online questionnaires and to attend public meetings.

Public Meetings

In an initial public meeting was hosted in two county locations and online The first public meetings offered information to the public on the scope of the planning effort and opportunities to provide input and aimed to obtain initial public input to inform plan goals and priority issues. ~~The purpose of a second round of public meetings will be.~~ Then after the draft plan was completed a second public meeting was offered to share draft plan goals and objectives and obtain public feedback to inform draft plan revisions.

Online Questionnaire

~~An online questionnaire advertised to the public invited input on the same questions and issues posed at the initial public meetings. An online questionnaire will be used to obtain additional feedback on the draft plan to inform revisions.~~ Online questionnaires were used along with each public meeting, to provide any person with an alternative way of providing input that did not require them to be available for the meeting.

Planning Commission

~~Before completing the planning process, the Planning Commission will be invited to review the plan, request improvements, and recommend its adoption by the County. This will take place through a public~~

Draft Wahkiakum County
Comprehensive Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan
~~February-April~~ 2024

~~hearing process.~~ In January, February, March, and April 2024, Wahkiakum County Planning Commission reviewed and recommended changes to the draft plan.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

~~Identifying goals started by considering whether the goals from the prior plan still served the County's interests. The discussions resulted in one change to the goals. The change acknowledges that while managing flood hazards in a manner that is sensitive to or even beneficial to fish and wildlife habitat and ecological functions is valuable, there is an even broader range of potential values that can be complemented or supported by multi-benefit flood hazard management projects.~~

GOALS

The plan's goals are aspirational, reflect the broad range of issues and opportunities that relate to flooding and are long standing reflections of community values. Identifying goals started by considering whether the goals from the prior plan still served the County's interests. The discussions resulted in one change to the goals, specifically to Goal #2. The change acknowledges that while managing flood hazards in a manner that is beneficial to fish and wildlife habitat and ecological functions is valuable, there is an even broader range of potential values that can be complemented or supported by multi-benefit flood hazard management projects.

1. Reduce the Amount of Flood Hazard Risk to Public Infrastructure, Citizens, and their Property.
2. Support opportunities for multi-benefit flood hazard mitigation projects.
3. Increase the Level of Coordination and Dialogue among Community Members and Interests of the State that Promotes Effective Floodplain Management Strategies.
4. Enhance Public Awareness about Activities that Increase Flood Risk to Existing and Future Development.
5. Protect and Enhance Productive Lands and the Rural Character of Wahkiakum County

OBJECTIVES

The following objectives express groups of actions that should reduce flood risk in the County. Each recommendation found at the end of the plan is meant to help achieve at least one objective.

1. Improve information for flood hazard management decisions. Flood insurance rate maps should be updated, other flood risk map products and flood risk studies should be created, channel migration zones should be identified and studied in more detail, and existing flood control infrastructure should be inventoried.
2. Update foundational plans and ordinances to reflect current conditions. The Shoreline Master Program and Floodplain Development Ordinance should be updated to reflect current conditions and state/federal requirements.

Formatted: Normal, Line spacing: single

Formatted: Normal, Line spacing: single

3. Maintain existing flood hazard management infrastructure and programs. Existing flood control infrastructure and culverts should be maintained until an informed decision is made to replace or relocate them. Diking districts should be supported with additional resources so that they can implement multi-benefit projects that are responsive to local values. Expand beneficial use of dredge material projects to protect Puget Island communities.
4. Make new flood hazard management investments to address the root causes of flood hazard risk. Pending the results of studies underway and initial projects by regional conservation partners, invest in upper watershed conservation projects that would reduce sediment supply and peak flows downstream.

INVENTORY AND CHARACTERIZATION

POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

The number and distribution of residents, visitors, and structures is a determinant of flood risks to people and property.

Wahkiakum County is rural with an area of 287 square miles, approximately 4500 residents in 2020. The 2020 population grew from approximately 4000 residents in 2010. Ten to fifteen percent of the population lives in the Town of Cathlamet, and the majority of the remainder of the population is located in lower elevations of the County. The population has grown in the last several years, despite the State of Washington in 2017 projecting a declining population. The most recent projections suggest that the County could reach a population of 5,000 by 2050.²




FIGURE 1: WAHKIAKUM COUNTY POPULATION CHANGE ESTIMATE TO 2017, AND FORECAST FROM 2017 TO 2040

Around 7% of the population primarily speaks a language other than English while at home. Over thirty percent of the County's population is over the age of 65, and nearly 20% of households do not have a broadband internet connection. About 12% of the population is in poverty, and the County's per capita income is about \$30,000. Around 17% percent of the population under 65 has a disability³. Unique challenges in either understanding flood risks or preparing for and recovering from flooding events are associated with each of these populations⁴. For example, these figures imply that there are over 300 county residents who might have difficulty understanding flood risk warnings or post disaster recovery

² State of Washington Office of Financial Management. 2023. Growth Management Act population projections for counties: 2020 to 2050.

³ U.S. Census Bureau. Quickfacts. <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/wahkiakumcountywashington>

⁴ US Census geographies in Wahkiakum County are too large to make valid estimates of the number of people residing in flood hazard areas who have any of the specific characteristics discussed above.

communications due to a language barrier, that around 900 residents lacking internet access to similar information.

Actively managed forests are the County's predominant land use. Agriculture is the second most predominant land use. Within this context, other land use types include the small-town urban land use patterns of the Town of Cathlamet, rural residential development interspersed amongst agriculture, water dependent and water related uses such as marinas adjacent to the Columbia River, and small groups of commercial/civic/industrial uses. The County's Comprehensive Plan⁵ and Shoreline Master Program support the continuation of these overall development patterns, with marginal increases in residential densities in each of the contexts where residences are already found.

CLIMATE

Climate is a determinant of flooding conditions. Climate in Wahkiakum County has been characterized as being a "mid latitude Marine West Coast Climate." Wahkiakum County's highest daily and monthly rainfall occurs between October and April, especially in November through January (National Weather Service, 2021). Heavy rainfall and extreme wind occur in large winter storm events called "atmospheric rivers," that cause flooding, landslides, and down trees. These storms sometimes melt snow at higher elevations, producing additional stormwater runoff. Within these wetter months precipitation has been known to exceed four (4") inches in some 24-hour periods (VTN, 1974).

Climate Forecasts

Projections^{6 7 8} suggest that extreme precipitation events will produce somewhat more precipitation in the future. For example, averages of available projections suggest that rain events with return intervals between 2 and 100 years will produce 6% to 9% more precipitation by the 2040's, with substantial variation among the projections that were averaged.

⁵ Wahkiakum County Comprehensive Plan.

<https://co.wahkiakum.wa.us/DocumentCenter/View/295/Comprehensive-Plan-PDF>

⁶ University of Washington Climate Impacts Group—. 2023. Heavy Precipitation Projections for use in Stormwater Planning. <https://data.cig.uw.edu/picea/stormwater/pub/viz/>

⁷ Morgan, H., Mauger, G., Won, J., Gould, D. 2021. Projected Changes in Extreme Precipitation Web Tool. University of Washington Climate Impacts Group—. <https://doi.org/10.6069/79CV-4233>

⁸ The projections assume a high greenhouse gas emissions scenario (RCP 8.5)—. Projections were not available for lower scenarios.




FIGURE 2 EXAMPLE OF PRECIPITATION PROJECTIONS AVAILABLE THROUGH THE INTERACTIVE VIEWER AT [HTTPS://DATA.CIG.UW.EDU/PICEA/STORMWATER/PUB/VIZ/](https://data.cig.uw.edu/picea/stormwater/pub/viz/)

Climate forecasts for atmospheric river events include increasing precipitation, increasing event frequency, and a shifting of atmospheric river events to occur more frequently earlier in the year, including October and November.

As a result of decreased snowpack and increasing participation, Bank full flows and widths **are expected to** increase in Wahkiakum County over the next 50 years, potentially on average in the range of 10% to 30%, although bank full flows for any given location on a stream will vary more widely based on a variety of factors.⁹

While less snowpack is forecasted for Washington, studies were not found forecasting whether there would be less snow accumulation in Wahkiakum County, and how less snow could moderate flows that would otherwise result from the heavy rain on snow events. Studies forecasting climate changes specific to each of the County's watersheds were not found.

Generally speaking, these forecasts suggest that the climate factors contributing to flooding will contribute more to flooding in the future than they do now, with climate changes contributing to

⁹ Mauger, G.S., M. Liu, J.C. Adam, J. Won, G. Wilhere, D. Dulan, J. Atha, L. Helbrecht, and T. Quinn (2021). New Culvert Projections for Washington State: Improved Modeling, Probabilistic Projections, and an Updated Web Tool. Report prepared for the Northwest Climate Adaptation Science Center. Climate Impacts Group, University of Washington. <https://doi.org/10.6069/31T3-RE28>

increasing flooded areas, flood depths, and flood flows, and more resulting impacts to residents, private property, roads, dikes, levees, culverts, and other infrastructure at risk of flooding.

Sea Level Rise

Available forecasts suggest some sea level rise occurring in the future, for example, an 83% chance of a 1/10th of 1 foot increase in Columbia River Estuary elevations in Grays Bay by the 2040's under a low greenhouse gas emissions scenario (RCP4.5), or a 80% chance of a 1 foot increase in Columbia River Estuary Elevations by 2120.¹⁰ Forecasts are available for other greenhouse gas scenarios, future dates, and locations. They all take into account the regional geologic trend of the land vertically rising at .4 feet per century. They do not account for local variations in vertical land movement. The projections generally suggest that sea level rise will occur to some extent in the coming decades¹¹, representing a factor contributing to more rather than less flood risk in and around today's tidally influenced flood-prone areas.

How Climate and Sea Level Rise Forecasts Were Used in this Plan

Climate and sea level rise forecasts are summarized for informational purposes in this plan. Specific policy and infrastructure recommendations are not based on climate and sea level rise forecasts.

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

¹⁰ University of Washington Climate Impacts Group. 2023. Interactive Sea Level Rise Visualizations. <https://cig.uw.edu/projects/interactive-sea-level-rise-data-visualizations/>

¹¹ Lavin, P., Roop, H.A., Neff, P.D., Morgan, H., Cory, D., Correll, M., Kosara, R., and Norheim, R., 2019. Interactive Washington State Sea Level Rise Data Visualizations. Prepared by the Climate Impacts Group, University of Washington, Seattle. Updated 7/20.




FIGURE 3 EXAMPLE OF SEA LEVEL RISE PROJECTIONS AVAILABLE THROUGH THE INTERACTIVE VIEWER AT [HTTPS://CIG.UW.EDU/PROJECTS/INTERACTIVE-SEA-LEVEL-RISE-DATA-VISUALIZATIONS/](https://cig.uw.edu/projects/interactive-sea-level-rise-data-visualizations/)

TOPOGRAPHY

Topography influences the rate and timing of water travelling through watersheds and therefore is a determinant of flood risk. Wahkiakum County's streams flow from relatively steep higher elevation areas to less steep lower elevation areas, before discharging to the Columbia River. Flows from the upper watersheds slow down in lower watershed areas as the topography flattens, contributing to flooding. Accumulated dredge spoils and sediment discharges from the upper watershed of Grays River have reduced its discharge capacity.

Larger flows transport earth material downstream and can create new channels as witnessed in avulsion events such as the one that occurred in 2001 at Gorley Springs. Lower gradient streams at the valley bottoms are more exposed to tidal and flow patterns in the Columbia River. These sections of Wahkiakum's watersheds experience lower rates of velocity and are therefore slower to drain and discharge material.

SOILS

Soil characteristics influence flooding in a few different ways in different locations and contexts. Flat areas with soils having low infiltration rates may experience more surface water accumulation from direct precipitation, as is the case in some lower areas of the Grays Bay watershed. In upstream watershed areas, soil infiltration partly determines how much water infiltrates slowly through the ground versus flowing relatively quickly over the surface toward downstream flood prone areas.

Soil erodibility and landslide susceptibility determine how much soil erodes and is deposited downstream. Wahkiakum County includes large areas of highly erodible soils that are also prone to landslides in its actively managed upland forests.. As described in later sections, these soils have eroded to downstream areas, causing changes to the shapes of stream channels, leading to further downstream bank erosion and channel migration, and limiting the flow capacity of streams and their ability discharge flood flows into the Columbia River Estuary.

Sediment sources and their interaction with the rivers of Wahkiakum is a complex process. More information is needed to understand sediment patterns and trends in order to make better decisions about what are the best strategies for reducing sediment delivery to stream channels. Generally speaking, the erodibility and landslide susceptibility characteristics of Wahkiakum County's soils will not moderate the effects of increasing precipitation as much as less erodible and landslide prone soils would in other places.

DRAINAGE PATTERNS

The county's upper watersheds typically have narrow steep channels (the upper zones). Surface water flows quickly and erodes sediment where erosive soils are vulnerable. Unpaved roads, degraded culverts, roads on steep slopes, and soils without stable vegetation, eroding channel banks, and landslides contribute sediment from the upper zone to downstream areas.

Downstream of the upper zones, somewhat flatter and wider channels allow coarser, heavier sediment particles to deposit in the transfer zones. A river's form and flow characteristics depend on the ratio of sediment transport capacity to sediment supply. Significant aggradation, channel widening, bed filling, pool filling, or braiding occurs where the amount of introduced sediment overwhelms transport capacity. These changes in channel shape and direction can cause land to erode and can cause flooding. This is especially true for sections of Grays River where sediment inputs are causing channel migration and erosion, and compounding the entrainment of more sediment to a system that is already sediment laden.

Downstream of transfer zones in flatter tidally influenced areas, lighter sediment settles and forms deltas. Dikes and tide gates have protected otherwise flood prone areas against overbank

flooding in tidal areas while at the same time preventing the same areas from serving as flood storage and receiving areas for eroded sediment. Depending on the timing of flooding events from seasonally high precipitation and storms, the tides can temporarily impede the ability of channels to convey water downstream, compounding flooding risk to private property and public infrastructure.

~~Columbia River and Willamette River Watershed dams have changed the timing and magnitude of Columbia River discharge and elevations reducing high flows that historically would re-configure drainage patterns near the mouths of the lower Columbia River's tributaries. Pile dikes, other in-stream structures, and Columbia River Federal Navigation Channel dredging and dredge material disposal have further modified lower Columbia River flow and channel patterns. Together, the upstream Columbia River dams, dredging activities, and local in stream mouths of the Elochoman, Skamokawa, and Grays watersheds, which at least in the Gray's River is limiting the rivers' discharge capacity and contributing to flood risks.~~

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

~~Wahkiakum County flooding patterns are reflective of its dynamic location in the Coastal zone of Washington. The amount of precipitation during rainy season gives shape to high stream densities relative to the watersheds size. The geologic nature (as described elsewhere XX) of areas shared by the County's watersheds exposes significant sections of the area to mass failures events in the form of both shallow and deep seated landslides. Less frequent debris flows have also been identified in the County's watersheds. These events occur naturally over the history of Willapa Hills province, The County's erosive soils, precipitation patterns, and legacy timber practices make many areas vulnerable to landslides. accelerate the frequency and intensity of these mass failures. Removing trees removes the canopy that would intercept precipitation events and the lack of root structure further destabilizes the soil structure tree roots leaves soil less secure. Associated activities such as road building and yarding also disrupt subsurface drainage patterns that contribute to additional erosion, and sediment transport to the stream network.~~

~~The effects from upslope watershed processes described above have broad implications for se conditions affect flooding patterns downstream in Wahkiakum County's floodplains. The decrease of vegetation cover shift hydrology patterns to a "flashier" system as more surface water is moving into stream channel areas than it can accommodate allows more rain water to travel more quickly into streams. This results in water overtopping its river banks and often eroding adjacent properties. Channel migration is a normal response to sediment inputs exceeding sediment discharges. Studies completed in the Grays River area (Figure 2-) provide some insight into channels migration patterns in lower gradient areas such as floodplains, where human infrastructure and dwellings are more common. While excessive sediment is still moving downstream through the watersheds from legacy land management practices, this is expected to decrease as the watershed responds to improved contemporary forest practices.~~

GRAYS RIVER

Grays River is the largest watershed in the County, with steep headwater streams where elevations can vary up to 1,500 feet in one mile. The basin expands occupies parts of three counties with approximately 55% of the watershed outside/upstream of Wahkiakum County. From the confluence of the West and

South Fork near the County’s northern boundary, the Gray’s River flows southwest as its floodplain broadens and develops more meander-like channel patterns before meeting the tides. Grays River’s major tributaries are the West Fork, Fossil, Klints, King, Thadbar, Nikka, Seal, Malone, and Hull Creeks.




FIGURE 4: GRAYS RIVER ELEVATIONS ON DAYS EXCEEDING 10 . FT. THESE ARE THE AVERAGE ELEVATIONS FOR THOSE DAYS, AND THE ACTUAL CREST ELEVATIONS ON THESE DAYS WERE HIGHER.. STATION ID 25B060¹²

Flow data was collected on the Grays River in the middle part of the last century, and since 2005 stages have been recorded at the Covered Bridge. Wahkiakum County funds ~~gage~~gauge operation and the National Weather Service’s Grays River flood forecast is based on this stage record. There is not a clear pattern over the last two decades of peak flood stages on the Grays River increasing in

¹² <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/continuousflowandwg/StationDetails?sta=25B060>

height or becoming more frequent, although the last three years have had more high-water days than the prior several years did.



FIGURE 5 GRAYS RIVER COVERED BRIDGE DURING THE HISTORIC 2007 FLOOD.

A 2006 Grays River watershed studyⁱ found timber harvest impacts on bank-full flood return interval and mean duration were minor, although the effects of roads associated with timber harvest were not examined and roads are known to significantly affect peak flows. The upper watershed has erosive soils and is susceptible to mass wasting ([soil, rock or other debris moving downhill](#)) after vegetation is disturbed. Steep channels deliver sediment to the lower Grays River valley.- Prior to the 2006 study, the watershed was producing around ten times more sediment than would be typical of forested watershed in the coastal region.

Sediment production from mass wasting and surface erosion lags behind forest road construction and timber harvest around 10 to 30 years. Watershed forest harvesting peaked in the late 1970's to early 1980' suggesting that going forward if all other factors such as climate were held constant the upper watershed should produce less sediment. Improving riparian forest health with modern forest practices should also increase the amount of instream large woody debris, improving the capacity of upper watershed reaches to store sediment. However, a contemporary comprehensive assessment or forecast

of sediment production and distribution in the watershed has not been completed, and even if the watershed were to produce less sediment in the future, there will be a substantial amount of previously eroded sediment working its way downstream through the watershed and affecting channels and flows.

-

Erosion Rates and Lateral Channel Migration Rates for the Mainstem, West Fork, and South Fork Grays River (Herrera 2005)

Reach/Sub-Reach	Photographic Period	Erosion Rate (m ² /year)	Lateral Migration Rate (m/year)
SR 4 sub-reach	1939-1966	394	0.17
	1966-1960	3,858	1.71
	1970-1982	3,488	1.46
	1982-1996	3,978	1.57
	1996-2003	8,684	3.43
Gorley sub-reach	1939-1966	1,709	0.72
	1966-1960	3,364	1.38
	1970-1982	3,291	1.29
	1982-1996	6,691	2.71
	1996-2003	11,292	5.13
West Fork response reach	1970-1996	1,595	1.06
	1996-2003	553	0.64
South Fork response reach	1970-1996	3,041	1.35
	1996-2003	1,253	1.01

*

FIGURE 6 GRAYS RIVER EROSION RATES REPORTED IN 2005

DEEP RIVER AREA

Deep River watershed, in the western part of the County regularly experiences flooding behind its dikes and tidegates. In the East Fork Deep River watershed, more than 100 acres of private land flood during winter storms, often closing one or two county roads. After heavy rains, water backs up at the culverts and tidegates connecting East Fork to Deep River and spreads across fields. Not enough water can get out of the system on each low tide to keep up with inputs, and so flooding can last for days. The dike that separates the East Fork from the Deep River mainstem holds the county-owned East Deep River Road, a paved, two-lane road. The dike has a low spot that overtops during king tides, exacerbating flooding in the valley. When the mainstem floods over the dike, the water tears off riprap armoring the inside of the dike. The County owns the five culverts that run through the dike at the terminus of the East Fork. One of the five culverts failed in 2018, reducing discharge capacity by 20%.

East Fork Valley flooding usually includes flooding and closing of Wirkkala road, a paved county road that provides access to three houses and timberlands. During slightly more severe floods, water also overtops West Deep River Road further upstream, another paved county road that provides access to twelve houses and timberlands.

SKAMOKAWA CREEK AREA

The Skamokawa Creek area includes about 14,100 acres, or about 20% of the County, in eleven subwatersheds. Major flood prone tributaries include: West Valley Creek, West Fork, Left Fork Skamokawa, Wilson, Falk, and Pollard Creeks. The tidal influence on the mainstem of Skamokawa Creek extends approximately 2 miles from its mouth. Alger Creek and Risk Creek drain into Brooks Slough, a major tidal channel that flows through the Julia Butler Hansen Refuge. Jim Crow creek is considered part of the Skamokawa Creek Area in this plan, but it drains directly into the Columbia River and is not a tributary of Skamokawa Creek.

A 1992 Wahkiakum County Conservation District study and management plan assessed watershed factors contributing to flood hazards in the basin such as the condition of soils, vegetation, land use practices, road densities, and climate. The plan makes connections between vegetation changes and their effect on increasing peak flows which can consequently cause streambank erosion from increased lateral channel migration. [Table 3-20](#) [Figure 7](#) shows an estimate of projected peak flows as a result of predicted forest harvests for a given flooding event. It also indicates what peak flows would be for a forest with 'Old Growth' Conditions.

<i>Flooding Event</i>	<i>Present Discharge (cfs)</i>	<i>Future Discharge (cfs)</i>	<i>Old Growth Conditions (cfs)</i>
10 Year	1,832	1,918	1,347
50 Year	3,074	3,205	2,422
100 Year	3,562	3,681	2,844

FIGURE 7 SKAMOKAWA CREEK ESTIMATED FLOW CHANGES FROM FOREST PRACTICES

ELOCHOMAN RIVER AREA

The Elochoman River originates in and just beyond the northeastern corner of Wahkiakum County and flows in a south-southwesterly direction for a large part of its drainage before it turns west and meanders into the Columbia. The Elochoman watershed covers approximately 27% of the County, draining approximately 42,000 acres. Following a pattern similar to the other basins in the County, the upper portion flows through a narrow valley with steep slopes draining major tributaries such as Otter Creek, Nelson Creek, North, West, and East Fork. In its middle reaches, the river flows through a series of less steep valleys turning into broader floodplains draining Duck Creek from the west and Beaver

Creek from the east. The lower reaches are in a tidally influenced delta featuring a network of slough channels and midchannel islands like Hunters Island at its mouth.

Birnie Creek is also included in the Elochoman River Area in this plan, although technically it is its own watershed and has its own distinct issues because of its proximity to the urban area of Cathlamet.

Areas of Special Flood Hazard include lower portions of Nelson, Beaver, and Alger Creek, and a significant portion of the Elochoman Creek mainstem.

Washington Department of Ecology publishes river flow and height data from a gauge located at Monroe Drive at River Mile 3.26. The data goes back to December 2014. Previously a gauge on the Elochoman River collected flow data from 1941 to 1979. Over the last several years, it appears that there is a pattern of more high flow events and higher high flow events occurring more recently.




FIGURE 8 ELOCHOMAN RIVER ELEVATIONS ON DAYS EXCEEDING 9 FT. THESE ARE THE AVERAGE ELEVATIONS FOR THOSE DAYS, AND THE ACTUAL CREST ELEVATIONS ON THESE DAYS WERE HIGHER.

PUGET ISLAND & LITTLE ISLAND

Puget Island ~~is~~ and Little Island ~~are~~ in the Columbia River and experiences different drainage patterns and flooding issues than other areas. Columbia River dams and navigation channel

structures and dredging have changed the island's flooding context. Local diking, filling, installation of flood structures, and other activities associated with human development have partially disconnected the island from the Columbia River floodplain. Puget Island and Little Island are protected by over 19 miles of levees along with drainage systems and pump stations. Major levee improvements, including heightening occurred in the 1970's. Little Island has two pump stations with a total of three pumps and one tidegate. Puget Island has four pump stations with a total of eight pumps and one tidegate structure with three gates. The Puget Island Diking District owns and maintains the pump stations and tidegates. The District performs regular maintenance, replacing electrical systems, pipes, and pump motors and other components as they age.


Flood control structures at Grove Slough have been installed to control tidal elevations. Pumps have also been installed at this location to maintain adequate water levels for properties along the Grove Slough channel network.

The channels around the island are products of both tidal and riverine forces. Surface water patterns maintaining the island landform have been manipulated by dredging and the construction of pile dikes. Pile dikes slow water at a channel's edges to direct flow energy through the channel center. They are used to aid navigation, prevent bank erosion, and provide stable areas for dredged material. In some cases, pile dikes can lead to undesirable accumulation of sediment, and in some cases, they can create eddies that create undesirable erosion.

Cathlamet Channel on the island's northeast side accumulates sediment from the Elochoman watershed and from dredge spoil migration. The Columbia River Navigation Channel is located on the island's southeast side and is maintained by the Portland District Army Corps of Engineers. The Portland district ~~also maintains the~~ is also responsible for the navigation channel's pile dikes that contributed to the erosional forces on shoreline areas adjacent to Sunny Sands road and Welcome Slough Road.

Some progress was made since the last plan was created organizing with property owners and working with the US Army Corps of Engineers to mitigate erosion around Cape Horn and Sunny Sands Road by depositing dredge spoils from the Columbia River Navigation Channel maintenance dredging program, however erosion is an ongoing problem along North Welcome Slough Road and Ostervold Road and reportedly a significant amount erosion has occurred at Sunny Sands Road in recent years, threatening progress that was made there previously to deposit dredge spoils. The Army Corps. Of Engineers recently completed inspections of the Puget and Little Island levees, and are expected to publish a report identifying issues and places of concern in the coming year. Based on the findings of this report, the Puget Island Diking District intends to organize with property owners, Wahkiakum County, and the Army Corps of Engineers to respond to risks identified in the report.

This area has a unique flash flood risk in two ways. In January of 1965, a piece of cliff calved into the Wauna channel pushing a large wave into the island and damaging property and causing one fatality. Puget Island also experienced flash flooding from a dike breach in 1948.



HABITAT

PRIORITY HABITATS AND SPECIES

The dynamisms of emerging Coastal weather patterns and watershed processes influence the shape and distribution of fish and wildlife habitats in the County. As described above forest practices in the watershed upper areas have indirect impacts to channel patterns, but also direct impacts to specific species. Development in the floodplain required conventional flood control practices in the form of dikes, revetments, and tide gates. The state maintains lists of priority habitat species for each County. State listed priority habitats related to floodplains include instream aquatic habitat, estuarine and freshwater wetlands, and riparian habitats.

Riparian/Wetland Habitat

Riparian areas and wetlands are the interface between terrestrial and aquatic habitats. Riparian areas are the zone of vegetation next to the stream corridor. Wetlands are defined by the unique oxygen-reduced or "hydric" soils created by extended saturation and/or inundation. These conditions promote unique plant communities valuable to the survival and reproduction of a variety of species. Wahkiakum County's floodplain riparian habitats tend to be in poor and sometimes fair condition.. Some of the important functions that these habitats are supposed to provide include:

- Continuous patches of mature plant cover from these areas perform numerous functions that benefit the health of the watershed:
- Provides migration corridors, dispersal routes and habitat connectors for wildlife;
- Promotes shade and cover from direct radiation maintaining cool aquatic temperatures for salmonids, birds, and other animals;
- Serves to hold and trap sediment delivery from upland and riverine sources;
- Contributes organic matter to support food web dynamics;
- Slows the energy associated with velocity of stream discharge, thereby preventing erosive processes downstream;
- The root structure of some riparian/wetland plant species binds soil particles together, thereby enhancing the structural integrity of the soil and protecting it against erosive forces.

Tidal Estuarine Habitat

Tidal wetland habitat performs important functions for migrating juvenile salmonids in the Columbia River Estuary. They serve as low velocity refuge areas during the transition from freshwater to the estuary and ocean. An analysis conducted by CREST in the 1980s found that tidal marsh and swamp habitats were significantly diminished over the prior century due to diking, filling, and tide gate installation. The CREST study found there had been an 88% decrease in tidal swamp habitat while showing an increase in tidal marshes and flats due to siltation of the Bay. For the upper portion of the Estuary, which includes Puget Island, Skamokawa Creek, Brooks Slough, and parts of the Julia Butler Hansen Wildlife Refuge substantial losses of both tidal marsh and swamp habitat types were found.

Grays Bay

Habitat Type	1870 Acreage	Present Acreage	Pct. Change
Deep Water	2,270	1,690	-25.6%
Medium Depth	2,230	2,040	-8.5%
Shallows/Flats	3,790	4,330	14.2%
Tidal Marshes	310	760	145.2%
Tidal Swamps	4,410	510	-88.4%

Upper Estuary

Habitat Type	1870 Acreage	Present Acreage	Pct. Change
Deep Water	6,520	5,060	-22.4%
Medium Depth	2,710	2,790	3.0%
Shallows/Flats	1,770	2,710	53.1%
Tidal Marshes	1,430	510	-64.3%
Tidal Swamps	11,180	2,250	-79.9%

FIGURE 98-ESTUARINE HABITAT CHANGES FROM 1870 TO 1980. REPRODUCED FROM THE CREST STUDY, WHERE 1980 WAS THE PRESENT.

Fish that rely on the County’s streams and wetlands and that are on the states priority species lists include:

Rainbow Trout
Resident Coastal Cutthroat
Summer Steelhead
Fall Chum
Winter Steelhead
Coho
Fall Chinook
Steelhead
Cutthroat
Coho
Chinook

Salmonid presence has been well documented in the Limiting Factors Analysis and Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board reports. The unique combination of upland spawning and tidal estuarine wetland habitat combines to play a vital role at various life cycle stages in the survival and productivity of these fish. Salmon life history patterns in the Lower Columbia River are highly varied and complex among anadromous fish species. ~~The introduction of artificially produced fish has modified salmon behavior in the Lower Columbia River.~~ Currently there are thirteen (13) stocks listed on the Federal Endangered Species List either as threatened or endangered. They all use the tidal, brackish areas of the Columbia River Estuary for at least a portion of their life cycle. During the spawning stage salmon use habitat in middle to upper portions of local watersheds.

Listed below are other species of concern that have been observed in Wahkiakum County and that have some relation to floodplain locations.

Priority Habitat Species List

Species	Location
Columbia White Tailed Deer	Puget Island, Elochoman lowlands
Dunn's Salamander	Abe Creek
Van Dyke Salamander	Elochoman
Sandhill Crane	Lower Skamokawa, Dead Slough
Northern Spotted Owl	Upper Skamokawa
Roosevelt Elk	Mid-Upper Skamokawa
Pacific Lamprey	West Fork, Grays River

HABITAT ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES RELATED TO FLOODING AND FLOOD CONTROL INFRASTRUCTURE

The primary set of issues at the intersection of flood risk management and habitat management in Wahkiakum County concerns state and federally listed fish species and their use of streams and connected wetlands. Within that broad topic, flooding, erosion, and our response to those hazards have created several different issues for salmon in different habitat contexts.

There are many factors outside of the County's and County stakeholders' control that diminish salmon populations and that make the salmon species using Wahkiakum County streams more vulnerable to any local conditions that are less than perfect. These issues are wide ranging and include everything from federal policies protecting salmon predators to changing ocean conditions, and it is not the County's responsibility to make up for those issues.

In some cases flood control projects can play a role in correcting one or more local habitat issues without sacrificing flood risk reduction benefits. In other cases, using external funding sources geared towards habitat improvement may be the most effective path to also achieving a flood risk reduction project, as may sometimes be the case when using external funds intended for fish passage improvements to improve fish passage and reduce flood risk by replacing an undersized or failing culvert. With any flood risk reduction project occurring in or adjacent to a stream, there are opportunities to design the project in ways that are more or less impactful or beneficial to habitat, so habitat should be considered along with other community values when considering these projects.

The State of Washington's Habitat Limiting Factors Analyses identified the following habitat limiting factors for salmon.

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt

Access and Passage

- There are culverts that prevent fish passage. While many culverts have been upgraded or replaced with bridges for fish passage, there are remaining culverts that prevent fish from accessing habitat.
- Low flows in Deep River, Seal River, the lower West Fork Grays River, and the Grays River between the Covered Bridge and the Canyon, may be partially caused or exacerbated by accumulation of sediment.

Floodplain and Side Channel Connectivity

- Most streams in their lower reaches are separated from their floodplains and side channel habitat has been restricted by flood control structures, bank hardening, channelization, and splash damming. Reconnecting historic floodplains and restoring riparian areas can in some cases include both habitat and flood risk reduction benefits.

Bank Erosion / Stability

- Increased peak flows, unstable soils and geology combined with forest practices, has led to substantial sediment loads and unstable, aggrading stream channels. Peak flows cause bank erosion in areas with alluvial deposits and limited woody vegetation. Both of these conditions lead to unstable stream substrates, which is a limiting factor for chum and chinook salmon.

Riparian Conditions and Large Woody Debris

- Degraded riparian habitats limit the recruitment of large woody debris into the stream, limit food production, and have diminished water quality functions, particularly in managing stream temperatures. Upper watershed forest practices and lower watershed land use patterns have left area streams with a limited supply of large woody debris.

Pool Habitat

- Pool habitat is limited due to a variety of practices that have simplified stream channels.

Water Quality and Water Quantity

- Water temperatures are elevated above recommended levels during parts of the year. Stream sections in each of the major watersheds, especially the Skamokawa, are on the state's 303(d) list for temperature.
- Low flows and elevated peak flows are limiting factors in many streams. Both issues are partly attributable to historic forest practices in the upper watersheds and historic flood control practices in the lower watersheds.

The public engagement process for this plan yielded local knowledge that adds to and some cases provides an alternative perspective to the State of Washington's habitat limiting factors analysis, including:

- Some but not all culverts prevent fish migration.
- There is excessive large woody debris in the Grays River (13-25 large logs every 2-5 minutes) floating downriver after the initial freshets of the year.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Headings (Calibri Light)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Headings (Calibri Light)


Formatted: Font: (Default) +Headings (Calibri Light),
Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Headings (Calibri Light)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Headings (Calibri Light),
Font color: Auto

- Bank Stability has been variable for over 140 years and was not a limiting factor for any of the very successful salmonids in the past when Grays River was a premier fishing river.
- Pool habitat in some cases is ineffective and can kill juvenile fish due to temperature fluctuations and mismanagement leading to poor water quality.

- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Headings (Calibri Light)
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Headings (Calibri Light)
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Headings (Calibri Light), Font color: Auto
- Formatted: Font: (Default) +Headings (Calibri Light)
- Formatted: List Paragraph, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"



Washington State Fish Passage



- Not a barrier
- ▲ Partial Fish Passage Blockage
- ▲ Total Fish Passage Blockage
- ▲ Barrier, Unknown Percent Passable
- Diversion
- ▲ Natural Barrier - Verified
- Unknown
- Corrected Barriers

FIGURE 109 STATE OF WASHINGTON FISH PASSAGE INVENTORY¹³

¹³ [Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2023. Fish Passage Inventory, Assessment and Prioritization.](#)



FIGURE 1149 WATER QUALITY IMPAIRED STREAM REACHES IN RED. MOST OF THE STREAMS IDENTIFIED ON THIS MAP ARE CONSIDERED TO HAVE EXCESSIVELY HIGH TEMPERATURES FOR SALMON. MORE INFORMATION ON WATER QUALITY IMPAIRED STREAMS IS AVAILABLE BY VISITING THE WASHINGTON WATER QUALITY ATLAS, ZOOMING TO WAHIAKUM COUNTY ON THE MAP, AND CLICKING ON PARTICULAR STREAMS TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THEIR WATER QUALITY IMPAIRMENT.

Formatted: Caption

Draft Wahkiakum County
Comprehensive Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan
~~February~~ April 2024

FLOODING ISSUES

Areas prone to flooding are found surrounding each of the County's major streams. The Wahkiakum County Flood Insurance Study ¹⁴describes the Columbia River, Skamokawa River, Elochoman River, Grays River, and Wilson Creeks as the primary sources of flooding. Around 8% of the population resides in floodplains. Additionally, the value of agricultural land can be degraded by flooding, and flood control structures themselves can be impacted by flooding. (Wahkiakum County, 2019). Seasonal flood related closures of and damage to transportation infrastructure occurs nearly every year. Additionally, public comments to inform this plan suggest that flooding impacts residential structures every year, even if the damages are not substantial enough to be documented as national flood insurance program claims. Finally agricultural uses are regularly impacted by flooding, for example when fields are too saturated to be used for livestock pasture.

Flooding in Wahkiakum County results from primarily from intense rainfall that causes rivers to overflow their channels, and from exceptional tidal events that cause the Columbia River to back up into local riverine floodplains. Both forms of flooding occur primarily between October and April, and they are interrelated in that exceptional tidal events impede the downstream flow of riverine flood waters.

While there is no historical record of flash flooding in Wahkiakum County, there is a risk of it occurring. Reports (Nelson, 2022) of prior winter storm events include instances of debris and slides blocking culverts. A sudden release of impounded water from a blocked culvert, or the sudden rerouting of river flow from a blocked culvert could cause a flash flood. Some of Wahkiakum County's population and structures are protected from flooding by dikes and levees. A sudden unplanned dike or levee breach could cause a flash flood as well.

Streambank erosion and channel migration are other flood related hazards occurring every year in Wahkiakum County. Active channel migration areas include Hull Creek (Grays River basin), West Fork Grays River and upper Fossil Creek (Grays River basin, Skamokawa Creek upstream of the West Fork of Skamokawa Creek, Skamokawa Creek between Standard Creek and Falk Creek, Wilson Creek, and the Elochoman River throughout the watershed as far downstream as below Beaver Creek.

PRIOR FLOODING

The previous CFHMP documents a historical record of flood events from 1849 to 2003 based on information from stream gauges, previous assessments, and anecdotal local information. Wahkiakum County Eagle has documented many of the County's relatively large flood events, helping to illustrate some of the local flood issues. The prior CFHMP's record, and a collection of Wahkiakum Eagle references are provided in figures below.

¹⁴ [FEMA. \(1990\). Flood Insurance Study, Wahkiakum County WA Incorporated Areas.](#)

Date	Flow Recorded/ Event
1849	1,201,560 cubic feet/second on Columbia River Mainstem
1859	869,364 cubic feet/second " "
1862	950,646 cubic feet/second " "
1864	749,208 cubic feet/second " "
1866	749,208 cubic feet/second " "
1871	862,296 cubic feet/second " "
1876	961,248 cubic feet/second " "
1880	961,998 cubic feet/second " "
1894	876,432 cubic feet/second " "
1933	Flood Stage of 17.2 feet reported on the Elochoman
1948	999,273 cubic feet/second on Columbia River Mainstem; Major Portions of Puget Island covered
1949	12.66 feet flood elevation recorded on Elochoman
1950	12.51 feet flood elevation reported on Elochoman
1956	12.49 feet flood elevation recorded on Elochoman; 10.23 recorded on Grays River
1962	12.86 feet elevation on Elochoman; 11.1 feet elevation recorded on Grays; Localized flooding reported throughout the County
1966	10.94 feet flood elevation recorded on Grays River
1972	11.29 feet flood elevation recorded on Grays River; 11.93 recorded on Elochoman
1975	10.86 feet flood elevation recorded on Grays River; 11.74 reported on Elochoman
1977	10.32 feet flood elevation on Grays River; 13.6 Feet on Elochoman; Localized Flooding in Towns of Grays River and its Floodplain
1979	USGS gages cease recording
1990	Significant flooding along Nelson Creek; Middle Valley; Seal River; Skamokawa; Closest recorded elevation @ Naselle exceeded 16 feet three (3) times during the year
1994	17.62 and 16.16 feet flood elevation @ Naselle
1997	19.26 feet flood elevation recorded @ Naselle; extensive flooding throughout the County and Pacific Northwest
1998	Dike fails near Gorley Springs requiring emergency evacuation and causing extensive damage to private property
2003	Erosion accelerates on Puget Island

FIGURE 124 HISTORIC FLOODING RECORDS IN COLUMBIA RIVER AND WAHAKIUM COUNTY WATERSHEDS

Reference Date	Reference Title
April 14, 2022	"Disaster assistance deadlines nearing"
January 13, 2022	"Downriver Dispatches" by Karen Bertroch
January 20 th , 2022	"Valley residents share concerns of erosion threats"
January 7, 2021	"Downriver Dispatches" by Darrell Alexander
January 30, 2020	"County still divided by slide; ferry running" by Kay Chamberlain
January 3, 2008	"2007, A Year in Review"
November 22, 2012	"Storm wallops region" by Rick Nelson.

FIGURE 132 WAHIAKUM COUNTY EAGLE ARTICLES REFERENCING FLOODING EVENTS SINCE THE LAST COMPREHENSIVE FLOOD HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

The NOAA Storm Events Database recorded 53 flood events between 1996 and January 11, 2022¹⁵. (NOAA, 2022). In those events, there were no reported injuries or deaths. A total of \$6,579,000 of property damage was reported across all events, however a substantial portion of this damage may have occurred in other counties affected by coastal floods that were recorded in the database as a common event with Wahkiakum County's coastal flooding. Reported damages occurred in 10 of the reported flood events.

There have been 98 paid NFIP claims valued at \$1,814,733.38. There have been nine substantial damage claims. (FEMA, 2021). There are two repetitive loss properties and two severe repetitive loss properties, in the Grays River and Skamokawa watersheds. (Wahkiakum County, 2019)

PROBABILITY OF FUTURE FLOODING

Approximately 9% of Wahkiakum County's area is included in Wahkiakum County's 1% annual chance floodplains. These were primarily mapped nearly 40 years ago. Any given place included in that area may have at least a 1% chance of being flooded in any given year. Flooding that at least disrupts transportation routes, erodes stream banks and agricultural land occurs every year. Flooding that damages private property structures may be less frequent or there is a less complete record of it occurring, and flooding that causes loss of life is not included in the recent historical record.

Studies have not mapped the area, estimated the depth, or described other characteristics of flooding that can be estimated to have a greater than 1% chance of occurring in a given year. For example, there

¹⁵ Twelve of sixty-five events are recorded twice as both coastal flooding and riverine flooding

are no maps or studies describing the extent of flooding that can be expected to occur annually or every ten years.

Neither has future flooding under expected future conditions been specifically studied. For example, there is not a study describing the County's floodplains under any given climate change and upper watershed timber harvest scenario for future decades.

Prior sections of this plan described climate and land use trends suggesting that in the future, flooding will be more frequent, more intense, and occur earlier in the year than it typically does now. Two factors that could moderate flooding in the future include the potential for there to be less snowpack, and the potential for rivers' sediment loads and channel migrations to stabilize as forest management practices improve with regards to erosion control, or as more time passes since the era of the County's most intensive timber harvests—.

VULNERABILITY

Critical Facilities and Other Infrastructure

The locations of several critical facilities were reviewed for their location relative to the 1% annual chance floodplain. Other types of critical facilities and infrastructure such as natural gas, communications lines, and dikes and levees were not evaluated for flood risk vulnerability.

Puget Island Fire Department, Skamokawa Fire Department, and Grays River Fire Department do not appear to be located in the 1% annual chance floodplain. The Grays River Fire Department was previously damaged by flooding in the December 3, 2007 storm, and relocated to a safer location. District 4 Fire Department at 703 Elochoman Valley Rd, Cathlamet, appears at least very close to the 1% annual chance floodplain.

The Town of Cathlamet's drinking water system supply intake is located in the Elochoman River, however there were no reports of water quality issues or intake structure damage associated with flooding or erosion. Town of Cathlamet's Wastewater Treatment facilities were partially located within the 1% annual chance floodplain adjacent to the Columbia River, however they have been moved to a safer location. The Cathlamet Ferry Terminal is located on the Cathlamet Channel shoreline of the Columbia River in and adjacent to the 1% annual chance floodplain, however issues related to flooding were not identified.

Transportation Facilities

Winter storms cause flooding and landslides that damage and obstruct transportation routes annually. Culverts vulnerable to collapsing also tend to fail during these high flow events. Newspaper and other reports from the last two decades following flood events focus largely on flood and landslide impacts to transportation routes and flooding impacts on transportation routes was a primary concern identified through public input. Participants identified impacts to workers and business owners accessing jobs and

their business operation, impacts to patients needing emergency medical services, hazards to drivers, and general disruptions to daily life as issues related to flooded roads.

Inventories on existing infrastructure have been completed since the CFHMP plan was developed. These are available through the local conservation district, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Department of Transportation. These inventories describe the condition of the culvert and supporting infrastructure. Depending on the condition of these structures, this information can provide insight into flooding processes and opportunities for future project development with local sponsors.

Given the public’s interest in flooding impacts to transportation infrastructure, an informal inventory of transportation flooding issues was conducted for this plan. The goal was to identify sections of roads that flood on an approximately annual basis, as remembered by County Planning and Public Works Staff. Following is a summary of the results:

Area	Location	Issue
Deep River	Intersection of SR 4 and West Deep River Road	Submerged road
	Multiple sections of East and West Deep River Roads in downtown Deep River and downstream	Submerged road
	Wainamo Road	Submerged road
	Wirkala Road at West Deep River Road. 700 feet.	Submerged Road
Eden Valley	Eden Valley Road near mile post 3 and the confluence of Crooked River and South Crooked River	Submerged road
	Multiple sections of Eden Valley Road and Upper Landing Road near their intersection	Submerged road
	Eden Valley Road near mile marker 2	Submerged road
Elochoman	Foster Road from Elochoman Valley Road to Risk Road. 3500 feet.	Submerged Road
	Risk Road near SR 4. 200 feet.	Submerged Road
	Beaver Creek Road Bridge over Elochoman River	Submerged road
	Schraum Road intersection with Beaver Creek Road	Debris clogs culvert, Submerged Road, Culvert Washout
	Private driveway upstream of Schraum Road washed out	Debris clogs culvert, Submerged Road, Culvert Washout
Grays	Altoona Pillar Rock Road from SR to south of Barr Road. 3000 feet.	Submerged Road
	Barr Road near Altoona Pillar Rock Road. 1200 feet.	Submerged road
	Altoona Pillar Rock Road just south of Larson Road. 300 feet.	Submerged road
	East Malone Road approximately 300 feet north of SR 4. 400 feet.	Submerged Road
	SR 4 between Seal River Road and Waistaka Road. 400 feet.	Submerged Road

Formatted Table

	SR 4 at Seal River. 800 feet.	Submerged Road
Skomokowa	Vista Park Road and SR-4	Submerged Road

FIGURE 143: INITIAL INVENTORY OF REGULARLY OCCURRING FLOOD IMPACTS TO TRANSPORTATION ROUTES

Population

Approximately 8% of the county population resides in a floodplain.ⁱⁱ Wahkiakum County has a relatively small and dispersed population, so despite having a large proportion of its area in floodplains (9%) and moderate proportion of its population in the floodplain, the number of people residing in floodplains is less than in more populated counties. Similarly, although Wahkiakum County’s population is growing, its growth in real numbers is small compared to more populated counties. There are no reported deaths resulting from flooding in the last two decades.

PAST AND PRESENT FLOOD HAZARD MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND FACILITIES, PROGRAMS AND REGULATIONS

Flood Control Structures

Dikes, levees, and other structures to control river flow have been implemented historically in Wahkiakum County since European settlement. In the 1940’s and 1950’s, the US Army Corps of Engineers began implementing some diking projects, and diking districts were formed as well. (Wahkiakum County, 1995). The prior Flood Mitigation Plan noted that many dikes were deteriorating, and that many tide gates were inoperable. *Figure [insert] represents the most recent effort to map the County’s flood control structures. (Wahkiakum County, 2015).* There is currently not a complete inventory of flood control structures, including all dikes, levees, and tide gates.

Specifically on the Grays River in 1940s and 50s, the Army Corps, in partnership with the County Conservation District investigated and implemented a variety of opportunities for stream bank protection that included the placement of riprap, stone revetments, gravel dikes, gravel removal, etc. ~~The Grays River Habitat District currently maintains these structures formerly the Upper Grays River Diking District.~~ In addition, tide gates were installed in the lower areas of the Grays River area. More than 20 of these structures were constructed in both the Grays and Deep River area. In the Grays River Flood Control District, flood control infrastructure is privately owned and privately maintained. Emergency repairs may qualify for a 50% cost share from the district. In 2023 the District began systematically monitoring tidegates and dikes, identifying and helping to organize needed repairs. Recent monitoring has resulted in their correcting several issues in area infrastructure, and in the future continued monitoring should enable district members to proactively plan for maintenance and repairs.

On Skamokawa Creek, in addition to diking, a canal was constructed to divert flow away from the historic channel. The tide gates which were installed effectively created a manmade artificial cut off meander. Additional types of flood control actions also included the installation of pump stations to control channel elevations on Nelson Creek and Puget Island. Pump stations were also installed in 1977 on Brooks Slough on the National Wildlife Refuge managed by US Fish and Wildlife Service.

Puget Island and Little Island+ are protected by over 19 miles of levees along with drainage systems and pump stations. Major levee improvements, including heightening occurred in the 1970's. The Puget Island Diking District (Diking District #1) continues to actively maintain and improve these assets.

Emergency Infrastructure Repairs

The County is accustomed to responding to flood damage to roadways and culverts within their regular budget and staff resources. Each year the County's public works department clears debris from roads and culverts and occasionally must restore roadway shoulders and complete emergency culvert replacements.

Dredge Material Management

The County, landowners and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have deposited dredge spoils at Puget Island locations that were experiencing erosion. Beneficial use dredge material disposal projects at Cape Horn and Sunny Sand Road have had some success in reducing erosion, however recent lessons suggest that beneficial use disposal areas subject to erosion need to be replenished with more dredge spoils, otherwise these areas will continue eroding.

Special Purpose Districts

~~Grays River Habitat Enhancement District (Formerly called Upper Grays-Grays River Flood Control District), Consolidated Diking District No. 1 of Wahkiakum County, Wahkiakum County Dike District No. 5, and Wahkiakum County Dike Improvement District No. 4 maintain dikes in Wahkiakum County, and in some cases participate in multi-benefit erosion control and flood risk reduction projects that have habitat and ecological benefits—~~ (Wahkiakum County, 2012) (MSRC, 2022). The County has also established four Flood Control Zone districts. The Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Soil and Water Conservation

District is also active in planning and implementing multi-benefit projects that provide flood and erosion risk reduction.

National Flood Insurance Program, Flood Hazard Ordinances, and Flood Insurance Rate Maps

Wahkiakum County and Town of Cathlamet's flood insurance studies were completed in 1990 and 1986 respectively (FEMA, 1986). Wahkiakum County and the Town of Cathlamet have adopted Flood Hazard Ordinances intended to be consistent with the standards of the National Flood Insurance Program¹⁶ and the Washington Floodplain Management Standards¹⁷. There are approximately 133 NFIP policies in Wahkiakum County (FEMA, 2021).

Public information

Wahkiakum County maintains flood hazard information and its flood hazard ordinance on its webpage. The County also published flood hazard warnings on its Facebook page, which has over 1,800 followers, a number equivalent to over one third of the county population.

Shoreline Master Program and Critical Areas Ordinances

Wahkiakum County's Shoreline Master Program (SMP) and Critical Areas Ordinance references and reinforces the County's flood hazard ordinance. They also support flood risk reduction by protecting the ecological and hydrologic functions of wetlands and shorelines, and limiting the amount of development that is allowed in and adjacent to wetlands and shorelines. The County is currently in the process of updating its SMP.

Tidal Wetland Habitat Conservation and Restoration Projects

Many projects have occurred in recent decades to conserve and restore tidal wetland habitat and have typically been aimed at improving salmon habitat. These projects also typically employ voluntary conservation easements with willing private landowners, helping them achieve their goals. Because these projects are in places where water elevations are primarily determined by Columbia River flows and tides, they typically do not provide a significant flood storage or discharge benefit. However, any project that uses a conservation easement to permanently protect a flood hazard area from being occupied by dwellings, roads, and other structures can be said to have some flood hazard mitigation benefit. [Flood hazard risks and benefits associated with any tidal wetland habitat conservation project need to be evaluated based on the particular conditions and designs of each project.](#) Following is a partial list of restoration projects that had some flood risk reduction benefit.

Grays/Deep River Areas

1. CREST, Gorley Springs
2. LFEG, Fossil Creek
3. CLT, Crazy Johnson

¹⁶ 44 CFR 60.3

¹⁷ RCW Chapter 86.16

Draft Wahkiakum County
Comprehensive Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan
~~February-April 2024~~

4. Deep river tide gate retrofit project
5. Deep river Oneida Landing
6. Cowlitz Indian Tribe, Grays Headwater Project (early phases)

Elochoman River Area

1. CLT-Lower Elochoman
2. Tidal area near SR 4- Nelson Creek project
3. Wahkiakum-Cowlitz Conservation District Project
4. Streambank erosion/LW placement
5. Culvert Improvements (~~i.e.~~, Duck Creek)

Skamokawa Creek Area

1. Dead Slough, Tide gate retrofit
2. Streambank protection, Wilson Creek
3. Riparian projects, numerous

Upper Watershed Conservation and Restoration Projects

The planning process did not create any inventory of upper watershed conservation and restoration projects that have a flood risk reduction benefit; however, an inventory and analysis of upper watershed actions could inform future flood risk reduction efforts.

State and Federal Programs

Washington State's Guidebook on Comprehensive Planning for Flood Hazard Management¹⁸ provides an overview of state and federal regulations relating to flood hazard management.

¹⁸ [Comprehensive Planning for Flood Hazard Management: A Guidebook \(wa.gov\)](#)

ESTABLISHED STATE AND FEDERAL FLOOD HAZARD MITIGATION GUIDANCE

The State of Washington and Federal Government provide guidance on flood hazard mitigation that complements their regulations and investment programs. While there is a large body of guidance from each of these sources and other sources, some of the highest-level resources relating to this plan's recommendations from these most established sources is provided below.

Washington State Guidebook

Washington Department of Ecology published an updated guidebook on comprehensive planning for flood hazard management in 2021. Since the prior version was published, and since Wahkiakum County's last Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan was completed, several new conditions have developed. These include:

- Endangered Species Act (ESA) listing of Salmon species.
- Increased understanding of tribal rights, including treaty rights.
- Increased understanding of the projected impacts of climate change on flood hazards
- Increased focus on environmental justice, diversity, equity, and inclusion, inscribed into state law with the passage of the Healthy Environment for All (HEAL) Act as Senate Bill 5141 in 2021.
- The failure of traditional structural flood control approaches, which have degraded habitat and disrupted natural processes while failing to curb ever-increasing flood damages.
- The broader application of the Integrated Floodplain Management approach.

The Washington State guidebook promotes comprehensive flood hazard management based on the following 12 principles:

1. Focus on Non-Structural Alternatives and Ecological Restoration
2. Respect for Rivers' Natural Processes
3. Focus on the Cause of Flood Damage
4. Integrated Floodplain Management
5. Consideration of the Entire Watershed, Not Just Local Conditions
6. Public Participation and Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
7. Coordination among Public Works, Planning, and Building Departments and Other Department Activities

8. Interagency and Stakeholder Coordination
9. Planning Process-oriented Examination of Issues
10. Consideration of Future Conditions
11. Consideration of Tribal Rights
12. Consideration of Environmental Justice

Washington Model Floodplain Ordinance

The Washington Model Floodplain Ordinance includes the minimum state and federal required regulations that must be contained in the local floodplain ordinance. It also includes recommended regulations to improve flood hazard mitigation beyond the minimum requirements. The model ordinance identifies which parts are required, and which parts are recommended. Implementing the minimum and/or recommended provisions of the Washington Model Floodplain Ordinance does not on its own result in integrated floodplain management or comprehensive floodplain management.

44 CFR Part 60C

44 CFR Part 60 contains the federal regulations that local governments must follow when creating and implementing their floodplain development ordinances [if they wish to make federally subsidized flood insurance available in their area](#). A subsection of this part, 44 CFR Part 60Cⁱⁱⁱ provides non-mandatory best practices for local communities to consider implementing, including but not limited to:

- Requiring that structures be elevated or floodproofed to elevations higher than the base flood elevation, to account for floating debris, land subsidence, and higher than expected floods.
- Acquisition of frequently flood-damaged structures;
- Preservation of the flood-prone and erosion prone areas for open space purposes;
- Disclosure of flood and erosion risk to prospective buyers and renters.
- Requiring new floodway delineations for subdivisions in flood prone areas.
- Requiring pilings instead of fill for structures that are to be elevated above the base flood elevation.


[The requirements and guidelines of 44 CFR Part 60 are intended to reduce flood risk to life and property. When property owners follow a local floodplain development ordinance based on these federal regulations, they reduce risk to themselves, their neighbors, and their community. When local ordinances are based on the best practices in addition to the minimum requirements, risk is reduced further.](#)

Channel Migration Zones

Channel Migration Zones (CMZ's) are areas along a river within which the channel(s) can be reasonably predicted to migrate over time as a result of natural and normally occurring hydrological and related processes when considered with the characteristics of the river and its surroundings. Washington Department of Ecology has published guidance on how to complete studies of and manage hazards in CMZ's^{iv}, including the following overview guidance for managing hazards in CMZ's: "The safest flood protection, and usually the least expensive option, is to limit development to areas not susceptible to either flood inundation or channel migration, thus eliminating exposure to channel migration hazards.

Draft Wahkiakum County
Comprehensive Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan
~~February-April~~ 2024

For existing communities, it is important to know whether they have areas within a CMZ so they can plan accordingly. Where defenses are needed, the most effective measures will accommodate some channel migration (e.g., levee setbacks) and dissipate the river’s erosive energy (e.g., rough versus smooth revetments).”



ALTERNATIVE FLOOD HAZARD MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS

Below is a preliminary list of alternative flood hazard management solution types that may be used to respond to flooding issues.

Dikes

Dikes are structures that limit stream flows to the stream channel. They protect areas adjacent to the dike from flooding when flood levels are lower than the top of the dike. When maintained, dikes can provide effective flood risk reduction for the flood events that they were designed to protect against. Dikes have played a critical Wahkiakum County's culture and agricultural economy. Dikes may limit the channel's capacity to convey a stream's flood flows, and disconnect wetlands and floodplain areas from the stream, which would otherwise provide additional flood storage capacity, fish habitat, and other ecological functions. In this regard, despite their effectiveness, dikes can increase flood risks in areas they don't protect, create the illusion that they protect adjacent areas from all flooding, and impair ecological functions. The prior CFHMP did not consider new dikes to be an appropriate solution in Wahkiakum County, however maintaining existing dikes is appropriate and essential to managing flood risk, ~~unless or until the community decides to replace the dike's flood risk management functions with other solutions.~~

Setback Levees

Compared with dikes levees are located further from the stream channel, leaving areas closer to the stream channel vulnerable to flooding, and connected to the stream to provide ecological functions and to store and convey flood flows. Setback levees may be designed to leave aquatic/ wetland/ riparian habitats intact, provide for recreational use of the floodplain, and accommodate channel migration. In some cases, it may be appropriate to replace dikes with setback levees to achieve community goals for floodplain areas closest to the stream, while maintaining protection for areas further away. The prior CFHMP considered levee setback projects potentially appropriate in the Lower Grays River. As with any flood control infrastructure, setback levees projects must only be implemented following engineering analysis to ensure that the project will function as intended and not increase flood risk in adjacent areas.

Riprap

Riprap is rocks placed over an area of shoreline to protect it against erosion from stream flows or waves, and it can be an effective tool for this purpose. Riprap can also increase erosion on nearby shorelines by redirecting the flow energies back into the channel and to adjacent shorelines. Riprap eliminates most ecological functions in the actual area that it covers and impacts ecological functions in adjacent areas as well. Riprap is appropriate in some situations such as emergencies in which there is an imminent erosion threat to something that is very important. However, in many situations alternative solutions are as effective at controlling erosion while having fewer negative impacts. Riprap is not recommended in any particular location.

Gabions

Gabions are wire mesh baskets filled with concrete or rocks that are used as a structural toe or sidewall on streambanks. Like riprap, these structures are effective in an emergency and for localized flooding. Combined with vegetation plantings, gabions can reduce downstream erosion. The prior CFHMP considered gabions potentially appropriate in the Lower Grays River (RM 14-Mouth).

Deflector Structures

Deflector structures are typically placed partially across a channel to deflect stream flow away from an eroding stream bank. Rock groins on the Grays River are an example of deflector structures. Similar to other hard shoreline protection methods, deflector structures direct the water's energy in a direction it would otherwise not be directed, potentially increasing the potential for erosion or other damage in nearby areas. ~~Figure 5.5 shows a combination of deflector material and woody material that combines the benefits of flood control while providing additional benefits such as trapping sediment and important functions for aquatic habitat.~~ The prior CFHMP considered deflector structures potentially appropriate around Puget Island, Lower Grays River (RM 14-Mouth), Middle Valley Skamokawa, and the Lower Elochoman River.

Channel Capacity Enhancement

Channel capacity enhancements are made to convey larger flood flows. Channel capacity enhancement design requires analysis of channel configuration, surface discharge patterns, sediment trends, and impacted habitats, often relying on new data collection to inform the analyses. Channel capacity enhancement should be responsive to upstream sources of sediment and undertaken in concert with upstream measures to lessen sediment deposition. The prior CFHMP considered this practice potentially appropriate in Lower Grays River (RM 14-Mouth), Middle Valley Skamokawa, Lower Elochoman River.

Flood Control Structure Maintenance

Diking districts are not sufficiently funded to maintain the area's flood control infrastructure, and attracting and retaining volunteer board members is a challenge to sustaining maintenance efforts. (Zimmerman, 2022) (Bertrich, 2022). Diking Districts may consider attempting to levy additional tax revenue to carry out their missions. Alternately diking district organizers and the County may consider forming Flood Zone Control Districts authorized under RCW 86.15.020. Flood Zone Control Districts have a variety of authorities at their disposal to fund flood control projects.

Flood Control Structure Inventories

~~It does not appear that there is a systematic inventory of dikes and tide gates, their condition, and maintenance or replacement needs for the whole County or for any of its watersheds. Formally inventorying Systematically inventorying, monitoring, and prioritizing maintenance, repair, and replacement needs of dikes, tidegates and other flood control infrastructure is an important can provide a foundation for allocating scarce local resources and communicating needs to external funders for flood control structure maintenance and improvements. Inventories and monitoring or information on these activities is available to varying degrees in different areas of the County.~~

Formatted: Font: Bold

Beneficial Use of Dredge Material

The beneficial use of dredge material includes using dredge material to manage erosion and flood risks, by depositing it on shore where erosion is occurring, or strategically placing it in aquatic areas where the river's flow patterns will distribute the dredged material to beneficial locations. ~~XXXXX reference requires the Army Corps of Engineers to use xxx percent of dredge material for beneficial purposes.~~

Beneficial use of dredge material is sometimes undertaken in concert with other new flood or erosion control measures such as revegetation, and dynamic revetments.

Section 125 Water Resources Development Act ([WRDA](#)) 2020 establishes national policy to increase the beneficial use of dredge material, increase the number of beneficial use demonstration projects, and support Corps' districts such as the Portland District to create beneficial use planning documents that will be added to the 20 -year Columbia River Navigation Channel Maintenance Dredging Plan. While WRDA does not authorize new funding to support the beneficial use of dredge material, it represents a positive change in policy that guides how the Corps plans for dredge material disposal. Beneficial use of dredge material is recommended to continue around Puget Island in all locations where more detailed analysis demonstrates that it is appropriate.

Riparian Plantings

Riparian areas provide a variety of ecological functions. The roots of vegetation in riparian areas bind soil particles together making vegetated riparian areas more resilient to erosion and less likely to contribute to stream aggradation. Maturely vegetated riparian areas can absorb and redirect stream flow energy that would otherwise cause more erosion. Riparian planting ~~is appropriate~~ is appropriate in a variety of contexts. While existing and regularly updated regulations should result in healthier riparian areas over time, intentional riparian plantings should follow projects that disturb riparian vegetation and should accompany more structural flood control measures described above.

Tide Gate Upgrades

Many tide gates are in need of repair, replacement, or removal. Older tide gates typically disconnected stream channels from their floodplains, confining flows to a smaller area of the channel, and increasing flow volumes and velocities. Newer tide gate designs provide more connection between channels and their floodplains, allowing for some positive floodplain functions while still protecting upstream areas from tidal flooding. The last CFHMP recommended tide gate upgrades in the tidally influenced areas of Grays River, Deep River, Rangila Slough, Skamokawa Creek, and Groves Slough on Puget Island.

Large Wood Placement

The Cowlitz Indian tribe is in completing Upper Grays River Watershed projects to repair hillslope processes, reduce sediment input, and provide habitat benefit for local fish populations using large wood structure placements and native plantings, this large-scale project is an attempt to rehabilitate sections the stream corridor to trap sediment and re-establish a healthy riparian zone for the future. Evaluation of this project's effectiveness for trapping sediment would be useful for informing project development elsewhere in the County. [There are floodplain landowner concerns about installed large woody debris breaking loose and damaging downstream dikes.](#)

Road Inventories and Maintenance/Decommissioning Programs

Private and public timber holdings are required to keep road inventories for their existing logging operations. Road inventories are an excellent platform for demonstrating effectiveness of project types completed to reduce erosion such as culvert replacement and road rehabilitation activities. Road inventories can also be used as a platform for collaborating with local partners to leverage resources for road decommissioning in areas that are vulnerable to landslides that are sources of sediment.

Culvert Replacement Program

There is not a program for proactively replacing aging culverts before they fail. The State's required culvert sizes for ESA listed salmon bearing streams are seen locally as cost prohibitive. Emergency culvert replacements following a failure involve less costly regulatory procedures, and may employ smaller culverts, so even though emergency replacements are required to be brought up to normal standard within several years, there are short term regulatory incentives to approach culvert replacements reactively. Creating an inventory of culverts and a system for maintaining the inventory can provide a basis for good decision-making regarding culvert replacements.

Use of County Owned Land for Restoration

The County owns land that may be used as functioning floodplain, for in-stream large woody debris projects, and sustainable forest practices.

Community Forestry

In community forestry, forest management decisions are made with local community input, opening the potential for decisions that are partially aimed at reducing downstream flood risk. This could include expanded stream buffers, diverse aged stands, and stream corridor projects. The State of Washington's Urban and Community Forestry program¹⁹ is a resource for exploring this idea further.

Watershed Modelling

Columbia Land Trust is applying the Visualizing Ecosystem Land Management Assessments (VELMA) Model in the Grays River watershed. The model establishes linkages across watershed process and their effect on variables such as stream flow. Output from the model show a variety of management scenarios during high flow and low flow events that may serve as useful conversation piece related to the Community Forest concept described above and tool for community engagement with landowners in Wahkiakum's upper watersheds.

Channel Migration Zone Characterizations

Channel migration zones are areas in a floodplain where a stream or river channel can be expected to move naturally over time. Guiding development away from channel migration zones reduces the future costs of repairing or replacing damaged infrastructure and property, lessens impacts on habitat.

The Inventory and Characterization Report to inform the County's pending Shoreline Master Program Update included a planning level identification of Channel Migration Zones. The analysis however did not identify rates of channel migration, and ultimately mapped relatively wide Channel Migration Zones that while valid within the scope and context of that analysis, included areas so large that they do not serve as well for prioritizing actions to reduce channel migration zone risks.

The County may consider completing more detailed Channel Migration Zone analyses for selected areas where channel migration is evidently occurring. After considering the results of those analyses, the community would have more complete information to help decide what methods to use to reduce channel migration zone hazard risk.

Flood Risk Mapping

¹⁹ [Urban and community Forestry in Washington State – Let's Get Growing! \(wordpress.com\)](https://www.wa.gov/urban-and-community-forestry)

Accessing flood risk information in Wahkiakum County is more difficult than it is most other places in Washington, because flood insurance rate maps for Wahkiakum County are dated, do not cover many areas of flood risk, and are not available in digital format. The County's 1990 Flood Insurance Study included analysis of flood risks using standard methods of the time for the Elochoman River up to River mile 4.5, and for much of the Columbia river. For these areas, base flood elevations were determined. Other limited extents of streams were analyzed using more approximate methods, and for these areas base flood elevations were not determined. These study areas do not encompass all of the areas where property and infrastructure are at risk of damage from flooding. The study was initiated nearly 40 years ago with a meeting between FEMA, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and local officials at the County courthouse on July 25th, 1983. Completing a new flood insurance study represents an opportunity for the community to understand current flood risks using current methods and data.

Wahkiakum County can begin scoping the process and estimating costs for updating flood insurance rate maps and producing additional flood risk information by contacting Washington's State Risk Map Coordinator to inquire about initiating a Risk Map project for Wahkiakum County. The Risk Map Coordinator would work with the County to create a scope of work that is responsive to the County's interests and concerns.

River	Begin Study Area (River Mile)	End Study Area (River Mile)	Decade Studied	Methods
Elochoman River	Mouth	4.5	1980's	Standard
Elochoman River	7.1	11.6	1980's	Approximate
Skamokawa Creek	Mouth	4.9	1980's	Approximate
Wilson Creek	Mouth	5.4	1980's	Approximate
Birnie Creek	Mouth	.05	1980's	Approximate

FIGURE 154 SCOPE OF WAHIAKUM COUNTY FLOOD INSURANCE STUDY

Floodplain Management-Development Ordinance

The most recent FEMA Community Assistance Visit (CAV) resulted in feedback to improve the floodplain ordinance and its administration. The CAV emphasized improvement to ensure that accessory structures such as outbuildings will obtain floodplain permits and have elevation certificates obtained at the required development milestones. (Rosen, 2001) (Wahkiakum County, 2006) Department of Ecology's review of the floodplain ordinance produced a variety of other proposed changes that are either recommended by Ecology or, required for compliance with state law^{20v} and the National Flood Insurance Program^{21, w}. Required changes are listed below:

- County must require elevation certificates with floodplain development applications.
- County must require that floodway development and floodplain development where no floodway is designated produce no rise in the base flood elevation.
- County must notify FEMA when annexations occur in the special flood hazard area.
- County must require elevation certificates upon completion of permitted floodplain development

²⁰ RCW 86.16 Floodplain Management

²¹ Code of Federal Regulations. (n.d.). eCFR :: 44 CFR Part 60 -- Criteria for Land Management and Use.

- County must maintain records of all floodplain development variances.
- County must maintain records of floodplain development improvement values and damages.
- County must require that if buildings or manufactured homes are constructed or substantially improved with fully enclosed areas below the lowest floor, the areas shall be used solely for parking of vehicles, building access, or storage.
- County must allow livestock sanctuary areas, and require that their creation follow the procedural requirements of the the floodplain development ordinance.

Formatted: List Paragraph, Bulleted + Level: 1 +
Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

An adopted floodplain management ordinance meeting minimum state and federal requirements provides flood risk reduction benefits to Wahkiakum County and ensures that property owners remain eligible for flood insurance associated with the National Flood Insurance Program. Local governments commonly adopt floodplain management ordinances that provide an extra level of flood risk reduction beyond what is required by the state and federal government. Some examples of options to reduce flood risk by going beyond the minimum standards include:

Community Rating System

Wahkiakum County can further reduce flood risk and reduce flood insurance premiums in the county by participating in the Community Rating System (CRS). CRS is a voluntary incentive program that recognizes and encourages community floodplain management practices that exceed the minimum requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Participation in the Community Rating System requires some extra administrative resources. A 2018 FEMA publication^{viii} titled "Small Communities in the CRS" states that of the 1,486 communities in the CRS as of May 2018, fully 150 have populations of 5,000 or less. Of those, 18 have reached Class 5, earning a 25% discount for the policyholders in their communities' Special Flood Hazard Areas." This and other FEMA publications include useful information for small communities such as Wahkiakum County if they consider participating in the CRS.

Shoreline Master Program and Critical Areas Regulations

The Shoreline Master Program is over 20 years old. Updating Shoreline Master Program and Critical Areas Regulations to reflect current conditions and best available science will ensure that floodplain management activities are undertaken in consideration of values such as ecological functions, public access, hazard mitigation, and economic opportunity.

Property Acquisitions and Purchase of Development Rights

Acquisitions and purchases of development rights can have flood risk reduction benefits to the extent that they prevent future development from locating in areas of risk, remove existing development that is at risk of flooding, or are needed to implement other activities that reduce risk.

FUNDING

This plan does not recommend using particular funding sources over others and does not include a recommendation to create a general flood risk reduction fund or to allocate any particular amount of funding to flood risk reduction now. Rather, each recommendation would require some amount of funding, with the amount needing to be determined based on the County estimating a project budget for each recommendation as it chooses to take initial steps toward implementation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The CFHMP ~~places an emphasis on non-structural solutions to flood hazard management, and particularly a renewed emphasis on~~ emphasizes creating and organizing information to inform flood hazard management decisions. This improved information should be used to identify and prioritize physical projects to reduce flood risk.

1. Update the Floodplain Development Ordinance

The County should update the floodplain development ordinance to at least meet the minimum standards of Washington State and the National Flood Insurance Program. While updating the ordinance, the County should evaluate opportunities to enhance flood risk protections beyond the minimum standards.

~~2. Finish Updating the Shoreline Master Program~~

~~The County's draft shoreline master program includes regulations that will help ensure that structural flood hazard management solutions are consistent with the goals of preserving ecological functions, promoting, and protecting public access to shorelines, and prioritizing water dependent and other preferred uses near local shorelines.~~

~~3.2.~~ Update Flood Hazard Area Maps and Information

~~Advocate for the~~ Consult with the State of Washington RiskMAP program about ~~to conduct~~ ~~a~~ conducting RiskMAP project in collaboration with the County, to create up to date information on flooding ~~ing and related risks-risks and other hazard risks for the County.~~ The RiskMAP process would produce an updated flood risk map, and a variety of other risk information that individuals and the community can use to protect themselves and each other from hazards. This information is a prerequisite for making ~~informed~~ decisions that based on the best and most up to date information and that are responsive to residents' interests. The County should attempt to customize the RiskMAP project to respond to the community's interest in making the transportation network more resilient to flooding, and to characterize flood risk from rain water accumulating behind dikes. The first step towards scoping a RiskMAP project, identifying goals and deliverable, and estimating project costs, is to request a consultation with the State RiskMAP Coordinator.

4.3. Channel Migration Zone Analyses

Complete Channel Migration Zone Analyses for some of the active channel migration areas identified in the Shoreline Master Program Inventory and Characterization Report. These include Hull Creek (Grays River basin), West Fork Grays River and upper Fossil Creek (Grays River basin, Skamokawa Creek upstream of the West Fork of Skamokawa Creek, Skamokawa Creek between Standard Creek and Falk Creek, Wilson Creek, and the Elochoman River throughout the watershed as far downstream as below Beaver Creek.

An initial step for this recommendation is discussing channel migration zones with the Washington Risk Map coordinator while considering whether to initiate flood insurance rate map updates as part of a Risk Map Project.

5.4. Maintain and Expand Flow and Stage Monitoring

Ensure that the existing Elochoman River and Grays River gauges are maintained so that long term trends in river flow and flood river stage characteristics can be assessed. Consider adding and maintaining additional gauges as well. In the Grays River watershed, adding flow measurement to the Covered Bridge gauge, and adding a gauge for stage and flow monitoring at the Altoona-Pillar Rock Road Bridge that crosses Grays River at Rosberg Hall would improve flood modelling efforts and inform future flood risk management projects. Each of these upgrades require funding and each upgrade can be made independently of the others. Adding flow monitoring to the Covered Bridge may be both the cheapest single upgrade, costing around \$10,000 per year, and the most impactful in terms of improving flood risk modelling. An initial next step is for Wahkiakum County to consider what it would be willing to pay for any of these upgrades, and ask a group of potential partners if any of them are willing to share the cost. Upgrades would be managed by Washington Department of Ecology after local funding is organized.

6.5. Inventory Monitor and Create Maintenance Programs for Flood Control Infrastructure Dikes and Levees.

Inventory flood control infrastructure, starting with areas locally known to have issues. While County residents and staff have deep knowledge of the area's flood control infrastructure, this knowledge needs to be documented and organized so that diking districts can prioritize resources and effectively communicate technical assistance and funding needs to partners.

6. Monitor and Create Maintenance Programs for Tidegates

Inventory tidegates, with an assessment of their condition, and relationship to surrounding fish habitat and flooding issues so that these considerations can be used to inform decisions on tidegate maintenance and replacement. While Puget Island Diking District and Grays River Flood Zone Control District are actively monitoring tidegates and prioritizing maintenance and replacements, the County does not know the extent to which this is happening elsewhere.

7. Prioritize Culvert Replacements Monitor and Create a Replacement Program for Culverts

Using existing culvert inventories, local knowledge of the most undersized and deteriorating culverts should be documented and organized, and the information should be used to identify priority culvert replacement projects and establish implementation goals. Initial steps to implement this recommendation may include documenting existing sources of information on culvert locations and conditions, and meeting with a small committee of County staff and knowledgeable partners to establish goals and begin creating an inventory project plan.

After making progress on a culvert inventory program, initial goals for culvert replacement may be modest, for example to proactively replace one specific culvert within the next three years, and

Formatted: Normal

proactively replace one additional culvert every two years thereafter. In any case, the selected culverts and schedule objectives should be determined by a review of ~~the existing a~~ culvert inventory, supplemented by local knowledge and community priorities.

8. Diking District Support

Explore opportunities to expand support for local ~~d~~Diking ~~d~~Districts, including ~~additional tax levies~~ or sharing technical or management staff that can help plan and execute flood hazard management projects. Initial steps to implement this recommendation are for diking districts to identify, document, and share information on their needs. Documenting unfunded needs may occur through an inventory process in the case of needs to perform maintenance, or replace infrastructure or equipment, or initially and more simply based on what may be obvious needs known by diking district board members based on their deep knowledge of the land and community. These needs, along with any others such as needed staff or consulting support, may be documented along with the districts' annual budgets, and re-visited each year.

9. Grays Bay Dredging

~~Continue advocating with the County's congressional delegation to fund~~Complete a feasibility study for dredging flow channels in Grays Bay. The feasibility study should consider opportunities to use dredge spoils for reinforcing and raising nearby dikes. The reasoning behind this recommendation is common sense observation that enough dredge spoils from Columbia River Navigation Channel maintenance dredging and eroded sediment from the upper watershed have settled into Grays Bay that it has reduced the capacity of the Gray's River mouth to discharge flood waters, increasing flooding in lower Gray's River areas. The feasibility study would characterize how dredging could provide flood risk reduction benefits. The study would also identify impacts to fish, wildlife and other natural resources from dredging and dredging material disposal, and estimate project costs. The US Army Corps of Engineers requires a 50% cost share from a local partner on a feasibility study, and 35% cost share on any actual dredging.

10. Puget Island Beneficial Use Dredge Material Disposal and Pile Reconfigurations

Continue working with the US Army Corps of Engineers and participating in opportunities to comment on the Columbia River Dredge Material Management Plan, to identify beneficial near shore and shoreline dredge material disposal opportunities that mitigate erosion issues on Puget Island, and to identify opportunities to modify in stream structures if they are contributing to erosion.

11. East Fork Deep River Reconnection and Flood Reduction

Wahkiakum County is collaborating with CREST and all affected landowners to design a culvert replacement and stream channel modification project that responds to flooding issues in the East Fork Deep River. The project has preliminary designs and project partners are actively requesting funding from external sources. The project's next steps are led by CREST and include continued

Formatted: Font: 14 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

funding requests, landowner communication, and design work. The project includes the following components:

1. Replace the bank of culverts and tide gate at the East Deep River Road dike with a muted tidal regulator, raise a portion of the dike to reduce tidal flooding, and addressing several areas of upstream channel constriction to reduce flooding.
2. Replace a culvert on Deep River Valley Road (often labeled West Deep River Road on maps) and three culverts on private land nearby, while realigning short channel segments and widening incised channel segments.
- 11- 3. Replace an undersized culvert on Wirkkala Road and two nearby private culverts.

12. Voluntary Buyouts for Flood Impacted Properties

The County may consider taking a leadership role in offering owners of properties that are negatively impacted by flooding the opportunity to relocate. Depending on the circumstances, these projects can be largely funded by FEMA for properties with repetitive losses claimed under the National Flood Insurance Program, or by the US Department of Agriculture for farmland that is impacted or threatened by flooding or erosion.

13. Lower Watershed Multi-benefit Projects

Local and regional conservation partners are active in identifying opportunities to restore floodplain habitats. Other local values of interest may be a part of floodplain management projects as well. For example, local landowners may consider partnering with land trusts focusing on agricultural preservation to obtain incentives for preserving agricultural uses.

Gorley Springs/Crazy Johnson, Grays River Strategy

This is a large floodplain area that receives substantial sedimentation from upper watershed processes. A portion of this area is currently protected by Columbia land trust and serves as the last remaining spawning areas for Lower Columbia Chum salmon. Large wood has been placed in this area as a part of past conservation projects. Local and regional partners should explore opportunities to create a comprehensive multi-benefit flood and erosion mitigation strategy in this area.

Large Woody Debris Installations for Streambank Protection

Large Woody Debris installations to control erosion may be beneficial around the Grays River covered bridge, Sorenson beach, County Park, and East Valley Skamokawa. Local diking districts or the County should initiate conversations with local and regional conservation partners to further assess the feasibility and probably effectiveness of this kind of solution in these locations. Area landowners should be consulted regarding large woody debris projects, as there is concern that large pieces of wood can break free and damage dikes.

14. Upper Watershed Multi-benefit Projects

The Cowlitz Indian Tribe has demonstrated success in implementing multi-benefit projects in upland forest areas that improve salmon spawning habitat and that retain sediment. The results of Columbia Land Trust's Visualizing Ecosystem Land Management Assessments (VELMA) Model may highlight opportunities to reduce flood and erosion risk by focusing actions upstream in the

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", No bullets or numbering

watershed. If modelling suggests upper watershed conservation and restoration projects can meaningfully reduce peak flows and sediment supply downstream in the areas where more lives, property, and agricultural uses are at risk of flooding, the County and downstream diking districts may consider actively investing with conservation partners on upper watershed projects.




FIGURE 165 EVALUATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	Recommendation	Term	Leadership and Partnerships	Next Step Identified	Short Term Objectives		Long Term Objectives	
					Improve information for flood hazard management decisions.	Update foundational plans and ordinances to reflect current conditions.	Maintain existing flood hazard management infrastructure and programs.	Make new flood hazard management investments to address the root causes of flood hazard risk.
1	Update the Floodplain Development Ordinance	1 st Action	Leadership: Building and Planning Department Partners: Public Works Department, Dept. of Ecology	Yes				
2	Flood Hazard Area Mapping	5 Years	Leadership: Building and Planning Department Partners: Public Works Department, Dept. of Ecology, Diking Districts	Yes				
3	Channel Migration Zone Analyses	2 Years	Leadership: Building and Planning Department Partners: Public Works Department, Dept. of Ecology	Yes				
4	Maintain and Expand Flow and Stage Monitoring	2 Years	Leadership: Public Works Department Partners: Dept. of Ecology, conservation, and research partners, Grays River Flood Control Zone District	Yes				
5	Monitor and Create	2 Years	Leadership: Diking Districts Partners: Public Works Department	No				

	Maintenance Programs for Inventory Flood Control Infrastructure Dikes and Levees							
	Inventory Tidegates		Leadership: Diking Districts Partners: Public Works Department	No				
6	Prioritize Culvert Replacements Culvert Monitoring	2 Years	Leadership: Public Works Department Partners: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Yes				
7	Diking District Support	2 Years	Leadership: Diking Districts Partners: Public Works Department	Yes				
8	Diking District Support Explore opportunities to expand support for local diking districts, including sharing technical or management staff that can help plan and execute flood hazard management projects. Initial steps to implement	5 Years	Leadership: County Commissioners Partners: Army Corps. Of Engineers	Yes				

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Normal, Line spacing: single, No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Centered

	<p><u>this recommendation are for diking districts to identify, document, and share information on their needs. Documenting unfunded needs may occur through an inventory process in the case of needs to perform maintenance, or replace infrastructure or equipment, or initially and more simply based on what may be obvious needs known by diking</u></p>							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	<p><u>district board members based on their deep knowledge of the land and community. These needs, along with any others such as needed staff or consulting support, may be documented along with the districts' annual budgets, and re-visited each year.</u></p> <p>Grays Bay Dredging Study</p>							
9	<p><u>Puget Island Beneficial Use Dredge Material Disposal</u></p> <p>Puget Island Beneficial Use</p>	2 Years	<p><u>Leadership: County Commissioners</u></p> <p><u>Partners: Army Corps. Of Engineers</u></p>	Yes				

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Centered

10	<u>Voluntary Buyouts for Flood Impacted Properties</u> Voluntary Buyouts	5 Years	<u>Leadership: Building and Planning Department</u> <u>Partners: FEMA</u>	No					Formatted: Font: 10 pt
11	<u>East Fork Deep River Flood Reduction</u>	5 Years	<u>Leadership: Public Works Department</u> <u>Partners: CREST</u>	Yes					Formatted: Centered
11	<u>Lower Watershed Multi-benefit Projects</u> Lower Watershed Projects	5 Years	<u>Leadership Role: Conservation Organizations</u>	No					Formatted: Font: 10 pt
12	<u>Upper Watershed Multi-benefit Projects</u> Upper Watershed Projects	5 Years	<u>Leadership Role: Conservation Organizations</u>	No					Formatted: Centered

REFERENCES

Association of State Floodplain Managers. 2003. No Adverse Impact: A Toolkit for Common Sense Floodplain Management.

Bertoch, K. (2022, January 20). Diking/Enhancement district studies flooding, seeks a new member. pp. <https://www.waheagle.com/story/2022/01/20/news/dikingenhancement-district-studies-flooding-seeks-a-new-member/20310.html>.

Code of Federal Regulations. (n.d.). eCFR :: 44 CFR Part 60 Subpart C -- Additional Considerations in Managing Flood-Prone, Mudslide (i.e., Mudflow)-Prone and Flood-Related Erosion-Prone Areas. Retrieved from [Website URL]

Code of Federal Regulations. (n.d.). eCFR :: 44 CFR Part 60 -- Criteria for Land Management and Use.

Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration. (2018, June). Small Communities and the Community Rating System. Retrieved from <https://www.crsresources.org/>

FEMA. (1986). *Flood Insurance Study, Town of Cathlamet, Washington, Wahkiakum County*. <https://map1.msc.fema.gov/data/53/S/PDF/530278V000.pdf?LOC=849e4a7a776e028c87ba3410e2915b9a>.

FEMA. (1990). *Flood Insurance Study, Wahkiakum County WA Inincorporated Areas*. <https://map1.msc.fema.gov/data/53/S/PDF/530193V000.pdf?LOC=c2d7c7324e8644cb214858ceb047d6b1>.

Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board. (2004, December 9). Grays-Elochoman and Cowlitz Watershed Management Plan. https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/810197_637cc3a12b754551b4be1e87d9e97440.pdf

Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board. Grays-Elochoman and Cowlitz Watershed Management Plan WRIAs 25 and 26. (n.d.). Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board. Retrieved from <https://www.lcfrb.gen.wa.us/watershedplanning>

Mauger, G.S., M. Liu, J.C. Adam, J. Won, G. Wilhere, D. Dulan, J. Atha, L. Helbrecht, and T. Quinn (2021). New Culvert Projections for Washington State: Improved Modeling, Probabilistic Projections, and an Updated Web Tool. Report prepared for the Northwest Climate Adaptation Science Center. Climate Impacts Group, University of Washington. <https://doi.org/10.6069/31T3-RE28>

May, C., & Geist, D. (2006). Grays River Watershed and Biological Assessment (Final Report, Project No. 200301300, BPA Report DOE/BP-00000652-38).

M.C. Mastin, A. G. (2010). *Magnitude and Extent of Flooding at Selected River Reaches in Western Washington, January 2009. Scientific Investigations Report 2010–5177*. United States Geological Survey.

Miller, I.M., Morgan, H., Mauger, G., Newton, T., Weldon, R., Schmidt, D., Welch, M., & Grossman, E. (2018). Projected Sea Level Rise for Washington State – A 2018 Assessment. Washington Sea Grant, University of Washington Climate Impacts Group, University of Oregon, University of Washington, & US Geological Survey. Prepared for the Washington Coastal Resilience Project. Updated July 2019.

Miller, I.M., Yang, Z., VanArendonk, N., Grossman, E., Mauger, G. S., & Morgan, H. (2019). Extreme Coastal Water Level in Washington State: Guidelines to Support Sea Level Rise Planning. Washington Sea Grant, University of Washington Climate Impacts Group, Oregon State University, University of Washington, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory & U.S. Geological Survey. Prepared for the Washington Coastal Resilience Project.

MSRC. (2022). *List of Special Districts by Type of District and County*. Retrieved from <https://mrsc.org/getmedia/21a589a5-10aa-44b1-bbb3-d91637822eaf/spdcountytype.xls.aspx>.

National Weather Service. (2021). *NowData*. Retrieved from <https://w1.weather.gov/climate/xmacis.php?wfo=sew>.

Nelson, R. (2022, January 20). Valley residents share concerns of erosion threats. *Wahkiakum County Eagle*.

NOAA. (2022). *Storm Events Database*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/stormevents/>.

Raymond, C., Conway-Cranos, L., Morgan, H., Faghin, N., Spilsbury Pucci, D., Krienitz, J., Miller, I., Grossman, E., & Mauger, G. (2018). Sea level rise considerations for nearshore restoration projects in Puget Sound. Report prepared for the Washington Coastal Resilience Project.

Revised Codes of Washington. (n.d.). Chapter 86.16 RCW: FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT

Rosen, A. (2001, June 3). Community Assistance Visit, post visit letter to Wahkiakum County. Department of Ecology.

Snover, A.K, G.S. Mauger, L.C. Whitely Binder, M. Krosby, and I. Tohver. 2013. Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation in Washington State: Technical Summaries for Decision Makers. State of Knowledge Report prepared for the Washington State Department of Ecology. Climate Impacts Group, University of Washington, Seattle. This report is available for download at: - Full report: <http://ces.washington.edu/db/pdf/snoveretalsok816.pdf>

Wahkiakum County. (2006). *Combined Floodplain Protection Ordinance*. Retrieved from <https://www.co.wahkiakum.wa.us/DocumentCenter/View/283/Combined-Flood-Plain-Management-Ordinances-PDF>.

Wahkiakum County. (2012). *Diking Districts*. Retrieved from <https://co.wahkiakum.wa.us/DocumentCenter/View/319/Diking-Districts-PDF?bidId=>.

Wahkiakum County. (2015). *Draft Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report*. https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ocrnkg13m83dt03/AAAdKSgjYJT8J-w2t0PmDHHa/Characterization%20Report?dl=0&subfolder_nav_tracking=1.

Formatted: Endnote Text, Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li

Wahkiakum County. (2019). *Wahkiakum County Hazard Mitigation Plan*.
<https://www.insurance.wa.gov/sites/default/files/2019-10/wahkiakum-county-hazard-mitigation-plan.pdf>.

Wahkiakum County. (1995). *Comprehensive Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan*.
<https://www.co.wahkiakum.wa.us/285/Long-Range-General-Planning>.

Warner, M.D., Mass, C.F., & Salathé Jr., E.P. (2015). Changes in winter Atmospheric Rivers along the North American West Coast in CMIP5 climate models. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 16, 118–128.
<https://doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-14-0080.1>

Wilshire, G. F., Atha, J. B., Quinn, T., Tohver, I., & Helbrecht, L. (2017). Incorporating climate change into culvert design in Washington State, USA. *Ecological Engineering*, 104(A), 67-79.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2017.04.009>

Zimmerman, D. (2022, April 14). Diking district strives to keep the Island dry. *Wahkiakum County Eagle*, pp. <https://www.waheagle.com/story/2022/04/14/news/diking-district-strives-to-keep-the-island-dry/20691.html>.

Warner, M.D., C.F. Mass, and E.P. Salathé Jr.. 2015. Changes in winter Atmospheric Rivers along the North American West Coast in CMIP5 climate models. *J. Hydrometeor*, 16, 118–128,

Warner, M. D., & Mass, C. F. (2017). Changes in the Climatology, Structure, and Seasonality of Northeast Pacific Atmospheric Rivers in CMIP5 Climate Simulations. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, 18(8), 2131-2141. https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/hydr/18/8/jhm-d-16-0200_1.xml

Washington Department of Ecology. (2014, August). Channel Migration Processes and Patterns in Western Washington: A Synthesis for Floodplain Management and Restoration (Publication no.14-06-028). Retrieved from <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/SummaryPages/1406028.html>

Washington State Department of Ecology. (2016). WA State Risk MAP Business Plan. Retrieved from <https://ecology.wa.gov/DOE/files/6b/6bb6ff88-cf29-42e2-a68d-81075327f0ff.pdf>

Wilhere, G. F., Atha, J. B., Quinn, T., Tohver, I., & Helbrecht, L. (2017). Incorporating climate change into culvert design in Washington State, USA. *Ecological Engineering*, 104(Part A), 67-79.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2017.04.009>

