

Recommendations

3.65 *Implement initial elements of the comprehensive strategy to mitigate nuisance flooding by elevating the unit block of King Street and The Strand.*

Discuss: Ballard, Ely, Rhodeside, Wood

Comments

1. We need to explore the viability of this aspect of the flood mitigation plan. (Ballard)
2. The idea of elevating the unit block of King and The Strand to reduce nuisance flooding is an extremely dubious proposition that may cause more harm than good. We should learn to live with nuisance flooding while fully valuing the publicity nuisance flooding brings to the waterfront area when all the TV trucks show up. (Ely)
3. Note that should be "as feasible." (Macek)
4. Elevating the streets is a poor idea. (Rhodeside)
5. No; the necessary engineering study and resulting cost benefit analysis is not yet funded by the city and, therefore, not available. It is premature to call for this degree of implementation and attendant construction without this information. (Wood)

3.74 *Integrate low flood walls into the design of the park in order to protect against frequent flooding. To the extent possible, walls should be constructed to be used as functional seating elements and to allow park users to view the stage.*

Discuss: Ely, Wood

Comments

1. A comprehensive cost-benefit analysis is needed to determine which flood-control measures, if any, would be beneficial for the waterfront area. Further, greater consideration should be given to the alternative of having no-build areas on those waterfront areas most prone to flooding. (Ely)
2. No; I agree with this statement as far as it goes, but I believe we need to add additional sentences here that address the further elements of flood protection found in our plan statement C2. (Wood)

Other comments

Will building in the flood plain increase costs to the point of making developments infeasible? (Olinger)