

	FFF IOC Meeting Agenda Dec 7 , 12:30 AM – 2:30 PM Zoom	
	Meeting Goals: Finalize the King County Comp Plan update recommendations. Explore concepts for a letter to the Executive in support of FFF and to recommended the updated comprehensive plan policies.	
12:30-12:50	1. Welcome, Activity and Updates a. Welcome activity b. FFF Written Updates – Any questions? c. Updates and Questions - Josh Baldi Materials: Written update	Tamie Kellogg Josh Baldi
12:50-2:10	2. Comprehensive Plan Update, future FFF engagement, and letter to the Executive a. Review, edit if needed and approve the draft King County comprehensive plan updated narrative and policy recommendations. b. Discuss FFF IOC letter to the Executive <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future FFF Engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Annual CIP Meeting ii. FFF annual progress iii. MDRC iv. Other, as needed c. Next steps * Includes a 10 min break Materials: Draft comp plan policy, future FFF engagement ppt, MDRC concept, and draft letter to the Executive	Michael Murphy & Angela Donaldson All
2:10-2:25	Ex-Officio Member Updates	Ex Officio Members
2:25- 2:30	Public input	
2:30	Adjourn	

Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood 2.0 Implementation Oversight Committee

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, September 13, 2022
8:30 am to 1:30 pm (scheduled)

The Hippodrome at Carnation Farms
28901 NE Carnation Farm Rd., Carnation, WA 98014

Committee Members Present (Y/N)					
* = denotes caucus co-chair					
Fish Caucus		Farm Caucus		Flood Caucus	
Cindy Spiry, Snoqualmie Tribe* <i>(proxy: Matt Baerwalde - Y)</i>	Y	Bobbi Lindemulder, farmer*	Y	Angela Donaldson, Fall City Community Association*	Y
Denise Krownbell, Snohomish Forum	Y	Lauren Silver, Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance	Y	Lara Thomas, City of Duvall	Y
Micah Wait, Wild Fish Conservancy	Y	Meredith Molli, Agriculture Commission	Y		
Daryl Williams, Tulalip Tribes <i>(proxy: Kurt Nelson - N)</i>	Y	Dave Glenn, Sno Valley Tilth	Y		
Rick Shaffer, Snoqualmie Forum	N	Liz Stockton, King Conservation District	Y		
Ex Officio Members Present (Y/N)					
Gary Bahr, WSDA	Y	Kirk Lakey, WDFW	Y		
Josh Baldi, KC DNRP	Y	Tom Buroker, WDOE <i>(proxy: Joe Burcar - Y)</i>	Y		

I) Call to Order & Welcome Activity / Updates

Facilitator Tamie Kellogg began the meeting at 8:52 am.

a) Welcome From Sarah Perry, King County Councilmember

KC Councilmember Sarah Perry welcomed all attendees. Perry expressed appreciation for FFF participants and their commitment, work, and interconnectedness, adding that anyone should feel comfortable reaching out to her.

b) Co-Chair Acknowledgements and Introductions

The passing of Claire Dyckman, a champion of the Snoqualmie Valley and key player in the development of FFF, was acknowledged by several, along with the passing of Terry Williams, an icon in habitat restoration and brother of Daryl Williams. Updates on several projects/efforts were given, including: the Agriculture Strategic Plan, the Hood Canal Restoration project, Growth Management Act updates at WDFW, a Qualco dairy digester project in Snohomish County, the Blue Heron Slough project in Everett, a \$100K grant for work on the Griffin Creek alluvial fan project, and others.

c) Welcome Activity

Tamie Kellogg and Joan Lee asked all present to consider what vegetable or dinner table food best represents FFF for them and spend several minutes mingling and discussing. The following results were shared:

- Leftovers: You're not always sure you want to keep them, but sometimes a day later you get your best meals, as you can combine and achieve something different.
- Pickles: Start by growing the cucumber, but then it must be put with other ingredients and given time to ferment. If done right, it's delicious.
- Stew: Combination of different ingredients coming together reflects the complexity of this group, and the flavor coming out.
- Carrots: You don't know what you'll get until it's pulled up; you see the top but not what's underneath. It's also versatile and can be prepared many ways.
- Garlic: There are different pieces/cloves making up the whole. It can be sweet or spicy and takes a whole season to grow.
- Zucchini: It's versatile, comes together well with other things. There is definite abundance in the end.
- Tomatoes: A challenge to take on every year, which takes a lot of resources, planning, and knowing what you're doing to achieve the best-tasting result.
- Beets: Tart and dirty, but if time is put into them, they become amazing.

d) Questions on Written Updates Provided in Advance

Micah Wait asked if IOC members could receive a copy of high-level plans for the Griffin Creek alluvial fan

project. Joan Lee confirmed this is possible.

e) Updates from Josh Baldi

- The “Great Resignation” is impacting WLRD. In particular, Baldi noted the loss of former FFF project manager Beth leDoux to another position, and the retirement of King County Stormwater’s Brian Sleight.
- King County Budget: It’s the middle of budget season now, with the proposed budget being transmitted to King County Council (KCC) in September. As of the most recent update, no additions or rate increases have been proposed. Inflation has had impacts across the board to items such as salaries and cost of living; this might cause some modest increases should the Executive take these to KCC. The biannual fund looks solid for the next couple of years, but after that it’s uncertain.
- King County Flood Plan and Comp Plan: A report has just been received on net environmental gains. This may cause ripple effects at the state level. Baldi noted that tracking best available science for these plans can be overwhelming, and FFF should think about what it wants to accomplish together.
- Other Funding Sources: It’s uncertain when state and federal grant sources will be available and what they’ll look like. WLRD is trying to identify resources, but the Division is heavily reliant on state and federal grants. There has been a lot of emphasis on fish passage, climate equity, and other issues. 57 flood reduction grants competing for \$12 million in funds have also been submitted to the Flood Control District (FCD).

II) Comprehensive (“Comp”) Plan Policy & Narrative (Michael Murphy, DNRP; Angela Donaldson)

Donaldson said depending on how much is done today, in October the hope is to be about 80% done with drafting comp plan policy language, and the language should be ready to send to the Executive and KCC in December. Murphy confirmed that 85% completion of language should be done by end of October. April 10, 2023 is when 95% completed language is needed in the Executive’s office. A six-month public review draft period begins in June. After the Executive transmits his proposed plan, KCC has a year to work on it. KCC will look at draft policy language in October to December of this year.

Murphy called attention to the draft comp plan policy and narrative document table in today’s meeting materials, a result of work from the last comp plan subcommittee meeting and fish and farm caucus meetings. The IOC will break into caucuses and provide feedback on Columns C and D of the policy/narrative table. Column C addresses policy and narrative drafting guidance; Column D addresses County commitments outside the comp plan.

After a few clarifying questions from the group, Donaldson emphasized the IOC is tasked with framing and completing the narrative, which should be kept clean and simple with no possible contradictions. This includes specific metrics, tasks, and actions. The expectation from caucuses is concurrence on these principles, but any concerns or questions should be noted. Murphy added that King County Regional Planning’s Chris Jensen has reviewed this table document to “soften” some of the language. Regional Planning is the “gate” to the Executive’s proposed comp plan, so it’s important for them to understand the context they are bringing to this. The hope is that King County, caucus members and other stakeholders will be on the same page.

III) BREAK

IV) Comp Plan Policy: Breakout Sessions

Attendees broke into fish, farm, and flood caucuses for about an hour to discuss the comp plan policy document.

V) LUNCH BREAK

VI) Debrief Caucus Discussions on Policy and Other King County Commitments to Further FFF

The caucus groups reported out the results of their breakout session discussions, then discussed next steps.

- Farm Caucus Discussion Points:
 - One of the biggest issue: need clarity/definitions, specifically of “watershed planning process” or “watershed process.”
 - Need to resolve issue of how lost farmland is incorporated into the narrative.
 - Engagement: What is the relationship between FFF participants and the MDRC?
 - MDRC needs a balance of staff inside this process. Develop an internal process to replace the APC that didn’t work as well as we’d like and was not transparent. Bring in external Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to as needed.
 - Accountability: It’s essential that FFF has role in hearing out/input into process.
 - Need funding generally and funding strategies specifically for agricultural projects.
 - Need an FFF advisory committee.
 - Need metrics and a threshold: what is the threshold where fish or agriculture where they are no longer viable?
 - External FFF principles should be mirrored and driven internally as well.
 - Long term expectation of FFF involvement with the County.

- Need a better idea of what commitment of County and partners coming together would look like.
- Need to review our work against other County plans to ensure consistency.
- Need metrics, a nimble/dynamic dashboard, to be looked at yearly.
- Need to move this process beyond this group, engaging with communities.
- Fish Caucus Discussion Points:
 - Need to clarify that FFF is not a watershed process, but part of an overall process.
 - Expand support of fish habitat for Chinook to instead cover all salmonids/fish resources.
 - Support for flood risk reduction; clarify language addressing “conversion to agricultural land.”
 - Guidance narrative lacks specificity in how it will play out.
 - Terminology needs clarifying and built-in flexibility to address near- and future-term needs.
 - Policy should represent the need for adaptive management.
 - Clarity on MDRC: if needed, there should be a senior level specialist (not just County) to understand the permitting landscape. A high-level person with this skill set would benefit all projects going through MDRC.
 - Instead of minimizing impacts, avoid and mitigate them when possible.
 - MDRC is a good chance to slow the process down if needed. Slow down to go fast later.
- Flood Caucus Discussion Points:
 - Language is cumbersome and could be cleaned up.
 - Need aggressive funding strategy in flood hazard management plan.
 - Are all projects being run through MDRC, or just capital, or drainage, etc.? Need project criteria.
 - Would like definition behind metrics and communication: which project, who it gets communicated to, how it’s tracked.
 - Flood Risk Reduction: not just ecological reasons, but integrated ecological function. Is the County committed to restoring ecological processes?
 - If not all salmonids, the protection list should be flexible/evolving.
 - Climate change: want consistency in land use code and conversion.
 - How are partners determined?
 - How do we assess the MDRC and FFF? It should be a consistent assessment, a partner assessment process as part of the watershed process.
 - Agree that FFF is not really a watershed process.
 - Need communication dashboard/pathway.
 - Ensure narrative meets intent.
- Next Steps: Tamie Kellogg said the IOC needs to give the County feedback. She noted work is needed on definitions, and on clarifying items under Column D of the policy/narrative table. Kellogg also noted there seem to be some more clear suggestions for Column C of the table for Michael Murphy to update in his next draft. Kellogg said the next step for all this is the FFF comp plan subcommittee, which is to reconvene the week of September 27th – 30th. The subcommittee will receive an updated table document and the notes with the combined caucus feedback from today. The subcommittee will decide if they need an additional meeting, and the co-chairs will decide if the caucuses need to meet. Kellogg added that another subcommittee meeting and review of policy language was likely before the IOC takes up the discussion at its December meeting. Murphy said language should be well in hand by October.

VII) Wrap Up/Adjourn (*Tamie Kellogg*)

Kellogg thanked everyone for their patience over the years of the pandemic, noting that things seem to flow better when the group meets in person. Joan Lee thanked all for attending. The next IOC meeting will be December 7.

The meeting ended at 1:12 pm.

FFF IOC Written Updates December 2022

King County Flood Management Plan

SEPA Comment Opportunity Closes December 9 – In order to fulfill the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), King County is preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to analyze the potential impacts of the flood plan on threatened and endangered species, water quality, historical and cultural resources, transportation, and more. A comment period to collect input on the scope of the EIS began on November 7 and will close on December 9 at 5:00 p.m. The most useful comments during the EIS scoping period are those on the elements of the environment, alternatives, or potential impacts. More information, including instructions for submitting comments, are available on the Flood Plan webpage.

Coastal, urban, and tributary flooding workshops – In order to more comprehensively characterize flooding in King County, workshops focused on coastal, urban, and tributary flooding will be held beginning in January 2023. These workshops will provide an opportunity to share input about flood hazards, problems, and potential risk reduction approaches. Two meetings will be held on each of the three topics, and more information about the meeting dates and how to register can be found on the Flood Plan webpage.

Jason Wilkinson

Project Manager, Flood Management Plan

206-477-4786

Buffers Implementation Task Force

Most of the Buffers Implementation Task Force (BITF) membership has been firmed up and we hope to hold a kick-off meeting later this month.

- Fish membership and affiliation: Matt Baerwalde – Snoqualmie Tribe, Daryl Williams – Tulalip Tribes, Elissa Ostergaard – Snoqualmie Forum
- Farm membership and affiliation: Wayne Gullstad – independent farmer, Andrew Stout – independent farmer, Lauren Silver – SVPA
- Flood membership and affiliation: TBD
- Ex Officio membership and affiliation: TBD
- SME's guidance and support: Snoqualmie Valley WID, American Farmland Trust, KCD, nonprofit restoration planting partners, King County Science Section (TBD)

Over the next 6 months, the BITF's primary focus will be on establishing recommendations for:

- buffer minimums
- site specific planting guidelines
- planting incentives for landowners and the next steps to put them in place

Agriculture Strategic Plan

The Task Force work continues to make significant progress in Q4 2022, with the draft Agriculture Strategic Plan now at about 90 pages long and 16 of the 18 issue papers finalized.

Remaining items include:

- finalizing the remaining 2 issue papers
- a recommendations table sorted by linked strategic plans and topic/values
- some formatting

Update on timing: Prior to caucus or IOC review, the plan needs a final comprehensive review/support from the Task Force and Ag Task force member organizations need to review for issues mentioning that specific organization. Stay tuned for information on caucus and IOC input in Q1, 2023.

The Strategic Plan Table of Contents (11/30/22):

1. Improved Farmland Productivity

1.1 Drainage

1.1.1 Drainage Maintenance for ADAP Eligible Waterways

1.1.2 Drain Tiles

1.1.3 Flap gates, Floodgates, and Pumps

1.1.4 Culverts

1.1.5 Drainage Maintenance for non-ADAP Waterways

1.1.6 Beavers

1.2 Flood Safety

1.2.7 Flood Safety for Farms: High Ground Refuge and Farm Pads

1.2.8 Home Preservation in the APD

1.3 Irrigation

1.3.9 Water Rights and Irrigation

1.4 Transportation

1.4.10 Revetments

1.4.11 Transportation and Bridges

1.5 Climate Change

1.5.12 Climate Change Predictions

1.5.13 Invasive Species

2. Increased Farmland Protections

2.1 Population Growth and Development Impacts

2.1.14 Population Pressure

2.1.15 Emerging Issues

2.2 Wildlife

2.2.16 Elk and Deer

2.3 Farmland Preservation

2.3.17 Farmland Preservation

2.4 Proposed acreage for a long-term, viable sector

2.4.18 Acreage Challenges, Needs and Recommendation

1 The river valleys in King County are important natural resource areas for agriculture, salmon habitat, and natural
2 floodplain processes. In compliance with the Growth Management Act, portions of several of these valleys were
3 designated as Agricultural Production Districts to protect land for long term commercial agricultural uses –
4 including the highest quality soils for food production – and to limit conversion of the land to uses that would be
5 incompatible with viable, long-term, commercial agriculture. Because many areas of farmland within Agricultural
6 Production Districts are within floodplains, floodways, or other low-lying areas, the ability to manage drainage and
7 infrastructure to support farming is an important aspect of retaining farmable land and supporting continued
8 agricultural uses within the Agricultural Production Districts.

9
10 The same geography covered by Agricultural Production Districts provides salmon habitat protection and
11 restoration opportunities of importance to King County, tribes, and other regional partners. Some of both the
12 highest quality and most degraded salmon habitat in King County is in rivers and streams flowing through
13 Agricultural Production Districts. King County continues to work diligently to restore habitat to advance recovery of
14 depleted salmon stocks, including those species listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species
15 Act, and strives to protect and enhance fish stocks, ecological functions and aquatic habitat in all county waterbodies
16 and floodplain areas, including in floodplains, rivers, streams and wetlands in Agricultural Production Districts.
17 Furthermore, King County continues to work toward recovery of all salmonid species given the nexus of salmonid
18 populations with tribal treaty rights.

19
20 Some of King County’s Agricultural Production Districts have vast areas of floodways and floodplains. King
21 County is committed to restoring floodplain processes and mitigating flood risks to ensure human health and protect
22 public safety, reduce the risk of property damage, maintain critical infrastructure supporting residents and
23 businesses, and to reduce public and private economic impacts of flood events. As climate change results in more
24 frequent and more damaging floods, agriculture businesses and homes will need increased support for home and
25 agricultural building elevations. Maintaining land use rules preventing conversions of agricultural land to other uses
26 will have a co-benefit of limiting new development that may be at increased risk of damage from floods.

27
28 King County supports ongoing viability of agriculture, protection, restoration and enhancement of salmon habitat,
29 and actions to reduce flood risks and enhance ecological functions of floodplains, all of which combine to create a
30 resilient landscape in the face of climate change and pressures of population growth. However, because current or
31 proposed land uses supporting one goal may affect advancement of other goals, decision-making about the size and
32 location of habitat and floodplain restoration and agricultural infrastructure projects can be challenging. The 2012
33 Comprehensive Plan update added policy R-650 that directed the County to develop an approach to improving and
34 balancing the interests of agricultural production, ecological function and habitat quality for salmon, and flood risk
35 reduction and floodplain restoration within each of the Agricultural Production Districts. In response, the County
36 and partners piloted a planning effort focused on the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District by
37 convening the Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, and Flood Advisory Committee with the goal of understanding
38 context and improving balance in King County’s work to advance multiple objectives. As a result of the ongoing
39 efforts of the Snoqualmie farm, fish, flood process, the County has begun to operationalize recommendations,

40 including recommendations for a revised administrative process for reviewing proposed projects and programmatic
41 actions in locations where agriculture, fish habitat, and floodplains intersect.

42

43 The revised administrative review process will occur in a watershed context by considering information from a
44 variety of sources, including three task forces convened based on recommendations from the Snoqualmie farm, fish,
45 flood effort:

- 46 • Buffers Task Force, to develop science-based recommendations for a policy that encourages voluntary
47 riparian plantings using variable-width riparian recommendations;
- 48 • Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District Strategic Plan Task Force to consider strategies to
49 improve the long-term productivity of farmland, bring more acres into production, especially food
50 production, and increase opportunities for farmers to develop the necessary infrastructure to support or
51 increase their farm businesses in the Snoqualmie Valley; and
- 52 • Regulatory Task Force, to evaluate and recommend improvements to regulations to promote a viable
53 agricultural economy and maintain and enhance habitat protection and healthy ecosystems.

54

55 While these task forces were developed with a specific focus on the Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District, the
56 lessons learned have informed principles which guide how the County works to achieve multiple benefits through
57 projects and programmatic actions implemented in other Agricultural Production Districts and all areas of
58 unincorporated King County where agriculture, salmon habitat, and floodplains converge.

59

60 Additionally, the revised administrative review process should consider recommendations from relevant plans
61 completed by King County and partner organizations related to salmon recovery, agriculture, drainage, floodplain
62 management, climate change, forest management, comprehensive and subarea planning, transportation and other
63 relevant plans. The revised administrative review process should incorporate and promote multi-objective thinking
64 wherever possible.

65

66 As King County implements and continues to refine its revised administrative process for reviewing proposed
67 projects and programmatic actions in a watershed context, King County should establish acreage targets for both
68 agricultural lands and floodplain and riparian habitat project area, with the goal of ensuring enough land of each
69 type remains available to support ongoing agricultural viability, ecosystem resilience, and species recovery. Targets
70 should be based on best available science and recent relevant planning efforts. King County shall periodically review
71 and adjust as necessary any such targets in the context of best available science and recommendations from relevant
72 plans. In conjunction with setting acreage targets, the County should consider means to avoid, minimize, and if
73 practicable, mitigate losses to farmable land commensurate with regulations applicable to aquatic resources.

74

75

76

77 Using recommendations from the Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, and Flood Advisory Committee, King County has
78 revised the process for reviewing projects in a watershed context, which is described in revised policy R-650. This
79 process will apply to projects sponsored by the Water and Land Resources Division in all Agricultural Production
80 Districts, and may be invoked for other projects if requested by project sponsors. Revised policy R-650 outlines the
81 minimum required elements of an administrative review process for habitat and floodplain restoration capital
82 projects and programs sponsored by the King County Water and Land Resources Division where fish, farm and
83 flood interests intersect. When planning and implementing projects of all types, King County should consider
84 watershed context and strive for consistency with recommendations in relevant plans related to salmon recovery,
85 agriculture and floodplains. Specifically, for projects sponsored by the Water and Land Resources Division in areas
86 where farms, fish habitat and floodplains overlap, the review process should:

- 87 • Formalize and standardize consistent, transparent, and efficient collaboration among County programs as
88 well as with community partners;
- 89 • Incorporate Farm, Fish, Flood principles into King County operating procedures by guiding projects
90 toward maximizing multiple benefits when possible, and providing rationale when projects will likely favor
91 one benefit to the detriment of another;
- 92 • Be informed of impacts and benefits to farm, fish, and flood hazard mitigation;
- 93 • Engage project sponsors early in the planning phase to fully explore opportunities for increased multi-
94 objective gains; and
- 95 • Be conducted as efficiently as possible.

96
97 The purpose of the review process shall be to develop recommendations to the Water and Land Resources Division
98 director to inform their decisions about approvals of locations, scope, and scale of proposed projects, with the
99 overarching goal for project outcomes to result in continued gains with respect to the viability of agriculture,
100 ecological benefits, and preservation or restoration of resilient landscapes. Additionally, the County should
101 periodically engage agricultural communities and habitat and flood partners as the review process is implemented to
102 discuss continued refinements to the process.

103
104 The review process may also be conducted for projects sponsored by entities other than the Water and Land
105 Resources Division, including those that facilitate infrastructure and drainage improvement projects on privately
106 owned farmland to support continued long-term commercial agricultural uses within Agricultural Production
107 Districts.

108
109 The Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, and Flood Advisory Committee process and associated planning work has been
110 instrumental in King County and partners learning how to balance needs of agriculture, salmon recovery, and
111 floodplain management in a collaborative manner considering watershed context. As a result, implementing targeted
112 planning efforts in all Agricultural Production Districts is no longer required for other Agricultural Production
113 Districts.

114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154

King County shall continue to support the Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, and Flood Advisory Committee until the level of progress envisioned at the formation of the committee is substantially complete, and King County should consider supporting similar collaborative efforts in other geographies when residents and partners request a localized planning effort. In its ongoing work in the Snoqualmie Valley and other geographies, the County shall seek to develop strategies, plans, and agreements that accommodate multiple methods of achieving balance in benefits to farming, fish habitat and flood risk reduction efforts (e.g. avoidance/minimization of impacts, onsite mitigation efforts, offsite offsets, etc.) King County should use lessons learned from its work in the Snoqualmie Valley to inform planning and decision-making processes in other APDs, with careful consideration given to issues specific to the Agricultural Production District in question. The Director of the Department of Natural Resources and Parks shall determine the level of support King County provides for Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, and Flood Advisory Committee or similar efforts in other geographies. These recommendations are reflected in a revised policy R-650a.

R-649 King County, through implementation of projects and programs, shall ensure sufficient land within Agricultural Production Districts remains available to support long term viability of commercial agriculture and that its programmatic and project actions support the maintenance or improvement of drainage and other agricultural support infrastructure. To the maximum extent practicable, King County should tailor measures to protect threatened or endangered species to support continued operation of working farms within the Agricultural Production Districts, and should strive for outcomes consistent with goals King County may establish for optimal area of productive agricultural lands within the Agricultural Production Districts.

Agriculture must remain the predominant use in any Agricultural Production District and aquatic habitat or floodplain restoration projects, as well as King County Mitigation Reserves Program projects, shall not reduce the ability to farm in the Agricultural Production District. Until the county implements a collaborative planning and review process in a watershed context as described in R-650, such projects are allowed only when supported by owners of the land where the proposed project is to be sited. Criteria to be considered:

- a. For a project proposed to be sited on lands that are unsuitable for direct agricultural production purposes, such as portions of property that have not historically been farmed due to soil conditions or frequent flooding, and which cannot be returned to productivity by drainage maintenance,**
- or**
- b. For a project proposed to be sited on lands suitable for direct agricultural production:**
 - (1) there are no unsuitable lands available that meet the technical or locational needs of the proposed project, and**
 - (2) the project is included in, or consistent with, an approved Water Resources**

155 **Inventory Area Salmon Recovery Plan, relevant agricultural plans, Flood Hazard**
156 **Management Plan or other similar watershed scale plan; or the project would not**
157 **reduce the baseline agricultural productivity within the Agricultural Production**
158 **District.**

159
160 **R-650** **The county shall administer a collaborative review process considering watershed**
161 **context for projects sponsored by the Water and Land Resources Division in any**
162 **unincorporated area of the County where habitat or floodplain restoration project**
163 **may result in reducing the amount of land available for farming.**

164
165 **The review process shall be administered by the Water and Land Resources Division**
166 **and strive for balance in outcomes that achieve co-equal goals of maintaining and**
167 **improving suitability of land for agricultural productivity, increasing habitat quality,**
168 **and restoring floodplains and ecological function. The review process should:**

- 169 • **occur early in the planning process for projects, and at regular intervals for**
170 **ongoing programs;**
- 171 • **consider guidance from relevant plans relating to agriculture, salmon**
172 **recovery, and floodplains;**
- 173 • **consider efforts for advancing multiple resource interests;**
- 174 • **track cumulative on-the-ground changes in land cover relative to acreage**
175 **targets for farmland and habitat restoration areas;**
- 176 • **consider input and recommendations resulting from engagement and input**
177 **from external partners and subject matter experts; and**
- 178 • **identify and address barriers to efficient implementation.**

179
180 **The review process may be offered for projects and programs sponsored by King**
181 **County agencies aside from the Water and Land Resources Division, or for projects**
182 **and programs sponsored by external entities.**

183
184 **King County should continue to refine its process for working in a watershed**
185 **context and reviewing projects and programmatic actions in Agricultural Production**
186 **Districts and other geographies within King County where farm, fish, and flood**
187 **interests converge. In its ongoing implementation and refinement efforts, King**
188 **County shall consider findings from relevant internal and external plans and seek**
189 **input from tribes, farmers, agricultural organizations, conservation organizations,**
190 **salmon recovery organizations, and other property owners and community**
191 **members.**

192
193 **R-650a** **The County shall continue to support the Snoqualmie Valley agricultural production**
194 **district farm, fish, flood effort through completion of the task forces and establishment**
195 **of measurable goals for agriculture, habitat restoration, and floodplain restoration for**

196 **the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District. The director of the Department**
197 **of Natural Resources and Parks shall determine King County’s level of support. The**
198 **county shall continue to document lessons learned to guide collaborative planning and**
199 **review processes in a watershed context for projects and programs in other**
200 **geographies with the co-equal goals of balancing farm, fish, and flood interests where**
201 **farms, fish habitat and floodplains overlap, as well as strategies for avoiding,**
202 **minimizing, and mitigating losses of farmable land, floodplain functions, and habitat**
203 **functions.**

204
205 **Until the county completes the collaborative process to determine the maximum**
206 **amount of agricultural land that may used for habitat restoration projects in the**
207 **Snoqualmie Valley APD, and considers habitat recovery goals, develops evaluation**
208 **criteria, a tracking system for the amount of agricultural land used for habitat**
209 **restoration projects, and establishes a decision-making process to guide all future**
210 **changes of agricultural land to habitat projects, the criteria in R-649 for siting habitat**
211 **projects in Agricultural Production Districts shall apply.**

212
213 **The county should support planning efforts similar to the Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm,**
214 **and Flood Advisory Committee in other geographies if and when the county and**
215 **partners choose to pursue such efforts in a particular Agricultural Production District or**
216 **other area of the county.**

217
218

MDRC and FFF Engagement

Draft Concept 9-27-22

KC Staff MDRC (APC)

Project and Program

Pre-acquisition/project – Feasibility (Role ends at project chartering)

- Review WLR-sponsored land purchases or capital projects that may affect agricultural land and fish habitat and/or flood functions
- Using FFF principles, provide sideboards for project proponent

Review Programs -(ADAP, TDR)

- Recommendation memo provided to WLR Div Dir by a balanced core membership of KC FFF staff, with additional disciplines as needed

FFF IOC Engagement

- **Monitor implementation of the 42** recommendations as resources allow; assess progress, priorities, and timelines, including all task forces
 - Review Task Force work for recommendations to forward to the Executive/DNRP Director
 - Form subcommittees as needed
- **Convene Annual CIP Review Meeting**
 - MDRC year in review briefing
 - WLR capital projects, including IDP current and upcoming
 - Review program progress (ADAP, TDR, PBRS/CUTS)
- **Other areas of potential progress:**
 - Ag and Habitat Acre within 2 yr.
 - Funding Strategies within 1 yr.
 - Flood Management Plan 2 yr.
 - Metrics - measure progress and ensure balance



FFF Comp Plan Subcommittee Meeting 10/4/22

Draft MDRC Concept

Please review and provide feedback on the draft MDRC concept proposal. Note: Concept has not been beta tested—more refinements are anticipated (including FFF Subcommittee input) to ensure this concept serves its primary purpose and does not result in excess bureaucracy.

DRAFT Concept:

MDRC Summary

The proposed MRDC would be a WLR staff group that would replace the APC and advise the WLRD Director earlier in the land acquisition and project design process. The MDRC would provide recommendations concerning multi-objective opportunities¹ and recommend the balancing of interests associated with WLRD proposed projects/programs where fish, farm and flood interests converge.² Intent is to improve decision making and provide greater transparency about those decisions important to the FFF IOC, partners, tribes, and communities.

MDRC responsibilities and qualifications:

- 1) Incorporate FFF principles within WLR operating procedures. This includes guiding projects toward maximizing multiple benefits and providing rationale when projects benefit one to the possible impacts of another.
- 2) Develop recommendations to the WLRD Director about balancing multiple benefits as projects and programs are planned and implemented. Identify areas of agreement and areas of disagreement.
- 3) Ensure adequate consideration of project proponent considerations.
- 4) Identify issues earlier in the process and standardize collaboration during critical stages of project development and project commitments.
- 5) Keep an ongoing record of recommendations about specific projects and ongoing programmatic efforts.

Periodically review the type and scale of projects and programs subject to MDRC review.

- 6) MDRC representatives will be from each F will be well grounded in the documents informing their engagement including KC documents (e.g., CWHH, SCAP, and ESJ). The MDRC will cite plans informing recommendations including but not limited to, FFF, salmon recovery plans, flood corridor plans, Transportation Needs Report, Flood Hazard Management Plan, Land Conservation Initiative, Comprehensive Plan, KC Subarea Plans,

¹ *Multi-objective opportunities may include agriculture, habitat, flood mitigation, climate resilience, and equity.*

² *The Division Director holds accountability within the Executive Branch for proposing biannual Division work plans that move through Department Leadership to the Executive to the KC Council for approval. The Division Director is then accountable for carrying out the council-approved budgeted work*

and the Agricultural Strategic Plan (pending). Representatives will also be well grounded in community opinions to inform confidential projects—such as land acquisitions.

MDRC Scope

For projects and programs occurring within a 100-year floodplain of unincorporated King County, the MDRC would review the following:

- 1) Prior to pursuing funding for land acquisitions within 100-year floodplains of County water bodies the MDRC will recommend multi-objective targets (for example, min/max buffers, % ag soils to be preserved, use or demolition of existing structures, compensatory storage potential).
- 2) Grants for plantings or CIP Projects to ensure multi-objective possibilities have been fully considered and as a requirement for WLR Division Director sign-off on grant submittal.
- 3) CIP Feasibility Studies will include or address recommendations from the MDRC for setting the parameters for the CIP project design.
- 4) Review of Priority Programs (e.g., ADAP, SHRP) prior to development of annual work program. Review to be conducted annually at a program level, rather than project by project, and include assessment of program criteria, service level projections, deliverables, and opportunities for multi-objective gains.
- 5) Review of additional projects or programs may be requested by FFF groups such as the Snoqualmie Valley FFF IOC if agreed to by the WLR Division Director.

MDRC Members

- 1) Core Team members would include a cross-section of WLR staff representing fish, farm and flood interests within WLR and within the community: OSA Unit Manager (Chair), AFI Unit Manager/Supervisor (Farm), Regional Partnerships Unit Manager (Fish), ERES Unit Manager (CIP), Unit Manager from Science Section (Science), Unit Manager from Stormwater section (Drainage/Water Quality), Unit Manager from F/A (Funding), River and Floodplain Management Unit Supervisor (Flood), Liaisons to FFF for Fish, Farm and Flood, River. When not the proponent, the Watershed Steward may be included on the Committee.
- 2) The WLR Project Proponent (Steward, CIP Project Manager, PBRs/CUT Program Analyst) will be communicated with regularly to ensure project/program is thoroughly understood by Core Team.
- 3) If agreed to by the Core team other subject matter experts may be invited into the conversation as needed, but recommendations will be developed by the Core Team.

FFF and Community Engagement

- 1) At the FFF annual project and program (list of 42) review, presentations will include a summary of the MDRC findings and recommendations. At the annual Project/Program review, FFF IOC may recommend projects where they would like to see additional exploration of alternatives or approaches undertaken by the MDRC.
- 2) MDRC FFF liaisons will be informed and remain connected with their FFF Caucuses so they can represent their interests in the conversations/review.
- 3) The project manager will follow current best practice for community outreach (including prior recommendations from FFF). Special outreach may occur based on recommendations from the FFF IOC.

DRAFT

Snoqualmie Fish Farm Flood Implementation Oversight Committee

December 7, 2022

The Honorable Dow Constantine King
County Executive
401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 800
Seattle, WA 98104

RE: Support for King County Comprehensive Plan Update and Commitment to Ongoing Work of the Snoqualmie Fish Farm Flood

Dear Executive Constantine:

The Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood (FFF) Implementation Oversight Committee (IOC) is a collaborative watershed planning process, first contemplated in the 2012 Comprehensive Plan. FFF output has been to assess competing goals and make recommendations that will guide balanced progress across critical priorities of protecting farmland, restoring habitat, and reducing flood risks in a shared landscape. Past recommendations have influenced new County processes that benefit King County and its partners. The IOC is comprised of individuals with diverse backgrounds and perspectives, including farmers as well as representatives of the Tulalip and Snoqualmie tribes, the King Conservation District, the Wild Fish Conservancy, the City of Duvall, the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum, the Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washington State Department of Ecology, and Washington state Department of Agriculture, the King County Agriculture Commission and the Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance.

The IOC recommendations contained in this letter and the attachments represent the committed work by the Committee in their role to provide oversight of the actions recommended in the June 12, 2017, letter to you and then County Council Chair Joe McDermott. IOC recommendations continue to build upon the foundation built in prior years through this current implementation phase.

In preparation for the upcoming 2024 Comprehensive Plan update, the FFF IOC convened a sub-committee to do a thorough assessment of the Comprehensive Plan narrative and policies that have guided the IOC efforts; R-649; R-650; R-650a; and R-651. The subcommittee's recommendations were subsequently revised and adopted by the FFF IOC (Attachment A) and are offered for consideration as you prepare your 2024 Comp Plan Update recommendations to the KCC.

Our recommendations support efforts that continue to advance and balance the three important county goals represented in these policies at a watershed scale: restoring habitat to aid salmon recovery; supporting farmers and preserving farmland; and, reducing flood risk for farmers and other Snoqualmie Valley residents.

The IOC commends and appreciates the ongoing commitment to these critical priorities. The dedication from the Executive branch and leadership at the Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD) spurs the IOC members to remain enthusiastic toward balanced solutions and innovation in the watershed planning context.

“Bundling” was a central premise in the 2017 recommendations; the idea that progress among the three F’s should be commensurate. While bundling is focused on the top tier commitment—large habitat restoration projects and comprehensive agricultural drainage improvements--the IOC’s intent continues to be that a mutual commitment exists to expedite funding and resources to accomplish *all* the priorities in Appendix II to the 2017 letter. While much progress has been made on both priorities, much more remains to be done. We feel strongly that King County and all the signatories to the 2017 letter should be committed to finding the necessary resources to that end.

As caucus chairs representing participants in the Fish, Farm and Flood Advisory Committee, we, as individuals or through our respective organizations, pledge to support the recommendations and the importance of bundling as described above. Moreover, we will stand up for and advocate for all the actions named in the recommendations and will rely upon the undersigned to advocate for all actions as well. Finally, through our work with implementing partner organizations, we will support the recommended actions reflected in this letter.

To that end, the following represent our high priority actions over the next biennium:

- Complete the process for setting agricultural and habitat acreage targets and establish a tracking process to monitor and communicate changes overtime.
- Implementation of the Agricultural Strategic Plan, developed by an FFF Task Force representing the Snoqualmie Valley farming community. We anticipate that in the first or second quarter of 2023, that FFF will forward the Executive a recommendation on this Ag Strategic Plan.
- Where appropriate, integrate FFF recommendations into King County Flood Hazard Management Plan update being led by WLRD.
- Complete the Buffers Implementation Task force and accelerate planting buffers.
- Complete the 2 D modeling of the Snoqualmie Valley.
- Implement a transparent process to ensure the voices of people outside the County have input to the administrative procedure for the proposed WLR Multidisciplinary Review Committee (MDRC). Request that the MDRC process starts as soon as possible (before the comp plan is complete).
- Commitment that the Snoqualmie FFF process will continue to have support through the next biennium, including at a minimum an annual meeting to present CIP concepts, designs or upcoming construction in or affecting the Snoqualmie Valley, and an annual meeting regarding FFF progress on recommendations annual meeting
- Establish a comprehensive funding strategy for implementation of FFF recommendations.
- Request the Executive consider appointing a representative from the Watershed Improvement District (WID) as an official IOC advisory committee member.
- Request again the presence of an FCD representative

In addition to the above, the IOC would like to highlight the following deliberated requests from the caucuses:

- The MDRC use a consistent process, including an acreage tracking tool, as part of the evaluation for project proposals of suitable habitat sites that will result in removal of agricultural land from production; and, have administrative procedures that define when engagement with other FFF Partners is needed.
- While lessons learned for the Snoqualmie FFF process have benefited county-wide processes, other APDs may have unique challenges that warrant similar collaborative efforts to determine criteria for balancing multi-objective actions (e.g., acreage targets, tracking and evaluation)

- To limit confusion, use the term “conversion” in its legal sense under the Growth Management Act
- Limit the use of qualifiers such as “viable” when protecting ag land; all farmland needs protection without subjectivity.
- Ensure the Endangered Species Act is referenced
- In R-649 (b) 2) Replace “Farm Management” with “relevant agricultural plans” seeking to allow for progressive planning efforts in APDs
- Whenever possible, seek to not only restore habitat, but enhance it

Getting to agreement around priority recommendations and guidance language was a rewarding effort and seeing implementation of these actions is even more meaningful.

Sincerely,

Angela Donaldson, CFM
FFF Flood Caucus Chair, FFF Comp Plan Sub-Committee Chair

Bobbi Lindemulder
FFF Farm Caucus Chair

Cindy Spiry, Snoqualmie Indian Tribe
FFF Fish Caucus Chair

cc: Christie True, Director, Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)
Josh Baldi, Division Director, Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD), DNRP Megan Smith, Deputy Director, WLRD, DNRP
Joan Lee, Manager, Rural and Regional Services Section (RRSS), WLRD, DNRP Curt Crawford, Manager, Stormwater Services Section (SWS), WLRD, DNRP John Brosnan, Strategic Planning Manager, SWS, WLRD, DNRP
Janne Kaje, Regional Partnerships Unit Supervisor, RRSS, WLRD, DNRP Richard Martin, Environmental Programs Managing Supervisor, WLRD, DNRP

Snoqualmie Fish Farm Flood Implementation Oversight Committee

December 7, 2022

The Honorable Dow Constantine
King County Executive
401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 800
Seattle, WA 98104

RE: Support for King County Comprehensive Plan Update and Commitment to Ongoing Work of the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood

Dear Executive Constantine:

The Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood (FFF) Implementation Oversight Committee (IOC) is a collaborative watershed planning process, first contemplated in the 2012 Comprehensive Plan. FFF output has been to assess competing goals and make recommendations that will guide balanced progress across critical priorities of protecting farmland, restoring habitat, and reducing flood risks in a shared landscape. Past recommendations have influenced new County processes that benefit King County and its partners. The IOC is comprised of individuals with diverse backgrounds and perspectives, including farmers as well as representatives of the Tulalip Tribes, Snoqualmie Tribe, the King Conservation District, the Wild Fish Conservancy, the City of Duvall, the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum, the Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washington State Department of Ecology, Washington State Department of Agriculture, the King County Agriculture Commission and the Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance.

The recommendations contained in this letter and the attachments represent the committed work by the IOC in their role to provide oversight of the actions recommended in the June 12, 2017, letter to you and then County Council Chair Joe McDermott. IOC recommendations continue to build upon the foundation built in prior years through this current implementation phase.

In preparation for the upcoming 2024 Comprehensive Plan update, the FFF IOC convened a sub-committee to do a thorough assessment of the Comprehensive Plan narrative and policies that have guided the IOC efforts: R-649; R-650; R-650a; and R-651. The subcommittee's recommendations were subsequently revised and adopted by the FFF IOC (Attachment A) and are offered for your consideration as you prepare your 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update recommendations to the King County Council.

Our recommendations support efforts that continue to advance and balance the three important county goals represented in these policies at a watershed scale: restoring habitat to aid salmon recovery; supporting farmers and preserving farmland; and reducing flood risk for farmers and other Snoqualmie Valley residents.

The IOC commends and appreciates the ongoing commitment to these critical priorities. The dedication from the Executive branch and leadership at the Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD) spurs the IOC members to remain enthusiastic toward balanced solutions and innovation in the watershed planning context.

The Honorable Dow Constantine
December 7, 2022

The idea that progress among the three F's should be commensurate was a central premise in the 2017 recommendations. While progress is focused on the top tier commitment—large habitat restoration projects and comprehensive agricultural drainage improvements--the IOC's intent continues to be that a mutual commitment exists to expedite funding and resources to accomplish *all* the priorities in Appendix II to the 2017 letter. While much progress has been made on both priorities, much more remains to be done. We feel strongly that King County and all the signatories to the 2017 letter should be committed to finding the necessary resources to that end.

As caucus chairs representing participants in the Fish, Farm and Flood Advisory Committee (IOC), we, as individuals or through our respective organizations, pledge to support the recommendations and the importance of commensurate progress as described above. Moreover, we will stand up for and advocate for all the actions named in the recommendations and will rely upon the undersigned to advocate for all actions as well. Finally, through our work with implementing partner organizations, we will support the recommended actions reflected in this letter. It would make sense that the next paragraph after the above would highlight the overall changes to the policies in Attachment A so they are clear. This gets into a lot of detail that doesn't seem relevant to the point of the letter or necessarily actionable by the Executive. Did we document any agreement that the IOC came to in revising the policies? I thought it was more of, we need to update language, I propose a subcommittee with representation from each F. Note in editing- changed the word bundling to commensurate progress.

To that end, the following represent our high priority actions over the next biennium:

- Complete the process for setting agricultural and habitat acreage targets for the Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District and establish a tracking process to monitor and communicate changes over time. Confirming this is only for Snoqualmie APD, right? Fish caucus has not agreed as a group that they need or have a process to develop habitat acreage targets. Timing and process consideration – Fish has buffer targets but what process will be used to develop habitat targets? Fish implementing a 10-year habitat project list developed in 2016, Forum staff will update in 2025–2026, list will be a moving target. Remove and habitat? Open to discuss. Does the target discussion require a separate task force? Thoughts? Statement in letter?
- Implementation of (Support for) the Agricultural Strategic Plan, developed by an FFF Task Force representing the Snoqualmie Valley farming community. We anticipate that in the first or second quarter of 2023, that FFF will forward the Executive a recommendation on this Ag Strategic Plan. Intended to be an agricultural community document, not a County document. Difficult to support or advocate for when we haven't seen the final report.
- Where appropriate, integrate FFF recommendations into the King County Flood Hazard Management Plan update being led by WLRD.
- Complete the Buffers Implementation Task force and accelerate planting buffers.
- Complete the 2 D modeling of the Snoqualmie Valley.
- Complete an analysis of predicted climate impacts to active agricultural lands to develop recommendations for habitat restoration and agricultural production relative to elevation and flood risk.
- Implement a transparent process to ensure the voices of people outside the County have input to the administrative procedure for the proposed WLR Multidisciplinary Review Committee (MDRC). Request that the MDRC process starts as soon as possible (before the comp plan is

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

complete). *What does this look like – “ensure the voices outside the County have input to the administrative procedure...” particularly tribes? The liaison as described in the separate MDRC concept document? The privacy needed for acquisitions may/will preclude outside direct involvement. Will FFF want to also review and recommend final MDRC scope and procedures in the next meeting?*

- Commitment that the Snoqualmie FFF process will continue to have support through the next biennium, including at a minimum an annual meeting to present CIP concepts, designs or upcoming construction in or affecting the Snoqualmie Valley, and an annual meeting regarding FFF progress on recommendations. *Do we want to state quarterly caucus meetings to keep progress and collaboration at the forefront and use of new task forces as funding is available.*
- Establish a comprehensive funding strategy for implementation of FFF recommendations. *There may be opportunities for applying for multi-benefit grants to implement many of the FFF priorities.*
- Request the Executive consider appointing a representative from the Watershed Improvement District (WID) as an official IOC advisory committee member. *How to ensure balanced representation? Need?*
- Request again the presence of an FCD representative as an official IOC advisory committee member.

In addition to the above, the IOC would like to highlight the following deliberated requests from the caucuses: *(Not sure of the benefit of sharing deliberations with the Executive. These should reflect changes proposed to the comp plan text, not things that haven't been agreed on. Are there priorities in the changed policies that we would like to highlight? If these are what should be included, many of them need more context to make sense.)*

- The MDRC use a consistent process, including an acreage tracking tool, as part of the evaluation for project proposals of suitable habitat sites that will result in removal of agricultural land from production and have administrative procedures that define when engagement with other FFF Partners is needed.
- While lessons learned for the Snoqualmie FFF process have benefited county-wide processes, other APDs may have unique challenges that warrant similar collaborative efforts to determine criteria for balancing multi-objective actions (e.g., acreage targets, tracking and evaluation). *We are still wondering how this will be documented to inform MDRC or how they could apply to other APD who may wish to come forward in the future?*
- To limit confusion, use the term “conversion” in its legal sense under the Growth Management Act *This needs more context.*
- Limit the use of qualifiers such as “viable” when protecting ag land; all farmland needs protection without subjectivity.
- Ensure the Endangered Species Act is referenced
- In R-649 (b) 2) Replace “Farm Management” with “relevant agricultural plans” seeking to allow for progressive planning efforts in APDs
- Whenever possible, seek to not only restore habitat, but enhance it

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Getting to agreement around priority recommendations and guidance language was a rewarding effort and seeing implementation of these actions is even more meaningful.

The Honorable Dow Constantine
December 7, 2022

Sincerely,

Angela Donaldson, CFM
FFF Flood Caucus Chair, FFF Comp Plan Sub-Committee Chair

Bobbi Lindemulder
FFF Farm Caucus Chair

Cindy Spiry, Snoqualmie Indian Tribe
FFF Fish Caucus Chair

cc: Christie True, Director, Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)
Josh Baldi, Division Director, Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD), DNRP
Megan Smith, Deputy Director, WLRD, DNRP
Joan Lee, Manager, Rural and Regional Services Section (RRSS), WLRD, DNRP
Curt Crawford, Manager, Stormwater Services Section (SWS), WLRD, DNRP
John Brosnan, Strategic Planning Manager, SWS, WLRD, DNRP
Janne Kaje, Regional Partnerships Unit Supervisor, RRSS, WLRD, DNRP
Richard Martin, Environmental Programs Managing Supervisor, WLRD, DNRP