

	<b>FFF IOC Meeting Agenda – Single Purpose meeting</b> March 8 , 2023 3:00 AM – 4:30 PM TEAMS	
	<b>Meeting Goals:</b> Finalize the King County Comp Plan update recommendations. Identify concepts for a letter to the Executive in support of FFF and to recommend the updated comprehensive plan policies.	
3:00-3:05	<b>1. Welcome, Introductions and Service Recognition</b>	Joan Lee
3:05-4:00	<b>2. Comprehensive Plan Update</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Recommended consensus language from Comp Plan Subcommittee , Angela Donaldson, Chair</li> <li>b. Statement of consensus recommendation (Angela)</li> <li>c. Brief review of changes that brought to consensus (Murph)</li> <li>d. Motion/Second to recommend</li> <li>e. Discussion</li> <li>f. Decision</li> <li>g. Raise a cup of coffee or tea or wholesome water if we get to consensus!</li> </ol> Materials: Draft comp plan policy and brief table of changes	Michael Murphy & Joan Lee
	<b>3. Next Steps</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Deadlines (Murph)</li> <li>b. Letter to the Executive</li> </ol> Materials: Draft letter to the Executive	Michael Murphy & Joan Lee
4:15-4:25	<b>4. If time: Ex-Officio Member Updates/Around the Table</b>	Ex Officio Members/IOC members
4:25- 4:30	<b>Public input</b>	Joan Lee
4:30	<b>Adjourn</b>	

# Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood 2.0 Implementation Oversight Committee

## DRAFT MEETING NOTES

**Wednesday, December 7, 2022  
12:30 pm to 2:30 pm (scheduled)  
Zoom Video Conference Call**

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	N
Micah Wait, Wild Fish Conservancy	N	Meredith Molli, Agriculture Commission	N		
Daryl Williams, Tulalip Tribes <i>(proxy: Kurt Nelson - N)</i>	Y	Libby Reed, Sno Valley Tilth	Y		
Rick Shaffer, Snoqualmie Forum	Y	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 12:35 pm.

#### a) Welcome

Kayla Eicholtz of the state Department of Ecology was introduced as the new regional floodplain planner, who also helps with national flood insurance program.

#### b) FFF Written Updates - Questions

There were no questions posed by those present.

#### c) Updates and Questions – Josh Baldi

- King County’s River and Floodplain Management Section (RFMS) team has updated Councilmember Sarah Perry on their work in the Snoqualmie Valley on behalf of the Flood Control District (FCD).
- A group including Lauren Silver, Wayne Gullstad, and Beth leDoux provided an update last week on the buffer task force to Ruth Musgrave, Natural Resources Senior Policy Advisor in Governor Inslee’s office. There is a keen interest in FFF work in this space. Musgrave was impressed, but made it clear something that requires this much work may not emerge in legislation anytime soon and this discussion may go on for a while. Musgrave was offered a field visit to the Snoqualmie Valley and expressed interest in doing so.
- Baldi singled out Angela Donaldson’s leadership, specifically on work on the King County Comprehensive (“Comp”) Plan. Baldi thanked Donaldson and all who have contributed input on the plan and corresponding letter to the Executive. Anyone with feedback for the floodplain citizen partner group should also contact Donaldson.

### II) Comprehensive (“Comp”) Plan Update, Future FFF Engagement, and Letter to Executive

Angela Donaldson has led a subcommittee to propose updates to the King County Comp Plan – specifically policies R649, R650, and R650A – in relation to FFF. The group has met several times since February and looks to send their work to the Executive with a clear consensus. This will include a motion to approve the comp plan narrative and policy revisions as written or amended, then moving on.

Donaldson motioned that the IOC approve the narrative and policy language updates as written. Cindy Spiry seconded the motion, which was followed by a lengthy discussion.

Discussion first focused on a perceived discrepancy in R650 between narrative and policy on the matter of the Multi-Disciplinary Review Committee (MDRC), a non-permitting collaborative project review process: whether the MDRC would be just for projects in the APD, or in any unincorporated area of the county where habitat or floodplain restoration projects may reduce farmland. Michael Murphy of DNRP offered to clarify language to state the MDRC

would apply in all areas of King County. There was a concern voiced that the County would struggle with setting up a land use tracking system to document farmland outside of APDs.

Discussion shifted to concern voiced by several IOC members, that the County may be “overstepping” in policy language asking to extend the MDRC beyond the Snoqualmie Valley. Murphy said the MDRC would apply to unincorporated areas where the three “fish, farm, and flood” interests converge, but not everywhere in the county. Josh Baldi added this is not intended to impose, but to create an option; to try to operationalize best practices and be more thoughtful and engaging earlier in the project process. A concern was also voiced on increasing difficulty in getting habitat projects permitted outside of APDs, that the IOC isn’t looking to do MDRC reviews outside of APDs. Donaldson explained current R650 language already applies to all APDs, not just the Snoqualmie, that the only issue being broadened in the subcommittee’s requested language change is to go beyond APDs.

Donaldson asked for a show of IOC hands on how many members wanted the MDRC process relevant specifically to APDs, not other parts of unincorporated King County. Three fish caucus members raised their hands. A few farm caucus members noted there is power in taking what’s learned from the Snoqualmie FFF process and applying it elsewhere, that the MDRC can help move projects forward and find benefits to all three “Fs” in areas outside the APDs. It was also noted that about 40% of farming in King County happens outside the APDs and that having a place to farm outside the APDs is key for agriculture.

Baldi explained the MDRC process will happen in WLRD internally regardless of FFF. Baldi further clarified the intent of FFF is not to impose on all of King County, but offer a recommendation for the Snoqualmie, and beyond that would be in the hands of WLRD. WLRD can make recommendations to the Executive about what should be implemented elsewhere. Tamie Kellogg clarified to the IOC that the recommendation on the table was that the collaborative review process would happen in any unincorporated area of the county. Kellogg noted any points of disagreement could be called out in the Executive letter or referred to caucus co-chairs for separate discussion.

After further discussion, it was agreed to vote on the R650 language as originally proposed, with none of the edits offered by the fish caucus prior to today’s meeting.

Angela Donaldson made a motion to approve R650 as written. Bobbi Lindemulder seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of six yeas to three nays.

It was noted the three “nay” voters would likely have approved the motion if the language on unincorporated areas in the first paragraph of R650 had been removed. A concern was voiced about how the MDRC process could increase delays for habitat restoration projects.

Discussion then moved to the R650A language. Much of this discussion focused on the setting of acreage targets for protecting farmland and for habitat projects, as indicated in the original FFF agreement. However, details for this goal were not clearly outlined in language of the original 42 FFF actions. Angela Donaldson explained not much is changing here, but the IOC does have a duty to update the language. This language states the IOC wants support/funds for FFF to continue, and that acreage targets for protecting farmland – but not necessarily habitat restoration – need to be determined, as guided by policy R649, and the County should support this for other APDs if needed.

There was some discussion as to the benefit toward larger FFF goals to try to define specific acreage targets now, especially given the ongoing effects of climate change. Further discussion from the fish caucus leaned toward removing a targeted habitat restoration acreage, that it isn’t really a significant issue for them. Farm caucus members supported this revision as long as they still got farmland acreage targets from the agriculture strategic plan task force, citing this is key to tracking farmland loss. Joan Lee, acting DNRP FFF project manager, stressed that a fundamental point in the original FFF agreement was agreeing that everyone at the table would come to agreement at some point on farm acreage.

Before agreeing to switch discussion to the Executive transmittal letter, Donaldson asked for a motion to approve R650A as written. Libby Reed made the motion, with Donaldson seconding. The motion passed with two nays and one abstention. The nay voters explained their sticking point against voting “yea” was discomfort with putting maximum acreage targets on farmland used for habitat restoration projects.

Donaldson noted a voiced concern about voting by majority as opposed to the IOC’s traditional consensus method, explaining this vote was largely to gauge where the IOC stands and document what language specifically needs to change. Donaldson expressed reservation about moving disagreement points into the transmittal letter until a clear intent was determined, but felt good about R650 and R650A due to the vote and clear guidance on the language. A few others voiced concern about moving the Executive transmittal letter forward today without a full IOC consensus.

Michael Murphy explained the comp plan timeline, that there is time to revise the language. Policy language needs to be 95% dialed in by April 10, for transmittal to King County Regional Planning. The hope was to get a jump start on this letter to give the Executive time to respond to it before then. What's due on April 10 is all narrative and policy, with no accompanying code. The hard deadline for the language is September, to transmit to Regional Planning for the Executive to transmit to King County Council (KCC). The IOC agreed to schedule one more meeting of the comp plan subcommittee as soon as possible, before the end of the year if feasible, to hash out the remaining disagreement points in this language. Donaldson requested any changes to policy language be specific in what needs to change.

### III) Ex Officio Member Updates

- **Kayla Eicholtz** gave an update on the [Flood Control Assistance Program](#) (FCAP). Applications for the 2023-2025 cycle run from mid-February through the end of March. The focus for FCAP this year is competitive planning projects. Workshops on January 11 and 19 will detail more about what is eligible. Priority funding is to be given to projects for underserved or overburdened communities.
- **Daryl Williams** reported on two yet-to-be-filed bills for next month's legislative session, both addressing voluntary stewardship programs (VSP). One bill would allow non-VSP counties to opt into the program late, which – if this were to happen with FFF – would mean restructuring FFF to fit the VSP mold. The second bill would apply to counties with VSP programs similar to FFF, and require them to file a plan with the conservation commission for approval, which could also mean more access to state funds. **Gary Bahr** agreed to track these bills as well.
- **Josh Baldi** reported the SEPA scoping comments for the King County flood plan are due this Friday, and asked Joan Lee to send out info to FFF members who wish to comment on this. Baldi noted that while the conversation at today's IOC meeting didn't necessarily land where they all wanted, these discussions still very much influence the way of thinking about this work under WLRD.

### IV) Public Input/Adjourn (*Tamie Kellogg*)

There was no public input.

The meeting ended at 2:32 pm.

***From Agricultural Strategic Plan Draft as of 03-08-2023***

***Farmable classification is land that can be readily farmed. Farmable includes the sub-categories of currently farmed, fallow, and agriculture infrastructure.***

*Currently Farmed* - Actively being farmed by the 214 commercial farm operations in the SVAPD primarily for forage, livestock, crop, and flower production.

*Fallow* is designated as farmable ground that is idle and currently not being farmed due to owner or management transition. Owner may need assistance to find farmers to operate on this land. Additional infrastructure improvements may be needed to make this ground productive when it has been fallow over time.

*Farm infrastructure* includes farm buildings on farm properties such as homes, barns, loafing sheds, manure lagoons, farm access roads, etc.

DRAFT COMP PLAN NARRATIVE/POLICY FOR FFF SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEW/COMMENT

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 ~~and honoring and sustaining the rights held by the State of Washington and Indian tribes as sovereign~~  
19 ~~trustees for fish, wildlife, and other aquatic resources,~~

Deleted: with  
Deleted: tribal treaty rights

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

Deleted: ing  
Deleted: other -developed  
Deleted: (or...not including  
Deleted: )

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

DRAFT COMP PLAN NARRATIVE/POLICY FOR FFF SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEW/COMMENT

46 context and improving balance in King County's work to advance multiple objectives. As a result of the ongoing  
47 efforts of the Snoqualmie farm, fish, flood process, the County has begun to operationalize recommendations,  
48 including recommendations for a revised administrative process for reviewing proposed projects and programmatic  
49 actions in locations where agriculture, fish habitat, and floodplains intersect.

50  
51 The revised administrative review process will occur in a watershed context by considering information from a  
52 variety of sources, including four task forces convened based on recommendations from the Snoqualmie farm, fish,  
53 flood effort:

- 54 • Buffers Task Force and Buffer Implementation Task Force recommendations for use of King County funds  
55 to implement voluntary, science-based, variable-width riparian, plantings;
- 56 • Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District Strategic Plan Task Force to consider strategies to  
57 improve the long-term productivity of farmland, bring more acres into production, especially food  
58 production, and increase opportunities for farmers to develop the necessary infrastructure to support or  
59 increase their farm businesses in the Snoqualmie Valley; and
- 60 • Regulatory Task Force, to evaluate and recommend improvements to regulations to promote a viable  
61 agricultural economy and maintain and enhance habitat protection and healthy ecosystems.

62  
63 While these task forces were developed with a specific focus on the Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District, the  
64 lessons learned have informed principles which guide how the County works to achieve multiple benefits through  
65 projects and programmatic actions implemented in other Agricultural Production Districts and all areas of  
66 unincorporated King County where agriculture, salmon habitat, and floodplains converge.

67  
68 Additionally, the revised administrative review process should consider recommendations from relevant plans  
69 completed by King County and partner organizations related to salmon recovery, agriculture, drainage, floodplain  
70 management, climate change, forest management, comprehensive and subarea planning, transportation and other  
71 relevant plans. The revised administrative review process should incorporate and promote multi-objective thinking  
72 wherever possible.

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

Deleted: three

Deleted: ,

Deleted: to develop science-based

Deleted: a policy that encourages

Deleted: riparian

Deleted: using science based variable-width riparian recommendations

Deleted: the

DRAFT COMP PLAN NARRATIVE/POLICY FOR FFF SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEW/COMMENT

92 Using recommendations from the Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, and Flood Advisory Committee, King County has  
93 revised the process for reviewing projects in a watershed context, which is described in revised policy R-650. This  
94 process will apply to projects sponsored by the Water and Land Resources Division in all Agricultural Production  
95 Districts [as well as unincorporated areas outside Agricultural Production districts where fish, farm and flood](#)  
96 [interests converge](#), and may be invoked for other projects if requested by project sponsors. Revised policy R-650  
97 outlines the minimum required elements of an administrative review process for habitat and floodplain restoration  
98 capital projects and programs sponsored by the King County Water and Land Resources Division where fish, farm  
99 and flood interests intersect. When planning and implementing projects of all types, King County should consider  
100 watershed context and strive for consistency with recommendations in relevant plans related to salmon recovery,  
101 agriculture and floodplains. Specifically, for projects sponsored by the Water and Land Resources Division in areas  
102 where farms, fish habitat and floodplains overlap, the review process should:

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

112 The purpose of the review process shall be to develop recommendations to the Water and Land Resources Division  
113 director to inform their decisions about approvals of locations, scope, and scale of proposed projects, with the  
114 overarching goal for project outcomes to result in continued gains with respect to the viability of agriculture,  
115 ecological benefits, and preservation or restoration of resilient landscapes. Additionally, the County should  
116 periodically engage agricultural communities and habitat and flood partners as the review process is implemented to  
117 discuss continued refinements to the process.  
118

119 The review process may also be conducted for projects sponsored by entities other than the Water and Land  
120 Resources Division, including those that facilitate infrastructure and drainage improvement projects on privately  
121 owned farmland to support continued long-term commercial agricultural uses within Agricultural Production  
122 Districts.  
123

124 The Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, and Flood Advisory Committee process and associated planning work has been  
125 instrumental in King County and partners learning how to balance needs of agriculture, salmon recovery, and  
126 floodplain management in a collaborative manner considering watershed context. As a result, implementing targeted  
127



128 planning efforts in all Agricultural Production Districts is no longer required for other Agricultural Production  
129 Districts.

130  
131 King County shall continue to support the Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, and Flood Advisory Committee until the  
132 level of progress envisioned at the formation of the committee is substantially complete, and King County should  
133 consider supporting similar collaborative efforts in other geographies when residents and partners request a localized  
134 planning effort. In its ongoing work in the Snoqualmie Valley and other geographies, the County shall seek to  
135 develop strategies, plans, and agreements that accommodate multiple methods of achieving balance in benefits to  
136 farming, fish habitat and flood risk reduction efforts (e.g. avoidance/minimization of impacts, onsite mitigation  
137 efforts, offsite offsets, etc.) King County should use lessons learned from its work in the Snoqualmie Valley to inform  
138 planning and decision-making processes in other APDs, with careful consideration given to issues specific to the  
139 Agricultural Production District in question. The Director of the Department of Natural Resources and Parks shall  
140 determine the level of support King County provides for Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, and Flood Advisory  
141 Committee or similar efforts in other geographies. These recommendations are reflected in a revised policy R-650a.

142  
143 **R-649**                    **King County, through implementation of projects and programs, shall ensure**  
144 **sufficient land within Agricultural Production Districts remains available to support**  
145 **long term viability of commercial agriculture and that its programmatic and project**  
146 **actions support the maintenance or improvement of drainage and other agricultural**  
147 **support infrastructure. To the maximum extent practicable, King County should**  
148 **tailor measures to protect threatened or endangered species to support continued**  
149 **operation of working farms within the Agricultural Production Districts, and should**  
150 **strive for outcomes consistent with goals King County may establish for optimal**  
151 **area of productive agricultural lands within the Agricultural Production Districts.**

152  
153 **Agriculture must remain the predominant use in any Agricultural Production District**  
154 **and aquatic habitat or floodplain restoration projects, as well as King County**  
155 **Mitigation Reserves Program projects, shall not reduce the ability to farm in the**  
156 **Agricultural Production District. Until the county implements a collaborative**  
157 **planning and review process in a watershed context as described in R-650, such**  
158 **projects are allowed only when supported by owners of the land where the proposed**  
159 **project is to be sited. Criteria to be considered:**

160 **a. For a project proposed to be sited on lands that are unsuitable for direct**  
161 **agricultural production purposes, such as portions of property that have not**  
162 **historically been farmed due to soil conditions or frequent flooding, and which**  
163 **cannot be returned to productivity by drainage maintenance,**

164 **or**

165 **b. For a project proposed to be sited on lands suitable for direct agricultural**  
166 **production:**

167 **(1) there are no unsuitable lands available that meet the technical or locational needs**  
168 **of the proposed project, and**

169 (2) the project is included in, or consistent with, an approved Water Resources  
170 Inventory Area Salmon Recovery Plan, relevant agricultural plans, Flood Hazard  
171 Management Plan or other similar watershed scale plan; or the project would not  
172 reduce the baseline agricultural productivity within the Agricultural Production  
173 District.

174  
175 **R-650** The county shall administer a collaborative review process considering watershed  
176 context for projects sponsored by the Water and Land Resources Division in any  
177 unincorporated area of the County where habitat, or floodplain restoration project  
178 may result in reducing the amount of land available for farming, as well as for  
179 drainage improvement programs or other land-based agriculture infrastructure  
180 projects that may affect habitat or floodplain function.

Deleted: drainage,

181  
182 The review process shall be administered by the Water and Land Resources Division  
183 and strive for balance in outcomes that achieve co-equal goals of maintaining and  
184 improving suitability of land for agricultural productivity, increasing habitat quality,  
185 and restoring floodplains and ecological function. The review process should:

- 186 • occur early in the planning process for projects, and at regular intervals for  
187 ongoing programs;
- 188 • consider guidance from relevant plans relating to agriculture, salmon  
189 recovery, and floodplains;
- 190 • consider efforts for advancing multiple resource interests;
- 191 • track on-the-ground changes in land cover relative to farmland and habitat  
192 restoration areas, focused on impacts to agricultural lands and fish  
193 populations;
- 194 • consider input and recommendations resulting from engagement and input  
195 from external partners and subject matter experts; and
- 196 • identify and address barriers to efficient implementation.

Deleted: cumulative

Deleted: acreage targets for

197  
198 The review process may be offered for projects and programs sponsored by King  
199 County agencies aside from the Water and Land Resources Division, or for projects  
200 and programs sponsored by external entities.

201  
202 King County should continue to refine its process for working in a watershed  
203 context and reviewing projects and programmatic actions in Agricultural Production  
204 Districts and other geographies within King County where farm, fish, and flood  
205 interests converge. In its ongoing implementation and refinement efforts, King  
206 County shall consider findings from relevant internal and external plans and seek  
207 input from tribes, farmers, agricultural organizations, conservation organizations,  
208 salmon recovery organizations, other property owners and community members,  
209 and the Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, Flood Implementation Oversight Committee.

Deleted: and

214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240

**R-650a**

The County shall continue to support the Snoqualmie Valley agricultural production district farm, fish, flood effort through completion of the task forces and establishment of measurable goals for agriculture, habitat restoration, and floodplain restoration for the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District. The director of the Department of Natural Resources and Parks shall determine King County’s level of support. The county shall continue to document lessons learned to guide collaborative planning and review processes in a watershed context for projects and programs in other geographies with the co-equal goals of balancing farm, fish, and flood interests where farms, fish habitat and floodplains overlap, as well as strategies for avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating losses of farmable land, floodplain functions, and habitat functions.

Until the county completes the collaborative process to determine [minimum acreage targets for both agricultural lands and floodplain and riparian habitat project area](#) in the Snoqualmie Valley APD, develops evaluation criteria [including climate change](#), a tracking system for the amount of agricultural land used for habitat restoration projects, and establishes a decision-making process to guide all future changes of agricultural land to habitat projects, the criteria in R-649 for siting habitat projects in Agricultural Production Districts shall apply.

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

- Deleted: in
- Deleted: the maximum amount of agricultural land that may used for habitat restoration projects
- Deleted: , and considers habitat recovery goals

**FFF Narrative and Policy changes explained**

23-Jan-23

**Line numbers**

*(in 'All Markup' view)*

Line numbers	Original language	New language	Rationale for change
18-19	King County continues to work toward recovery of all salmonid species given the nexus of salmonid populations with tribal treaty rights.	King County continues to work toward recovery of all salmonid species given the nexus of salmonid populations and honoring and sustaining the rights held by the State of Washington and Indian tribes as sovereign trustees for fish, wildlife, and other aquatic resources.	Agreed upon language after discussions among King County tribal liaison and Snoqualmie Tribe staff, with input from other tribes, as well.
26-27	Maintaining land use rules preventing conversions of agricultural land to other uses will have a co-benefit of limiting new development that may be at increased risk of damage from floods.	Maintaining land use rules that prevent conversions of agricultural land to uses other than habitat restoration or flood protection will have a co-benefit of limiting new development that may be at increased risk of damage from floods.	clarifying edit re benefits of preventing certain uses on ag land
46-50	...including three task forces convened based on recommendations from the Snoqualmie farm, fish, flood effort: •Buffers Task Force, to develop science-based recommendations for a policy that encourages voluntary riparian plantings using variable-width riparian recommendations;	...including four task forces convened based on recommendations from the Snoqualmie farm, fish, flood effort: •Buffers Task Force and Buffer Implementation Task Force recommendations for use of King County funds to implement voluntary, science-based, variable-width riparian plantings;	Added buffer implementation task force and revised language for clarity
70 and 74-75	As King County implements and continues to refine its revised administrative process for reviewing proposed projects and programmatic actions in a watershed context, King County should establish acreage targets for both agricultural lands and floodplain and riparian habitat project area	As King County implements and continues to refine its revised administrative process for reviewing proposed projects and programmatic actions in a watershed context, King County should establish minimum acreage targets for both agricultural lands and floodplain and riparian habitat project area,	Adds word "minimum" to reflect that targets may change through time (e.g. we could realize we need more...). Also adds climate to context considered.
	In conjunction with setting acreage targets,...	In conjunction with setting minimum acreage targets,...	
82-83	...reviewing projects in a watershed context, which is described in revised policy R-650. This process will apply to projects sponsored by the Water and Land Resources Division in all Agricultural Production Districts ...	...reviewing projects in a watershed context, which is described in revised policy R-650. This process will apply to projects sponsored by the Water and Land Resources Division in all Agricultural Production Districts as well as unincorporated areas outside Agricultural Production districts where fish, farm and flood interests converge,...	Clarified in narrative that review of WLRD projects will occur in all geographies where overlaps exist, not just in APDs
164-167	R 650The county shall administer a collaborative review process considering watershed context for projects sponsored by the Water and Land Resources Division in any unincorporated area of the County where habitat or floodplain restoration project may result in reducing the amount of land available for farming.	R 650The county shall administer a collaborative review process considering watershed context for projects sponsored by the Water and Land Resources Division in any unincorporated area of the County where habitat, or floodplain restoration project may result in reducing the amount of land available for farming, as well as for drainage improvement programs or other land-based agriculture infrastructure projects that may affect habitat or floodplain function.	Clarification regarding how drainage programs participate in the review process.
178-180	•track cumulative on-the-ground changes in land cover relative to acreage targets for farmland and habitat restoration areas;	•track on-the-ground changes in land cover relative to farmland and habitat restoration areas, focused on impacts to agricultural lands and fish populations;	Removes "cumulative" requirement, which would raise questions about when to start; specifies land cover is of interest; removes mention of acreage targets.
195-197	In its ongoing implementation and refinement efforts, King County shall consider findings from relevant internal and external plans and seek input from tribes, farmers, agricultural organizations, conservation organizations, salmon recovery organizations, and other property owners and community members.	In its ongoing implementation and refinement efforts, King County shall consider findings from relevant internal and external plans and seek input from tribes, farmers, agricultural organizations, conservation organizations, salmon recovery organizations, other property owners and community members, and the Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, Flood Implementation Oversight Committee.	Adds specific mention of SVFFFIOC in list of who should be involved in ongoing refinement of review process
211-215	Until the county completes the collaborative process to determine the maximum amount of agricultural land that may used for habitat restoration projects in the Snoqualmie Valley APD, and considers habitat recovery goals, develops evaluation criteria, a tracking system for the amount of agricultural land used for habitat restoration projects, and establishes a decision-making process to guide all future changes of agricultural land to habitat projects, the criteria in R-649 for siting habitat projects in Agricultural Production Districts shall apply.	Until the county completes the collaborative process to determine minimum acreage targets for both agricultural lands and floodplain and riparian habitat project area in the Snoqualmie Valley APD, develops evaluation criteria including climate change, a tracking system for the amount of agricultural land used for habitat restoration projects, and establishes a decision-making process to guide all future changes of agricultural land to habitat projects, the criteria in R-649 for siting habitat projects in Agricultural Production Districts shall apply.	Adjusts language to be consistent with minimum acreage targets terminology for target setting.

DRAFT COMP PLAN NARRATIVE/POLICY FOR FFF SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEW/COMMENT

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 ~~and honoring and sustaining the rights held by the State of Washington and Indian tribes as sovereign~~  
19 ~~trustees for fish, wildlife, and other aquatic resources,~~

Deleted: with  
Deleted: tribal treaty rights

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

Deleted: ing  
Deleted: other -developed  
Deleted: (or...not including  
Deleted: )

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

DRAFT COMP PLAN NARRATIVE/POLICY FOR FFF SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEW/COMMENT

46 context and improving balance in King County's work to advance multiple objectives. As a result of the ongoing  
47 efforts of the Snoqualmie farm, fish, flood process, the County has begun to operationalize recommendations,  
48 including recommendations for a revised administrative process for reviewing proposed projects and programmatic  
49 actions in locations where agriculture, fish habitat, and floodplains intersect.

50  
51 The revised administrative review process will occur in a watershed context by considering information from a  
52 variety of sources, including ~~four task forces convened based on recommendations from the Snoqualmie farm, fish,~~  
53 flood effort:

- 54 • ~~Buffers Task Force and Buffer Implementation Task Force recommendations for use of King County funds~~  
55 ~~to implement voluntary, science-based, variable-width riparian, plantings;~~
- 56 • Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District Strategic Plan Task Force to consider strategies to  
57 improve the long-term productivity of farmland, bring more acres into production, especially food  
58 production, and increase opportunities for farmers to develop the necessary infrastructure to support or  
59 increase their farm businesses in the Snoqualmie Valley; and
- 60 • Regulatory Task Force, to evaluate and recommend improvements to regulations to promote a viable  
61 agricultural economy and maintain and enhance habitat protection and healthy ecosystems.

62  
63 While these task forces were developed with a specific focus on the Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District, the  
64 lessons learned have informed principles which guide how the County works to achieve multiple benefits through  
65 projects and programmatic actions implemented in other Agricultural Production Districts and all areas of  
66 unincorporated King County where agriculture, salmon habitat, and floodplains converge.

67  
68 Additionally, the revised administrative review process should consider recommendations from relevant plans  
69 completed by King County and partner organizations related to salmon recovery, agriculture, drainage, floodplain  
70 management, climate change, forest management, comprehensive and subarea planning, transportation and other  
71 relevant plans. The revised administrative review process should incorporate and promote multi-objective thinking  
72 wherever possible.

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

Deleted: three

Deleted: ,

Deleted: to develop science-based

Deleted: a policy that encourages

Deleted: riparian

Deleted: using science based variable-width riparian recommendations

Deleted: the

DRAFT COMP PLAN NARRATIVE/POLICY FOR FFF SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEW/COMMENT

92 Using recommendations from the Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, and Flood Advisory Committee, King County has  
93 revised the process for reviewing projects in a watershed context, which is described in revised policy R-650. This  
94 process will apply to projects sponsored by the Water and Land Resources Division in all Agricultural Production  
95 Districts [as well as unincorporated areas outside Agricultural Production districts where fish, farm and flood](#)  
96 [interests converge](#), and may be invoked for other projects if requested by project sponsors. Revised policy R-650  
97 outlines the minimum required elements of an administrative review process for habitat and floodplain restoration  
98 capital projects and programs sponsored by the King County Water and Land Resources Division where fish, farm  
99 and flood interests intersect. When planning and implementing projects of all types, King County should consider  
100 watershed context and strive for consistency with recommendations in relevant plans related to salmon recovery,  
101 agriculture and floodplains. Specifically, for projects sponsored by the Water and Land Resources Division in areas  
102 where farms, fish habitat and floodplains overlap, the review process should:

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

112 The purpose of the review process shall be to develop recommendations to the Water and Land Resources Division  
113 director to inform their decisions about approvals of locations, scope, and scale of proposed projects, with the  
114 overarching goal for project outcomes to result in continued gains with respect to the viability of agriculture,  
115 ecological benefits, and preservation or restoration of resilient landscapes. Additionally, the County should  
116 periodically engage agricultural communities and habitat and flood partners as the review process is implemented to  
117 discuss continued refinements to the process.  
118

119  
120 The review process may also be conducted for projects sponsored by entities other than the Water and Land  
121 Resources Division, including those that facilitate infrastructure and drainage improvement projects on privately  
122 owned farmland to support continued long-term commercial agricultural uses within Agricultural Production  
123 Districts.

124  
125 The Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, and Flood Advisory Committee process and associated planning work has been  
126 instrumental in King County and partners learning how to balance needs of agriculture, salmon recovery, and  
127 floodplain management in a collaborative manner considering watershed context. As a result, implementing targeted

128 planning efforts in all Agricultural Production Districts is no longer required for other Agricultural Production  
129 Districts.

130  
131 King County shall continue to support the Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, and Flood Advisory Committee until the  
132 level of progress envisioned at the formation of the committee is substantially complete, and King County should  
133 consider supporting similar collaborative efforts in other geographies when residents and partners request a localized  
134 planning effort. In its ongoing work in the Snoqualmie Valley and other geographies, the County shall seek to  
135 develop strategies, plans, and agreements that accommodate multiple methods of achieving balance in benefits to  
136 farming, fish habitat and flood risk reduction efforts (e.g. avoidance/minimization of impacts, onsite mitigation  
137 efforts, offsite offsets, etc.) King County should use lessons learned from its work in the Snoqualmie Valley to inform  
138 planning and decision-making processes in other APDs, with careful consideration given to issues specific to the  
139 Agricultural Production District in question. The Director of the Department of Natural Resources and Parks shall  
140 determine the level of support King County provides for Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, and Flood Advisory  
141 Committee or similar efforts in other geographies. These recommendations are reflected in a revised policy R-650a.

142  
143 **R-649**                    **King County, through implementation of projects and programs, shall ensure**  
144 **sufficient land within Agricultural Production Districts remains available to support**  
145 **long term viability of commercial agriculture and that its programmatic and project**  
146 **actions support the maintenance or improvement of drainage and other agricultural**  
147 **support infrastructure. To the maximum extent practicable, King County should**  
148 **tailor measures to protect threatened or endangered species to support continued**  
149 **operation of working farms within the Agricultural Production Districts, and should**  
150 **strive for outcomes consistent with goals King County may establish for optimal**  
151 **area of productive agricultural lands within the Agricultural Production Districts.**

152  
153 **Agriculture must remain the predominant use in any Agricultural Production District**  
154 **and aquatic habitat or floodplain restoration projects, as well as King County**  
155 **Mitigation Reserves Program projects, shall not reduce the ability to farm in the**  
156 **Agricultural Production District. Until the county implements a collaborative**  
157 **planning and review process in a watershed context as described in R-650, such**  
158 **projects are allowed only when supported by owners of the land where the proposed**  
159 **project is to be sited. Criteria to be considered:**

160 **a. For a project proposed to be sited on lands that are unsuitable for direct**  
161 **agricultural production purposes, such as portions of property that have not**  
162 **historically been farmed due to soil conditions or frequent flooding, and which**  
163 **cannot be returned to productivity by drainage maintenance,**

164 **or**

165 **b. For a project proposed to be sited on lands suitable for direct agricultural**  
166 **production:**

167 **(1) there are no unsuitable lands available that meet the technical or locational needs**  
168 **of the proposed project, and**



169 (2) the project is included in, or consistent with, an approved Water Resources  
170 Inventory Area Salmon Recovery Plan, relevant agricultural plans, Flood Hazard  
171 Management Plan or other similar watershed scale plan; or the project would not  
172 reduce the baseline agricultural productivity within the Agricultural Production  
173 District.

174  
175 **R-650** The county shall administer a collaborative review process considering watershed  
176 context for projects sponsored by the Water and Land Resources Division in any  
177 unincorporated area of the County where habitat, or floodplain restoration project  
178 may result in reducing the amount of land available for farming, as well as for  
179 drainage improvement programs or other land-based agriculture infrastructure  
180 projects that may affect habitat or floodplain function.

Deleted: drainage,

181  
182 The review process shall be administered by the Water and Land Resources Division  
183 and strive for balance in outcomes that achieve co-equal goals of maintaining and  
184 improving suitability of land for agricultural productivity, increasing habitat quality,  
185 and restoring floodplains and ecological function. The review process should:

- 186 • occur early in the planning process for projects, and at regular intervals for
- 187 ongoing programs;
- 188 • consider guidance from relevant plans relating to agriculture, salmon
- 189 recovery, and floodplains;
- 190 • consider efforts for advancing multiple resource interests;
- 191 • track on-the-ground changes in land cover relative to farmland and habitat
- 192 restoration areas, focused on impacts to farmable agricultural lands and
- 193 fish populations;
- 194 • consider input and recommendations resulting from engagement and input
- 195 from external partners and subject matter experts; and
- 196 • identify and address barriers to efficient implementation.

Deleted: cumulative

Deleted: acreage targets for

197  
198 The review process may be offered for projects and programs sponsored by King  
199 County agencies aside from the Water and Land Resources Division, or for projects  
200 and programs sponsored by external entities.

201  
202 King County should continue to refine its process for working in a watershed  
203 context and reviewing projects and programmatic actions in Agricultural Production  
204 Districts and other geographies within King County where farm, fish, and flood  
205 interests converge. In its ongoing implementation and refinement efforts, King  
206 County shall consider findings from relevant internal and external plans and seek  
207 input from tribes, farmers, agricultural organizations, conservation organizations,  
208 salmon recovery organizations, other property owners and community members,  
209 and the Snoqualmie Valley Fish, Farm, Flood Implementation Oversight Committee.

Deleted: and

214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240

**R-650a**

The County shall continue to support the Snoqualmie Valley agricultural production district farm, fish, flood effort through completion of the task forces and establishment of measurable goals for agriculture, habitat restoration, and floodplain restoration for the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District. The director of the Department of Natural Resources and Parks shall determine King County’s level of support. The county shall continue to document lessons learned to guide collaborative planning and review processes in a watershed context for projects and programs in other geographies with the co-equal goals of balancing farm, fish, and flood interests where farms, fish habitat and floodplains overlap, as well as strategies for avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating losses of farmable land, floodplain functions, and habitat functions.

Until the county completes the collaborative process to determine minimum acreage targets for both agricultural lands and floodplain and riparian habitat project area, in the Snoqualmie Valley APD, develops evaluation criteria including climate change, a tracking system for the amount of farmable and unfarmable agricultural land used for habitat restoration projects, and establishes a decision-making process to guide all future changes of farmable agricultural land to habitat projects, the criteria in R-649 for siting habitat projects in Agricultural Production Districts shall apply.

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

- Deleted: in
- Deleted: the maximum amount of agricultural land that may used for habitat restoration projects
- Deleted: , and considers habitat recovery goals

## Snoqualmie Fish Farm Flood Implementation Oversight Committee

March 8, 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 Implementation Oversight Committee

Dear Executive Constantine:

The purpose of this letter is to request that our consensus recommended revisions to Comprehensive Plan Policies R-640, R-650, and R-650a be included in your recommended 2024 update.

The Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood (FFF) Implementation Oversight Committee (IOC) is a collaborative watershed planning process that was first contemplated in the 2012 Comprehensive Plan and convened by you in late 2013. The IOC is comprised of thirteen individuals of diverse backgrounds and perspectives, including local 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.

Initially, the FFF focus was on achieving your charge that we develop a balanced set of recommendations that would guide progress across critical priorities of protecting farmland, restoring habitat, and reducing flood risks in a shared landscape. Those recommendations were shared in June of 2017 and continue to influence our work and the County's efforts. Central to those recommendations was the "bundling" of fish and farm progress to ensure that both areas progressed commensurately and received sustained County investment. Since 2018, the IOC has focused on ensuring such balanced implementation continues, with available resources focused on top IOC priorities.

The recommended Comp Plan policy revisions are based on our experience since 2018 and are intended to provide greater clarity toward restoring habitat to aid salmon recovery, preserving farmland to support farm operations, and reducing flood risk for farmers and other Snoqualmie Valley residents. To arrive at consensus recommendations, the FFF IOC convened a sub-committee that met over 7 times since 2022 to conduct a thorough assessment of the Comprehensive Plan narrative and policies that have guided the IOC effort. The subcommittee's consensus recommendations were subsequently reviewed and adopted by the FFF IOC (Attachment A).

For the polices to result in positive outcomes, there are several aspects of County service provision that we would like to call to your attention:

- A way to compare progress for both fish and farms is through the nexus language of acreage lost or gained. While measuring acreage imperfectly captures impacts to functions for either farms or

fish, it does provide a way to measure and analyze progress. We recommend the County establish a **process to set minimum acreage targets** for agriculture and habitat and establish a tracking process to monitor and communicate changes over time.

- There were over 40 action items recommended in the initial FFF 2017 recommendations. We would appreciate a work plan that provides clarity on the County capacity and commitment to make sustained progress to complete those actions. Of particular interest are the following:
  - Ability to implement recommendations of the soon to be completed Agricultural Land Resource Strategic Plan
  - Complete the Buffer Implementation Task Force now underway
  - Establish a comprehensive funding strategy for implementation of FFF recommendations
  - Continue to support the Integrated Drainage Program building on the success and lessons learned from the Griffin Creek Pilot Project
  - Request the Executive consider appointing a representative from the Watershed Improvement District (WID) as an official IOC advisory committee member and a commensurate addition of membership from the fish community per the 2017 agreement
  - Request the presence of an FCD representative
- The County obtained federal funding and is now in the process of completing a 2Dimensional Hydraulic model for the entire Snoqualmie Valley. We appreciate County staffing and effort to complete that work. We also recommend that findings of the **modelling effort be included in the County's Flood Hazard Management Plan** currently underway.
- Commitment that the Snoqualmie FFF process will continue to have support through the next biennium, including at a **minimum two annual meetings: one to present CIP concepts**, designs or upcoming construction in or affecting the Snoqualmie Valley, and **to review FFF progress** on recommendations.

Getting to agreement around priority recommendations and guidance language was a rewarding effort and seeing implementation of these actions is even more meaningful. The Committee wishes to thank you for the privilege of serving on the IOC and commends and appreciates your ongoing commitment to these critical priorities. The dedication from the Executive branch and leadership at WLRD spurs the IOC members to remain enthusiastic toward balanced solutions and innovation in the watershed planning context. We would particularly like to recognize the work of two individuals: Tamie Kellogg who served as a consultant to the County from the first meeting in late 2013 through 2022; and Michael Murphy whose remarkable skill allowed the intent of the IOC to be woven into the words of the recommended policies.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Dow Constantine  
December 7, 2022

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

## FFF IOC Members - Updated 12/2/22

<b>Name</b>	<b>IOC Member?</b>	<b>Organization/Affiliation</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Angela Donaldson	Yes	Flood IOC Rep	<a href="mailto:kcfloodingirl@gmail.com">kcfloodingirl@gmail.com</a>
Josh Baldi	Yes	KC DNRP/Ex Officio	<a href="mailto:josh.baldi@kingcounty.gov">josh.baldi@kingcounty.gov</a>
Bobbi Lindemulder	Yes	Farmer	<a href="mailto:chucknbob@aol.com">chucknbob@aol.com</a>
Cindy Spiry	Yes	Snoqualmie Tribe	<a href="mailto:cindy@snoqualmietribe.us">cindy@snoqualmietribe.us</a>
Daryl Williams	Yes	Tulalip Tribes	<a href="mailto:darylwilliams@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov">darylwilliams@tulaliptribes-nsn.gov</a>
Denise Krownbell	Yes	Seattle Public Utilities	<a href="mailto:denise.krownbell@seattle.gov">denise.krownbell@seattle.gov</a>
Gary Bahr	Yes	WSDA/Ex Officio	<a href="mailto:gbahr@agr.wa.gov">gbahr@agr.wa.gov</a>
Lara Thomas	Yes	Flood IOC Rep	<a href="mailto:lara.thomas@duvallwa.gov">lara.thomas@duvallwa.gov</a>
Meredith Molli	Yes	Ag Commission rep	<a href="mailto:MeredithMolli@gmail.com">MeredithMolli@gmail.com</a>
Micah Wait	Yes	Fish IOC Rep	<a href="mailto:Micah@wildfishconservancy.org">Micah@wildfishconservancy.org</a>
Rick Shaffer	Yes	WRIA 7 Forum/City of Duvall	<a href="mailto:rick.shaffer@duvallwa.gov">rick.shaffer@duvallwa.gov</a>
Lauren Silver	Yes	SVPA	<a href="mailto:Lauren@svpa.us">Lauren@svpa.us</a>
Kirk Lakey	Yes	WDFW/Ex Officio	<a href="mailto:kirk.lakey@dfw.wa.gov">kirk.lakey@dfw.wa.gov</a>
Libby Reed	Yes	Sno Valley Tilth	<a href="mailto:libby@snovalleytilth.org">libby@snovalleytilth.org</a>
Tom Buroker	Yes	WA DOE/Ex Officio	<a href="mailto:Thomas.buroker@ecy.wa.gov">Thomas.buroker@ecy.wa.gov</a>
TBD	Yes	King Conservation District	