

KING COUNTY AGRICULTURE COMMISSION

MEETING NOTICE

THURSDAY, MAY 9, 2019

3:00-6:00 P.M.

PRESTON COMMUNITY CENTER

MEETING AGENDA

3:00	Call to Order <ul style="list-style-type: none">Welcome and IntroductionsApproval of AgendaApproval of Minutes (March and April)	Meredith Molli, Chair
3:05	Old Business - Updates (approx. 3 min each) <ul style="list-style-type: none">Commission DetailsKC Ag ProgramLand Conservation InitiativeLocal Food InitiativeKing Conservation DistrictFarm BureauFarm, Fish Flood	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Patrice BarrentineRichard MartinLeann KrainickMike LufkinJosh MonaghanBruce Elliott, Rosella MosbyMeredith Molli, Richard Martin
3:25	Public Comment related to a specific agenda item <i>3 minutes/person</i>	Meredith Molli
3:40	City of Seattle Food Access Spending/Farm Economy Report <ul style="list-style-type: none">Study Design and FindingsQ & A	Natalie Thompson, Hannah Hill, City of Seattle; Melissa Knox, Lina Pinero Walkinshaw, UW Center for Public Health Nutrition
4:05	Compost for Farms <ul style="list-style-type: none">OverviewFeedback	Rick Reinlasoder
4:20	Break and Composting Exercise	
4:35	Direct Market Opportunities and Challenges for King County Farm Businesses <ul style="list-style-type: none">Study Design and FindingsQ & A	Mary Embleton, KCD Regional Food Grant Program Manager; Lina Pinero Walkinshaw, Emilee Quinn, Jennifer Otten, UW Center for Public Health Nutrition
5:00	King County Farmers Market Presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none">Market DescriptionsQ & A	Leigh Newman-Bell, Pike Place Market Carrie Olsen, Renton Farmers Market Jennifer Antos, Seattle Neighborhood Farmers Markets
5:40	Policies and Procedures <ul style="list-style-type: none">ProposalDiscussionMotion/Vote	Meredith Molli
5:50	General Public Comment <i>3 minutes/person</i>	Meredith Molli
5:55	Concerns of Commissioners	Meredith Molli
6:00	Adjourn	Meredith Molli

Next Meeting : July 11, 3-6pm, Preston Community Center, Preston



King County
Water and Land Resources Division
 Department of Natural Resources and Parks
 King Street Center
 201 South Jackson Street, Suite 600
 Seattle, WA 98104-3855
206-477-4800 Fax 206-296-0192
 TTY Relay: 711

King County Agriculture Commission
DRAFT Meeting Minutes
Thursday, March 14th, 2019 – 3:00 pm to 6:00 pm
Sammamish Valley Grange, Woodinville

Commissioners	P	A	Commissioners	P	A	Ex Officio	P	A
Meredith Molli, Chair	X		Amy Holmes		X	Fereshteh Dehkordi, DPER	X	
Leigh Newman-Bell, Vice-Chair	X		Nayab Khan		X	Becky Elias, SKCPH		X
Roger Calhoon	X		Leann Krainick	X		Josh Monaghan, KCD	X	
Sarah Collier	X		Darron Marzolf	X		Kevin Wright, WSU	X	
Bruce Elliott	X		Rosella Mosby		X			
Year Eng	X		Paul Pink		X			
Lily Gottlieb-McHale	X		Kevin Scott-Vanderberge	X				

P=Present; A=Absent

County Staff/Representatives Present		
Patrice Barrentine, DNRP	Richard Martin, DNRP	Megan Moore, DNRP

Guests Present		
Andrew C. Ely, Viva Farms	Barbara Lowe, Viva Farms	Libby Reed, Sno Valley Tilth
Serena Glover, Friends of Sammamish Valley	Liesl McWhorter, 21 Acres	Brenda Vanderloop, SVA
Emily Hoffman (?), FoSV	Vanda Minea, Sammamish Grange	Gwen Vernon, KCD
Barbara Kelson, Apple Farm Village	Tom Quigley, Sammamish Grange & Sammamish Valley Alliance	

Meeting Action Summary

- **Approval of January 10, 2019 Meeting Minutes - Action**
- **Commission, County, and Organizational Updates**
- **Winery Code Amendment - Action**
- **Updates: Agriculture Code Changes; Policies and Procedures**
- **Commission Planning for 2019**

Meeting called to order at 3:08 pm

Approval of Meeting Agenda (ACTION)

Leann Krainick asked to add a Local Food Initiative (LFI) update after the Land Conservation Initiative (LCI) update. Darron Marzolf motioned to approve the agenda as amended; Ms. Krainick seconded. It carried unanimously.

Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes (January 10, 2019) (ACTION)

Sarah Collier confirmed she seconded a motion whose credit was listed as uncertain in the minutes. Leann Krainick confirmed attribution of another uncertainly-interpreted comment to Amy Holmes. Bruce Elliott motioned to accept the minutes as amended. Ms. Collier seconded the motion, which carried with unanimous approval.

Old Business – Updates

- **Commission Details (Patrice Barrentine):**
 - Lora Liegel has resigned from the Commission, leaving one open seat. Recruitment for this opening will be rolled to address during the annual new Commissioner recruitment process, open until May.
 - Commissioners’ annual financial disclosure forms are due to Ms. Barrentine or Rick Ybarra by April 14.

- **King County Agriculture Program (Richard Martin):**
 - Mr. Martin invited any interested parties to join the Land Committee.
 - On March 1 the County closed on the 70-acre former Byers property near Carnation. The property is now leased by Sno Valley Tilth and the County's goal is keep SVT on the land; long-term disposition of the property is still being determined. The arrangement with SVT is fulfillment of a second Memorandum of Understanding from the Tall Chief land controversy, in which the County agreed to help SVT and Tilth Alliance advance farmer training in the Snoqualmie Valley.
 - An opening to fill Bee Cha's former position closed last Sunday, and a selection is expected by April. There is funding to support the position, a farm manager/immigrant farmer outreach coordinator, for at least two years.
 - King County Council (KCC) has asked the Executive to consider a change to the County's comprehensive plan. The proposal involves policy on public infrastructure within/adjacent to APDs, and identifying potential "offsite mitigation strategies," such as paying into an in-lieu fee mitigation bank, for removing land from an APD. The current comp plan does not allow APD land removal without equal land being provided in return. This new proposal stems from the city of Woodinville taking Sammamish APD land to build a traffic roundabout, which has not been compensated for. KCC is seeking broader policy on how to respond to public works projects within APDs. Ivan Miller with the Executive's office will present on the scope of this proposal at April's Commission meeting. The two comp plan sections addressing this are R655 and R656. Mr. Martin said no Commission letter is needed yet, but Commission feedback, due April 22, is urgently sought to inform the Executive's position.
- **Land Conservation Initiative (Leann Krainick):**
 - Ms. Krainick relayed an email from Darren Greve, one of the LCI group leads. It states the current Parks levy expires at the end of 2019 and will be on the fall election ballot. Ms. Krainick's concern is there should be time placed on a Commission agenda soon for County staff to speak on how the levy impacts agriculture.
- **Local Food Initiative (Leann Krainick):**
 - The annual Kitchen Cabinet meeting is April 23 at Seattle's King Street Center. Mike Lufkin has encouraged anyone involved with agriculture to attend. There will be more details next Commission meeting.
- **King Conservation District (Josh Monaghan):**
 - KCD is in the final months of compiling its next five-year work plan, which they hope to submit to KCC for fall. KCD has been consulting farmers/stakeholders/partners for feedback on what KCD can do differently.
 - On the regional food grant program, KCD is shifting more investments into competitive projects focused in: working farmland access, consumer demand, coordinating farm technical assistance, and infrastructure.
 - KCD has partnered with Snoqualmie WID and the County, largely on Flood Control District (FCD) funds, on agricultural drainage efforts. KCD believes FCD should continue to fund this, though some of KCD's rate collection is to be invested as well.
 - Work will continue with city partners to support urban agriculture, and investing in one-on-one farm planning.
- **Farm Bureau (Bruce Elliott):**
 - Mr. Elliott said the Bureau lobbying team is busy at the state legislature, with agriculture interests being threatened from several different vantage points.
 - He encouraged Bureau members to look into the Bureau's scholarship program.
- **Farm Fish Flood 2.0 (Richard Martin):**
 - The buffers task force completed drafts of two white papers on buffer science and impacts to agriculture.
 - The regulatory task force is focusing on facilitating agriculture drainage, to understand needs to achieve a lasting efficient program. Eric Beach is navigating this and trying to gain support from regulatory agencies.
 - Patrice Barrentine is preparing to launch the agriculture strategic plan task force later this month. This group's work will be key to understanding needs to achieve long-term agricultural viability in the Snoqualmie Valley.
 - The next Implementation Oversight Committee (IOC) meeting is April 4 in Duvall; all are invited to attend. This meeting will introduce a quarterly report document to more widely disseminate work being done in FFF.

Public Comment (Related to Specific Agenda Item)

- **Andrew Ely** spoke about Viva Farms. The non-profit began in Skagit County, incubating 20 small farms on 80 acres of land. They recently expanded work to the Sammamish Valley, on 10 acres with six incubating farms. A main goal is to support the LFI/local food economy in King County by empowering new and aspiring farmers in sustainable agriculture. Viva also runs the SAgE Collaborative, a college network with accredited programming for higher education students relevant to sustainable agriculture. He said any collaboration in terms of empowering current and future farmers is welcomed.

- **Vanda Minea** voiced concerns about KCC’s proposed changes to the County’s winery code. She said she liked some changes but opposed others. She also expressed a wish to do more about agricultural land being taken from APDs without public knowledge, such as the Woodinville roundabout. She appealed to the Commission to consider the Sammamish Valley’s centuries-long farming history in their decisions. She said more farmland is needed for growing food, not houses or streets, and agriculture contributes to local communities. She said citizens here can accept wineries, but their main opposition is to tasting rooms.
- **Tom Quigley** said he would defer to others present to comment on the winery ordinance, but wished to address the issue arising from Woodinville taking farmland by eminent domain. He said the County seemed to legitimize the City’s taking farmland for the roundabout. He opposed financial incentive for taking farmland from production, saying to allow this would mean it’s “over” for agriculture. He said since farmers have the City’s/County’s attention now, it should be made known that they wish to preserve the Zante farm. He suggested County funds from selling farmland go into a farmland trust to buy local farmland, and communities need to recognize value of farmland and acquire/hold it in perpetuity. He discouraged buying farmland to mitigate for public works projects.
- **Libby Reed** spoke on the work of SVT, a farmer-led organization supporting sustainable farmers in the Snoqualmie and Snohomish valleys. She said SVT is here today to support Sammamish Valley farmers and emphasize that loss of farmland is a critical issue, and that she is concerned for SVT’s area as well.
- **Liesl McWhorter** voiced concern the “eminent domain” issue in the Sammamish Valley will set irrevocable legal precedent for future decisions. She said 21 Acres officially supports the winery code amendment proposed by the Friends of the Sammamish Valley (FoSV) organization. She noted a problem of not having answers for new and prospective farmers seeking to buy farmland, as the eminent domain issue is evaporating available farmland here.
- **Serena Glover** spoke on behalf of FoSV, a non-profit organization to protect local farmland. She noted for the record she does have an “interest” in the winery industry. She said the winery ordinance is the “worst threat” ever to the Valley, and the version before KCC is worse than the Executive’s proposal. She said it allows urban-use commercial businesses in rural residential areas; i.e., remote tasting rooms and event centers. She reiterated an earlier public comment that their opposition is not to wineries, but to remote tasting rooms. She took specific issue with proposed demonstration project “overlay” areas, where tasting rooms would be allowed in rural areas without an attached winery, as well as “fake” home-based wineries that do not grow any source crop on-site. She said while Sammamish Valley is “ground zero” on this, it will impact countywide, as tasting rooms will look countywide for cheaper rural land instead of cities. She voiced concern about impacts to the ecosystem and farmland from infrastructure (roads, sewer hookups, etc.) added to rural areas to accommodate more tasting rooms. She stated the ordinance violates both the Growth Management Act (GMA) and the County comp plan. She does not believe County lawmakers are acting accountably in protecting farmland. She asked the Commission to consider these factors and strongly tell the County it needs to protect/preserve farmland, abide by the GMA, and keep bars in cities. She provided a handout of FoSV’s amended version of the current proposed ordinance, which she said protects farmland while supporting the wine tourism industry. She asked anyone interested to reach out to FoSV’s website for more information.
- **Brenda Vanderloop** emphasized the importance of education and farming/access to farming. She believes there is a discrepancy in the County’s efforts, in that it has farmland preservation programs but seems to be acting against those efforts. If new/potential farmers can’t access farmland, then farming is a lost cause for future generations.

Winery Code Amendment Action – Meredith Molli; Winery Code Committee (ACTION)

Patrice Barrentine recapped a history of the County winery ordinance and Commission involvement. The Commission worked with Executive office staff to formulate the Executive’s original proposal. November saw a different striker amendment from KCC Local Services Committee chair Kathy Lambert added to this proposal. However, the Local Services Committee passed the striker to full KCC this Monday. A new striker by Councilmembers Lambert and Balducci also passed Monday. Ms. Barrentine handed out a draft letter from the Commission winery committee, which comments on the November 30 striker. She said the Commission could comment on the newer striker later.

Ms. Molli said two winery committee meetings were held between January and now, at which the draft letter, originally from 2017, was rewritten. She asked for feedback on the draft. Ms. Barrentine added there are five “bullet” points of main concern from the winery committee in the draft, and encouraged particular review of these. These concerns involve: (1) 60% minimum on-site product content; (2) parking/impacts to farm traffic; (3) number of special events; (4) water/sewer; and (5) enforcement.

Roger Calhoon asked if addressing the November striker is still relevant now. Ms. Molli replied the bullet-list concerns are the same for the November striker and the March 8 one. Ms. Barrentine said KCC is seeking the Commission’s input before they proceed. Mr. Calhoon suggested amending this draft to clarify this would not be the Commission’s

final word on the issue, as they have not had a chance to review the new information. Ms. Molli agreed this was fair. Leann Krainick believed the Commission not sending a response would be a mistake and could be misconstrued as them not being concerned. She agreed the concerns from the prior striker are still relevant in the March one, and also agreed with Mr. Calhoon a letter should be sent now stipulating that an updated recommendation is forthcoming. Josh Monaghan suggested the new language in the letter should frame the Commission's current situation, and asked if the Commission is sure these five main concerns are the ones they want to address. Sarah Collier said she would support adding such framing language.

There was some discussion on the concern of vehicle parking as a simplified proxy for traffic concerns, such as more vehicles leading to more congestion, and more impervious surface (roadways/overflow parking) which can lead to flooding. There was also discussion on Lambert's striker revision indicating 24 special events per year would be allowed for a winery/tasting room, versus two events per month in the Executive's proposal. The chief concern here is that, while the two limits may seem similar, a 24-per-year allowance would result in a higher concentration of events in the busy summer farming season. Another line of discussion focused on clarifying the "water/sewer" concern. The Executive's proposal states each winery must be tied to an existing water system; Lambert's striker states new wells can be drilled for these establishments. The Commission does not support new wells, due to not enough irrigation water/water rights being available here; a domestic well is also not sufficient to support a large facility.

Ms. Krainick stated her take was that she supports the Executive's proposal, but would support changes to it if they benefit agriculture. Mr. Calhoon said there are things he doesn't like about the Executive's proposal, such as special district overlays, but he believes the Commission should focus on what it can affect, and let the rest go. Ms. Molli said she agreed somewhat with this.

Leigh Newman-Bell advised the Commission should focus more on the five main bullet-point concerns of the letter, so the Commission would be comfortable sending it. Richard Martin suggested the letter be more demonstrative in stating what the Commission wants, and perhaps there should be clarification about allowed activities in APDs vs. rural areas.

Ms. Krainick motioned to add a sentence to the draft letter, stating the Commission will further review the striker amendment updated 3/8 and will send additional comments before the full scheduled vote of KCC in May. Bruce Elliott seconded the motion. Ms. Collier suggested the Commission clearly reiterate its recommendation to retain the 60% minimum on-site product requirement. Ms. Molli added the letter should also simply state the Commission "opposes" converting APD farmland to wineries. Ms. Krainick and Mr. Elliott accepted these amendments, and the amended motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Ms. Krainick made a second motion, to send the letter to KCC as amended at this meeting. Darron Marzolf seconded the motion, which also passed with a unanimous vote.

--BREAK--

Agricultural Code Changes Update – Patrice Barrentine

Ms. Barrentine reviewed the agriculture code amendments worked on by the Commission, adopted over a year ago. These included new and expanded definitions for: agriculture, agricultural products, agricultural activities (including drainage), and agriculture support services. It also added a streamlined agriculture permit process through an inter-departmental technical review committee, and consolidated all allowed agriculture activities under one category table.

Ms. Barrentine noted that many farmers are still unaware of these changes, and asked how the word on this new work might be spread. Bruce Elliott offered to take it to an upcoming Farm Bureau meeting. Leann Krainick recommended making the information available for download on the FarmKingCounty.org website. Meredith Molli asked if the information could be converted to a brochure, and include a link to the activities table. Ms. Barrentine agreed to take these suggestions and work on implementing them.

Policies and Procedures Update – Meredith Molli; Leigh Newman-Bell

Ms. Molli briefly recapped the off-and-on process the Commission has undergone to update the current Policies and Procedures document. She said today, instead of reviewing the document line-by-line, the Commission should focus on non-controversial updates and remove any obsolete/redundant references, then close out this process next meeting. Patrice Barrentine can email out the other versions of the document, and track Commissioners' comments, if needed.

Ms. Molli strongly advised Commissioners to make time in their schedules to review this. She asked Commissioners to get their feedback to Ms. Barrentine, by two weeks ahead of the next Commission meeting, so Ms. Molli and Ms. Newman-Bell can incorporate it into the updated document. Ms. Barrentine asked anyone needing further information to contact her, noting this document can be amended at any time with a 60% vote among Commissioners.

Commission Planning for 2019 – Meredith Molli; Commissioners

Ms. Molli directed attention to a printed wall table with a proposed schedule of topics for the Commission to address in 2019, and asked for feedback. Patrice Barrentine logged all suggestions, noting the Commission generally has time to focus on one major issue, and perhaps two smaller updates, each meeting. Ms. Molli asked any further topic/schedule suggestions be brought to hers, Leigh Newman-Bell's, and Ms. Barrentine's attention. Ms. Newman-Bell said this process will be ongoing and Commissioners should speak up any time with any urgent issues.

Discussion turned to how to interface more with KCC members and staff. Ms. Molli said the Commission should highlight the agriculture occurring in each Councilmember's district, and encourage them to attend these meetings and discuss it. Several ideas on how to do so were voiced by Commissioners and staff, also logged by Ms. Barrentine.

Ms. Molli then reviewed membership of current Commission committees, stating new people need to be recruited and regular meeting dates need to be set. Ms. Newman-Bell said these meetings can also be done via conference calls. Ms. Barrentine made note of all new volunteering committee members and meeting date suggestions.

Public Comment (General)

- **Barbara Lowe** addressed the Commission on hydrology concerns in the Sammamish Valley in relation to the winery ordinance, citing a Masters' degree in hydrology. Her chief concerns are a possible dramatic increase in impervious surface cover, and dewatering large areas for underground storage, if a large number of wineries come into the area. More impervious surface would mean more erosion, flash floods, and sediment in the river. Impervious surface can lead to lack of future groundwater storage, and also make surface water heated and toxic. Digging out large areas for underground storage can increase local landslide hazard. Dewatering large areas of land for this storage, she continued, would create a "cone" of depression and also affect the baseline hydrology of the whole valley. She said the County has not done an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on this situation, that environmental considerations are being put aside.

Concerns of Commissioners

- **Leann Krainick** reported she and others in her area have been getting mail from a company called Re-Energetica, who are seeking to put 30 acres of solar panels on their farm fields in return for monetary compensation. She said this is not allowed in APDs, but could not say for certain if this also applies to rural areas. She voiced concern about this, and wondered if it is something the Commission should address.
- Ms. Krainick also spoke on a need to start recruiting new Commissioners, as it would be good to have each County district represented here. Patrice Barrentine said the Commission currently lacks representatives from districts 1 and 6. She agreed to return to the Commission with information about the available seats, as well as send out the recruitment materials to hand out to prospective applicants.

Meeting Adjourned at 6:03 pm

Next Meeting

April 11th, 2019, 3:00 – 6:00 pm, Preston Community Center (Preston)



King County

Water and Land Resources Division

Department of Natural Resources and Parks
King Street Center
201 South Jackson Street, Suite 600
Seattle, WA 98104-3855
206-477-4800 Fax 206-296-0192
TTY Relay: 711

**King County Agriculture Commission
DRAFT Meeting Minutes
Thursday, April 11th, 2019 – 3:00 pm to 6:00 pm
Preston Community Center, Preston**

Commissioners	P	A	Commissioners	P	A	Ex Officio	P	A
Meredith Molli, Chair	X		Amy Holmes		X	Fereshteh Dehkordi, DPER		X
Leigh Newman-Bell, Vice-Chair		X	Nayab Khan		X	Becky Elias, SKCPH		X
Roger Calhoun		X	Leann Krainick	X		Josh Monaghan, KCD		X
Sarah Collier	X		Darron Marzolf		X	Kevin Wright, WSU	X	
Bruce Elliott		X	Rosella Mosby		X			
Year Eng	X		Paul Pink	X				
Lily Gottlieb-McHale	X		Kevin Scott-Vanderberge	X				

P=Present; A=Absent

County Staff/Representatives Present		
Patrice Barrentine, DNRP	Evan Lewis, DNRP	Ivan Miller, KC Executive’s Office
Eric Beach, DNRP	Richard Martin, DNRP	John Taylor, DLS

Guests Present		
Deloa Dalby, Savor Snoqualmie Valley	Gwen Vernon, KCD	Nadia (?) Anderson – recording unclear

Meeting Action Summary

- **No official votes taken due to lack of quorum**
- **Commission, County, and Organizational Updates**
- **Updates: Sammamish APD mitigation; KC fish passage restoration; regulatory how-to documents**
- **Discussions: Draft response letter to winery code amendment; Policies & Procedures**

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm (no quorum)

Approval of Meeting Agenda

Due to lack of quorum, Meredith Molli noted there could not be a vote at this time to approve today’s agenda, but the meeting would proceed with the agenda as written.

Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes (March 14, 2019)

Due to lack of quorum, Meredith Molli noted there could not be a vote at this time to approve the meeting minutes, and such a vote would be delayed until next month’s meeting.

Public Comment (Related to Specific Agenda Item)

- **Deloa Dalby**, of Savor Snoqualmie Valley, said SSV seeks to implement “Savor Sammamish Valley,” and asked for Commission input on how to engage the agricultural community. Savor is a group that pulls together much of what makes Snoqualmie Valley special: arts, culture, events, restaurants, etc. She noted the parallels between Snoqualmie and Sammamish Valleys, saying she wishes to engage recreational visitors, to see them collaborate with farmers. It was suggested Ms. Dalby speak to the Commission’s Marketing and Promotion committee.

Old Business – Updates

- **Commission Details (Patrice Barrentine):**
 - Several Commissioners have not submitted financial disclosure forms. These are due as soon as possible.

- Ms. Barrentine reviewed the 2019 proposed Commission meeting schedule and topic suggestions, as well as the 2019 committee meeting schedule. She said these could be updated as needed.
- Ms. Barrentine congratulated Year Eng on her family farm being featured in April's issue of *Sunset* magazine.
- **King County Agriculture Program (Richard Martin):**
 - The County is hiring a new farm manager/immigrant refugee outreach coordinator. Interviews will be held and a decision made next Monday, with the selected individual starting the first of May.
 - Data collected during the fall 2018 south King County immigrant refugee farmer assessment is being analyzed, with a draft report now being reviewed by County agriculture staff. The report should be ready for review by May's Commission meeting. Mr. Martin said there is much more to be done for these communities.
 - Department of Local Services (DLS) has hired an economic development program coordinator, Hugo Garcia. Mr. Garcia will focus for now on economic development in urban unincorporated King County, but has shown interest in rural areas, one project each for forest and agriculture. Mr. Martin suggested Mr. Garcia present to the Commission sometime in the future and ask guidance on where to invest time and resources.
 - On March 25, Josh Monaghan, Cynthia Krass, and Mr. Martin presented to King County Council's (KCC) Rural Services, Roads, & Bridges Committee on drainage issues and strategies, specifically the Agriculture Drainage and Assistance Program (ADAP). Councilmember Kathy Lambert has been pushing to accelerate ADAP for some time and sponsored a budget proviso that requires DNRP to develop a plan to accelerate the rate of drainage maintenance in agricultural areas of King County. The benchmark would be to maintain all agricultural waterways in seven years, and revisit them every seven years. This is a dramatic increase from the current rate; a plan for this is expected to KCC by late summer/early fall. Once this is drafted, Eric Beach and Lou Beck of DNRP will come to the Commission for input.
 - Mr. Martin gave a few statistics from a 2018 assessment of County agriculture/forestry services to rural constituents. The County responded to over 6,000 landowner calls and emails; helped develop and finalize over 100 farm/forest plans; and made 250 individual site visits to landowners to provide technical support.
- **Land Conservation Initiative (Leann Krainick):**
 - There will be a new property tax rate proposed by the Executive, as part of the Parks initiative on the August ballot. The proposed rate goes from 16.82 cents to 18.32 cents per thousand dollars in value, with \$810 million in revenue estimated over the next six years. A special budget committee is to review this on April 15, and it will go to full KCC April 24. More information will be presented next Commission meeting.
- **Local Food Initiative (Leann Krainick):**
 - The Kitchen Cabinet meets the afternoon of April 23 at King Street Center in Seattle. Content of the meeting is being determined. The annual report should be sent to printers next week; Patrice Barrentine will send out the information when available. Ms. Krainick strongly encouraged agriculture voices to attend.
- **King Conservation District (Gwen Vernon, KCD):**
 - This year's Regional Food Systems Grant Program launched just over two weeks ago, with a deadline of April 23 for submission of pre-proposals.
 - KCD is reviewing their rates and charges plan for the next five years. Bea Covington, KCD's executive director, will reach out to the Commission to discuss this.
- **Farm Bureau:**
 - There was no update available.
- **Farm Fish Flood 2.0 (Meredith Molli, Richard Martin):**
 - The most recent Implementation Oversight Committee (IOC) meeting was last week. Their next meeting is August 8; caucuses meet a month prior. Commissioners are encouraged to attend.
 - Caucuses are still determining measures of success, to be finalized next month. Mr. Martin said these are to gauge progress towards completing key FFF benchmarks. Next Commission meeting, the agreed-upon milestones will be presented, then the rest of the list, for the Commission to determine its highest priorities.
 - County staff have developed a framework for quarterly reporting on FFF progress, which will be made available to all interested parties going forward.
 - Mr. Martin said many FFF documents are being produced but not circulated widely beyond caucuses, and asked anyone who would like to be on a distribution list to receive these documents to contact him.
 - Patrice Barrentine reported the agriculture strategic plan task force held its first meeting two weeks ago. Nayab Khan is the Commission representative on this group.

Sammamish APD Mitigation Update – Ivan Miller, Comp Plan Manager, KC Executive's Office

Mr. Miller spoke on updating the County's Comprehensive Plan ("Comp Plan"), which outlines areas for urban growth, agriculture, forestry and other uses. He noted the case where the city of Woodinville built a traffic roundabout by

taking land from the APD without a permit. The current Comp Plan requires that any APD land taken for public infrastructure be replaced by property of comparable size, soil quality and agricultural value. Woodinville has been challenged to find suitable replacement property. Although public infrastructure projects within APDs are rare, the KCC asked Executive staff, as part of a work scope for the 2020 Comp Plan update, to review policies to address these cases and consider alternative mitigation options. Commission feedback is sought to aid Executive staff as they develop recommendations. These will be transmitted to KCC at end of September, after public review in July.

These are the offsite mitigation options KCC asked Executive staff to research:

- 1) Create an in-lieu fee program where a city may provide County money to replace the taken farmland.
- 2) Use the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program, where the County buys development rights but not the land. But the idea is to put land back into an APD, which can't be done here as the County does not own the land.
- 3) Implement a program to restore existing "farmable" but unfarmed APD lands. There are 5,000+ such acres in APDs the County would like to get back into production. The question asked is whether to allow a city, if an infrastructure project is happening there, to provide County funding to restore land already inside the APD.

Executive staff analyzed these options and made the following determinations:

- Option #1 may be workable, but Commission feedback is sought first.
- Option #2 is not ideal.
- For Option #3, the County already has programs to help restore land viability and/or create markets for existing land. There could be a new "farmland restoration program," or adding of resources to existing programs.

Mr. Miller said, as current policies are meant to secure equal land to replace lost farmland, the proposal might impose a sort of "sequencing" to prioritize alternatives:

- 1) Secure land of equal value adjacent to the affected APD and expand the APD boundary to include the newly acquired property. The sponsoring municipality or agency could acquire the replacement property or pay into a "farmland replacement fund" that would be managed by King County ("in-lieu fee").
- 2) If land in that APD is unavailable, acquire land next to another APD and add it to that APD.
- 3) Implement a restoration program rather than an in-lieu fee program, as this sort of event happens rarely and any collected in-lieu money would likely sit unused for a long time pending acquisition of suitable property. Funds contributed to a restoration program could be invested relatively quickly.

Executive staff continue to work with Richard Martin and Michael Murphy at DNRP, and the County's Prosecuting Attorney's Office, to consider these options. Mr. Martin noted the Woodinville roundabout affected about 1/2 an acre, and it would be hard to find new APD land with paid funding equal to something that size.

Leann Krainick agreed using the TDR program (Option #2) did not seem viable. She voiced concern about the in-lieu option (#1) and stressed that should that option be selected, the sponsoring municipality or agency should be required to pay a fee equal to the development value of the affected land, not the current agricultural value. Meredith Molli also voiced concern about option #1, saying this could "open a door" to this scenario becoming more common. She did not think allowing municipalities to pay money to take farmland out of production was a good direction for County policy.

Ms. Krainick continued that option #3 is the best of those presented, but wondered about the County's role should this occur, as it could put the County in a position to own land; the Commission has already agreed this is not appropriate. She asked how the County would enforce landowners putting land back into production, citing that usually landowners with this unused land don't have the necessary skill to farm it. She advised caution in crafting language for this option, adding that the Commission could help with this.

Mr. Miller said a key question for the County is if anything is broken with the current system. While this scenario hasn't happened much, growth in King County continues and such a problem may still occur. He believes one addition to policies will be to clarify that the County has to agree to these events before they happen; a road in a jurisdiction can't be built without a permit from that jurisdiction. He asked if the "sequencing" idea would give the County, and the party building the infrastructure, more flexibility to find land. Restoring land or adding money to restoration programs would only be considered after a determination that the County cannot replace the taken land.

The Executive will issue a public review draft of the comp plan for comment on July 1. At least six public meetings will occur over a month-long period, and then an updated draft will be transmitted to KCC on September 30. For this update, KCC has a deadline to adopt the comp plan by the end of June 2020.

Patrice Barrentine reiterated Ms. Krainick's concern about which value to assess affected land at, and what factors should be considered to determine suitable mitigation options for a piece of land. Mr. Miller said current policy

language specifying “comparable size, soil quality, and agricultural value” for replacement lands would be kept, but encouraged the Commission to think of language to strengthen this. Ms. Barrentine added that land value in the Sammamish APD doesn’t equate to other APDs; any money spent there would buy less land elsewhere. Mr. Martin shared this concern regarding taking land from an APD and putting it in another, due to cost difference between APDs.

Paul Pink said it is important to consider actual agricultural value/impact of taken farmland, not just the size of the acreage, particularly when it occurs in tiny increments like the Woodinville roundabout. He said total losses should still be tracked, but it may not be worth the time, money, and effort to replace something as small as 1/3 of an acre by itself.

Ms. Molli said no changes may be needed to current policy, but proposed in cases with small pieces of land where equivalent farmable land couldn’t be reclaimed, if there might be a way to utilize such replaced pieces with a sort of accessory agricultural use. Mr. Miller said this is how the County has tried to frame the restoration question, that available funds can support any existing such programs such as drainage or farm pads. Sarah Collier stressed that adding farm resource/support funding does not offset the acreage of farmland loss. Mr. Martin said whatever way the County goes, the mitigation should be structured to more than offset any loss of agricultural value.

Mr. Miller noted common themes in the feedback: concerns about this path in general; doing so in a way to bring useful land back into production; there is little support for TDR/in-lieu options, but general agreement that restoration is best if new land cannot be secured. He asked Commissioners to contact him with any further questions or concerns.

Regulatory “How-To” Documents – Eric Beach, DNRP/WLRD Regulatory/Permitting Specialist

The FFF Regulatory Task Force is working on a “how-to” document to inform farmers about allowable farming activities and how to get permits for those practices that are not exempt from the permitting process. Mr. Beach said that one key objective of the Task Force is to understand what activities require a permit, and obtain clear policy statements from appropriate regulatory entities that confirm Task Force understanding.

Mr. Beach explained that County code regulates many common farm activities, this oversight often implemented via permits. But the overall farming community doesn’t have much understanding of what is allowed and how to get any needed permits. County code can be reviewed online but is not intuitive and often difficult to navigate. The presence of “critical areas” such as wetlands and aquatic areas can also shape whether a permit is needed. While the County puts out bulletins, these are often not as helpful as they could be.

Mr. Beach said the goal is to inform/encourage people on what they can do without a permit, then make the permitting process transparent and accessible. Specific objectives are to: identify project requirements; compile a “permitting pathway” for necessary permits along with steps and cost estimates; and get a supporting policy statement from DPER that this is an accepted pathway. There is also a chance to identify possible code changes or process improvements.

Mr. Beach then quickly reviewed a lengthy list of agricultural activities that will be addressed in the “How To” booklet and asked for Commission feedback on anything missed. The booklet will also include a primer on government agencies and policies that affect farming as well as a set of Best Management Practices intended to minimize regulatory oversight. He said the intent is for this booklet to be as transparent and understandable as possible.

Commission member feedback covered various points, including:

- The guide should start with why permitting is important, as this may be unclear to many farmers and members of public. It should be presented as a “how-to” manual, and keep that tone.
- A big part of this guide should be to make clear the distinctions of where you do not need a permit. Policy statements from other agencies stating a permit is not needed for a particular activity are also important.
- Would the booklet be available in languages other than English? Mr. Beach replied just English for starters, then decide whether translated versions would be helpful. Patrice Barrentine observed it is often easier to get an in-person interpreter than translate documents in print.
- Clarify what is allowed in terms of shared infrastructure.
- Consider a process similar to that employed by state Department of Labor and Industries. In this, the landowner invites a code inspector for a site visit to determine what needs correcting. Then, if future inspections detect a code violation, consequences are mitigated due to the landowner being proactive. We want to provide landowners with an incentive for trying to do the right thing and implementing best management practices.
- Has research been done to determine if similar documents already exist elsewhere? Mr. Beach said the task force will do extensive research on this before recommending a format for the booklet.
- Add a section in the resources portion listing preferred vendors or contractors.

Ms. Molli suggested it would be a good idea for a committee to review this document in detail, then bring it back to full Commission. Mr. Beach agreed to follow up on this.

--BREAK--

Fish Passage Restoration Program – Evan Lewis, Fish Passage Barrier Removal Project Manager, DNRP/WLRD

Mr. Lewis overviewed the County's fish passage restoration program. He said its goal is essentially to get the most fish to the best habitat as efficiently as possible. Restoration of passage to blocked habitats is considered one of the best ways to help salmon. He described the work as developing a programmatic way to get large habitat gains as quickly as possible, while addressing infrastructure needs.

Many blocks are associated with roads, trails, stormwater systems, and the like. The County wants flexibility to get funding to projects with high habitat gains, while building partnerships to leverage resources and work strategically to connect projects so fish can go as high as possible in a given waterway. A key part of this is looking not just at County facilities, but also being a technical assistance resource for other entities who may have fish-passage issues. Another aspect is to find sustainable funding to achieve success long-term, as this will be a decades-long process. Another goal is to get buy-in to the program from stakeholders for this to succeed. As part of the early action, in this biennium the budget includes about \$12.5 million to advance three dozen projects expected to have major fish passage benefits. This will serve as a testing ground to determine best practices for the future.

The County estimates there are 2,900 County-owned/maintained sites to assess whether or not they are barriers to fish passage. The focus will be on parts of the County that have salmon access; areas blocked by natural barriers such as above Snoqualmie Falls will not be addressed. There are data on 500 sites that have previously been surveyed; it is expected that about 1,000 of the 2,900 sites will be determined to be at least partial barriers to fish.

In April, two teams of two staff each will be hired to conduct the barrier inventory. This will verify if there's a crossing at a particular site if there is fish use potential, if it is passable, etc. Findings will be submitted to WDFW for their online database as well as incorporated into the County's geospatial database. Data will also be used to prioritize different sites by factors such as habitat quality or how much habitat would be opened up above the barrier once it is repaired or replaced. The County also wants to look at condition and cost of these facilities. Lastly, the County will look at relationships to other projects, so projects can be linked together. Staff will work with tribal, state, and other partners to get buy-in on the methodology, so hopefully discussions of project sequencing will be straightforward. The goal is to complete inventory assessment prioritization by the end of 2020.

He discussed a graph illustrating expected results. About 90% of the total expected gain in habitat access comes from one half of the projects. As work progresses, the County wants to stay on that steep part of curve, and not spend a lot of money on barrier projects that will provide minimal habitat gains. Extensive dialogue is needed with the tribes and state on how this will work.

The County will determine from the inventory a cost estimate to address all barriers, then look at a range of scenarios. They will determine what phasing will look like, determine the gap between existing and needed funding, and what can be done to close that gap. Mr. Lewis noted the County hopes to avoid taking funds from other salmon restoration efforts, which likely means the program will need to pursue a diverse mix of funding sources. Other options include integrating projects into existing capital programs; considering a fish passage capital restoration program; leveraging existing state/federal programs, taking advantage of grants; looking for partnerships; being innovative.

He reviewed an expected timeline for the work. Scoping and development is complete, and field inventory assessment is beginning. Later will come developing prioritization methodology through 2019-2020. Then comes work on early action projects, developing program procedures from 2020-2021, recommending funding strategies and program procedures in spring 2021, and beginning project implementation in earnest in 2021.

The following questions and feedback came from Commissioners and staff:

- How much are private landowners relied on in this work, and is the County having issues there? Mr. Lewis said the County is working with tribes and other entities, who have mostly been amicable so far.
- What line item in the County budget funds this work? Mr. Lewis said many of the early actions are funded through Surface Water Management (SWM) fees. Some funds also come from the Real Estate Excise Tax (REET), and the Parks levy.
- Does the County seek specific feedback from the Commission? Mr. Lewis replied he'd like to hear experiences and concerns on issues such as removing/replacing culverts.

- The County should keep in mind that some bridges on farmland transport very heavy loads.
- The County should have an informational sheet, with items such as costs, to present up front to landowners.
- Including ADAP and the Snoqualmie WID on agricultural culvert projects is key, as the County agriculture program has water quality cost-share money which could help make progress on this.
- In the future, it would be interesting for the County to present to the Commission specifically on the Snoqualmie part of this work, and think about working in conjunction with FFF efforts and how agricultural resources can be used to help this.
- How much work will occur on farmland? Mr. Lewis said when prioritization is done, he will be able to provide an answer.
- Is there an outreach plan for farmers and landowners once prioritizing is done? Mr. Lewis said there is a communications plan, and he'd like to stay in contact with the Commission and others to reach out and get input.

Winery Code Amendment Letter – Meredith Molli, Commissioners

Patrice Barrentine briefly recapped the winery committee meeting held just before this meeting. The Commission voted last meeting to send a letter to KCC in response to the first striker amendment to the Executive's winery code proposal. This letter is now working its way through DNRP. Today the winery committee discussed the second striker.

In the packet for review today is a draft letter about this second striker, and comments. Due to lack of quorum tonight, Ms. Barrentine advised a special meeting conference call in two weeks to vote on the letter to send.

Ms. Barrentine said she has researched another special overlay district in the Sammamish Valley, an agriculture buffer special overlay district. This overlay is where the tasting room/winery/distillery special overlays are. These newer proposed overlay districts are pilot areas, to test how certain proposals will work from a business standpoint, and assess the businesses' residential and agricultural impacts, in these specific zones. Further legislation could be proposed to implement these overlays long-term, or change them entirely. The agriculture buffer zone, first legislated in 1993, is on a hillside on one side of the valley, meant to protect the APD. Councilmember Lambert said Dylan Brown in her office has more information on this. Ms. Barrentine noted there is another proposed overlay on Vashon.

The Commission reviewed the letter's bullet-point list item recommendations one by one:

The winery committee recommends, for agricultural zones:

- Not supporting Winery/Brewery/Distillery (WBD)-1s in agricultural zones.
- That WBDs grow 60% of product on-site; the committee also does not support a WBD-1 in an APD sourcing crops off-site from Puget Sound counties.
- That WBDs in APDs must do all four designated stages of wine processing.
- Not supporting grandfathering in of existing parking spaces.
- Not supporting conditional use permit setback reduction to as little as 25 feet.

The winery committee recommends, for rural zones:

- Not supporting WBD-1s as residential accessory uses.
- Not supporting incidental sales or tastings for WBD-1s.
- That more, or all four, stages of wine processing are required for WBDs.
- Not supporting grandfathering in of existing parking spaces.

The winery committee recommends, for special overlay districts:

- Not supporting reducing setbacks to 25 feet, even with conditional use permits, for all winery sizes.

The following suggestions were made in addition to the above:

- The Commission still wants feedback from Rosella Mosby, Roger Calhoon, and Amy Holmes regarding residential accessory uses in rural areas.
- Key language in the recommendations refers to production facilities being located on the "least suitable" land in a parcel in an APD; however, current code says it should be located on land "not suitable" for farming, and the recommendation should be updated to reflect this.
- The committee recommends a short statement clarifying, in terms of the agricultural industry vs. winery industry, the distinction between and definitions of "production" and "processing."
- Discussion whether to require a WBD-1 in an APD to do all four stages of wine processing on-site, or simply bar WBD-1s from APDs.

Councilmember Lambert offered her Committee's reasoning behind the discussed points:

- Her Committee wants to keep WBD home occupations as small as possible, as they were interfering with neighborhoods. The Executive proposal barred all home occupation WBDs. Councilmember Lambert said this would make them the only industry banned from starting up in a home, which the Committee thought unfair.
- She voiced strong disagreement with the 60% on-site product requirement, as she believes it is arbitrary. She feels the 60%, if kept, should refer to the amount of a property in production.
- The 75-foot setbacks: the Committee wants to be flexible, to make allowances if there's an atypical piece of property.
- The special district overlays: these are due to many wineries in Woodinville already being established. The Committee specifically put in the striker that a WBD on a small parcel could not move to another parcel.
- Parking: in the overlay areas, the Committee wanted as few variables changed as possible. They believe the current parking is working, and therefore should not be changed. The local population is going to increase dramatically in the future, so what is already there should be kept.
- She noted there already many tasting rooms moving into downtown Woodinville, and her Committee are trying to complement something that's already going to happen regardless.

A citizen asked how many wineries this is affecting. Councilmember Lambert answered less than 50. Ms. Barrentine observed the main challenge has been tasting rooms in the APDs, more so than WBDs. John Taylor of Department of Local Services added that the key concern for farmers is not that this activity happens in the APD – the concern is the development on the boundaries of the APD, creating pressure on the APD.

Policies and Procedures – Meredith Molli, Commissioners

Ms. Molli reiterated the Commission could not vote on this document today due to lack of quorum, but believed those present should review and discuss it briefly. Many comments have come from Ms. Molli, Leigh Newman-Bell, and Patrice Barrentine, but further feedback from Commissioners is sought.

The following comments were made:

- In recent years, the vote to move new Commissioner candidates forward in the appointment process has not gone to the full Commission, just the selection committee. If it is policy for new applicant selection votes to go before the full Commission, this should actually happen – or this policy should be changed.
- There is no provision for who presides over a meeting if both the chair and vice chair are unavailable. Ms. Barrentine said sometimes in those cases the chair can designate a temporary chair for that meeting.
- Sometimes it falls out of an individual Commissioner's control whether they are presented in media as an Agriculture Commissioner instead of an individual. There should be a provision to protect a Commissioner from recriminations in these cases. Ms. Barrentine asked what sort of provision, suggesting a Commissioner should notify the County staff liaison if they are interviewed.
- Group items related to Commissioner appointment and dismissal together numerically in the main document.
- Three consecutive missed meetings, or four to five meetings missed in a 12-month period, should be grounds for dismissal discussion.
- Re-add the section addressing Commissioner first-time appointments.
- Are new Commissioners expected to self-educate and/or learn as they go? Ms. Barrentine replied that agriculture is a broad field and no one person can know all of it.
- A good thing to add to new Commissioner training would be how to bring issues before the Commission.
- Commissioner reimbursement: Ms. Barrentine said she has not gotten a ruling on this yet.
- The "job description" should be developed. "Job description" should be labeled as "job responsibilities."
- Add a glossary of terms to the training manual.

General Public Comment

- Councilmember Lambert reported that on April 22 there will be a Firewise presentation to KCC's Local Services, Regional Roads, and Bridges Committee, which she chairs. Then on May 13, several people from various levels of government, will present to this Committee about fire response coordination.
- Councilmember Lambert spoke briefly on the "serious problem" facing County bridges. She talked to DOT in Washington, DC last week on this. The County will close or raise restrictions on 35 of its bridges by 2040, many of these in agricultural areas. She asked anyone wanting further information to contact her office.

Concerns of Commissioners

- Leann Krainick spoke on behalf of Rosella Mosby on a proposal to widen State Highway 18 to mitigate traffic through Auburn. One proposal would remove a large portion of Mosby farm in the Upper Green APD. While this

is a state issue, Ms. Krainick wants County staff to keep the Commission aware. Patrice Barrentine said Ms. Mosby met Auburn's mayor last week on how long public comment will be accepted, as this proposal runs through the center of the Mosby farm. Ms. Krainick said another proposal would make Green Valley Road a major bypass for Auburn, which would impact the APD/farmland, fish, bicyclists, and pedestrians. There are more costly proposals, but going through the APD is less so for the state. Ms. Barrentine said the Commission will take action on this at some point. Ms. Krainick asked if the Mosby farm is in the Farmland Preservation Program; if so, the County would have a vested interest in this situation. Ms. Barrentine agreed to check.

Meeting adjourned at 6:08 pm

Next Meeting

Special Meeting: April 25, 2019, 1:00 – 2:30 pm, teleconference from King Street Center (Seattle)

Regular Meeting: May 9, 2019, 3:00 – 6:00 pm, Preston Community Center (Preston)



King County
Water and Land Resources Division
 Department of Natural Resources and Parks
 King Street Center
 201 South Jackson Street, Suite 600
 Seattle, WA 98104-3855
206-477-4800 Fax 206-296-0192
 TTY Relay: 711

King County Agriculture Commission
DRAFT Special Meeting Minutes
Thursday, April 25th, 2019 – 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm
Conference Call from King Street Center, Seattle

Commissioners	P	A	Commissioners	P	A	Ex Officio	P	A
Meredith Molli, Chair	X		Amy Holmes	X		Fereshteh Dehkordi, DPER		X
Leigh Newman-Bell, Vice-Chair	X		Nayab Khan	X		Becky Elias, SKCPH		X
Roger Calhoon	X		Leann Krainick	X		Josh Monaghan, KCD		X
Sarah Collier	X		Darron Marzolf	X		Kevin Wright, WSU		X
Bruce Elliott	X		Rosella Mosby		X			
Year Eng		X	Paul Pink		X			
Lily Gottlieb-McHale	X		Kevin Scott-Vanderberge	X				

P=Present; A=Absent

County Staff/Representatives Present		
Patrice Barrentine, DNRP	Dylan Brown, KCC Staff (Lambert)	Megan Moore, DNRP

Guests Present		
Cynthia Krass, Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance		

Meeting Action Summary

- **Discussion/vote on response letter to King County winery ordinance striker amendment.**

Meeting called to order at 1:08 pm

Approval of Meeting Agenda

Leann Krainick motioned to accept today’s agenda as written. Amy Holmes seconded; the motion carried unanimously.

Public Comment (Related to Specific Agenda Item)

There was no public comment during this period.

Winery Code Amendment Letter – Meredith Molli & Winery Code Committee (ACTION: Vote)

The Commission reviewed their draft letter to King County Council (KCC) in reply to a March 8, 2019 striker amendment to the County Executive’s proposed winery/brewery/distillery (“WBD”) ordinance. The letter notes several issues with the November 30, 2018 striker have been resolved to the Commission’s satisfaction, but several more concerns remain from the March 8 striker regarding APDs, rural areas, and special overlay districts.

Ms. Molli opened discussion by asking for Roger Calhoon’s and Amy Holmes’ feedback on the topic of if WBD-1s should be allowed in rural zones as an accessory use. Ms. Holmes said she emailed her comments to Mr. Calhoon, Rosella Mosby, Ms. Molli, and Leann Krainick; she asked Patrice Barrentine to send these to the full Commission. Ms. Barrentine agreed, adding these would go in today’s meeting packet as well.

Ms. Holmes said her concern about WBD-1s in rural areas is they are a “slippery slope” that can lead to problems in areas like Vashon as well as Woodinville; that, for example, a farm purchasing off-site-produced wine and offering tastings of it at their farm stand doesn’t seem in keeping with the purpose of a farm stand. She suggested specific language would be needed to clarify the definition of “accessory.” Regarding the proposed 60% on-site product requirement for WBDs, she views the idea of a properly-licensed farmer producing cider or beer with crops they grow on-site as an acceptable “value-added” product. Insurance and an apparent lack of code enforcement are also rural area

concerns. She added that parking is at the heart of her concerns on residential accessory use WBDs, citing a fatal car crash by one such establishment on Vashon.

Mr. Calhoon voiced uncertainty on the circumstances under which this proposal is occurring. He tended to favor people being allowed to “do their own thing” with their property, especially in rural areas, if it does not impact neighbors. He agreed the Commission should be careful on what they support or oppose, and outlawing certain things may not work.

There was some discussion clarifying the Commission’s proposed 60% on-site product content guideline for WBDs.

Through further discussion, the Commission also clarified/revised several bullet-item concerns in the letter:

- The Commission does not support WBD-1s in RA zones as a residential accessory use.
- The Commission does not support tastings or incidental sales for WBD-1s other than those items used for product containment, i.e., bottles or growlers.
- The Commission would like to see all four stages required for WBD production/processing in agricultural and rural zones.

Ms. Barrentine noted that in addition to the above, all suggested revisions from the prior Commission meeting have been integrated into this draft letter.

After review of the agreed-upon changes, Darron Marzolf motioned to approve the letter with these changes. Ms. Krainick proposed a friendly amendment to the motion, to approve the letter and send it to KCC. Mr. Marzolf accepted the amendment. Kevin Scott-Vanderberge seconded the amended motion. It carried unanimously.

General Public Comment

There was no public comment during this period.

Concerns of Commissioners

There were no comments during this period.

Meeting adjourned at 1:52 pm

Next Meeting

May 9th, 2019, 3:00 – 6:00 pm, Preston Community Center (Preston)

2017 Ag Land Use and Infrastructure by King County Council District
 Acres by Generalized Ag Land Use

Sum of Acres		Ag Land Use Type								Grand Total
KCCCD	Farmed Food	Farmed Not Food	Unfarmed	Unfarmable	Ag Infrastructure	Outside Ag Survey	Grand Total			
1	24	79	2	0	1	31,577	31,682			
2	10	8		12		18,110	18,140			
3	8,430	4,417	2,816	4,923	310	624,054	644,950			
4	2					18,415	18,417			
5	935	151	251	259	45	41,961	43,602			
6	130	405	51	107	43	36,198	36,933			
7	6,974	3,232	2,684	4,643	216	57,706	75,455			
8	922	246	301	165	26	50,384	52,043			
9	7,909	4,973	2,641	1,738	149	439,689	457,100			
Grand Total	25,336	13,510	8,746	11,847	790	1,318,093	1,378,322			

Original Spreadsheet:

\\dnrp1\Projects\WLRD\ag\AgLandUse\AgLU2017\tallies

AgLU_AgInfra_KCCD_March2019.xlsx

Source GIS Project:

\\dnrp1\Projects\WLRD\ag\AgLandUse\AgLU2017\MapDocs

Tally_AgLU2017_byKCCD_March2019.mxd

King County Agriculture Commission Policies and Procedures

1.0. SUBJECT TITLE: King County Agriculture Commission Policies and Procedures

1.1. Effective Date: Immediately following a majority vote of the King County Agriculture Commission.

2.0. PURPOSE:

2.1. DUTIES: The Purpose and Duties as defined by Enabling Ordinance #11417:

The Commission shall advise the council and executive on agricultural policies and programs, including, but not limited to:

A. Existing and proposed legislation and regulations affecting commercial agriculture;

B. Land use issues as they impact agriculture; and,

C. Ways to maintain, enhance, and promote agriculture and agricultural products in the region.

D. Livestock regulation implementation and monitoring duties set forth in K.C.C. chapter 21A.30. (Ord. 14199 § 23, 2001: Ord. 11417 § 6, 1994)

2.2. The MISSION STATEMENT as developed by the King County Agriculture Commission is:

The King County Agriculture Commission, working with citizens, agricultural producers, and public officials shall actively influence regional policy to preserve and enhance agricultural land; support and promote a viable agricultural community; and educate the public about the benefits of local agricultural products.

3.0. REFERENCES:

3.1. King County Ordinance 11417 establishes the King County Agriculture Commission purpose and provides guidelines for its powers, duties, operations, and membership.

3.2. King County Code 2.98 (Rules) requires each County governmental agency to prepare a set of internal rules for its operation consistent with the spirit of the law contained in RCW 42.17 (Public Records) and in RCW 42.30 (Open Public Meetings).

3.3. King County Code 3.04 (employee Code of Ethics) deals with ethical behavior and conflict of interest of county officials and employees, including members of boards and commissions and private consultants.

3.4. Revised Code of Washington 42.17 (Public Records) requires public agencies to make available to the public their procedures, documents and indexes for inspection and copying.

3.5. Revised Code of Washington 42.30 (Open Public Meetings) requires that all meetings of the governing body of a public agency be open to the public with few exceptions. Staff liaison shall give legal public notice for all Commission meetings.

4.0. DEFINITIONS:

4.1. Agriculture: For the purpose of the Commission deliberations commercial agriculture shall be defined as those activities defined in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 7.48.310 and that meet the income criteria set forth in King County's Code (including Current Use Tax program (based on RCW 84.34), Farmers Market Receipts, or Schedule F.

5.0. POLICIES & PROCEDURES:

5.1. Commissioners:

5.1.1. The Commission shall consist of the fifteen residents of King County serving without compensation; following the initial staggering of the Commissioner's terms, appointments are for a three-year term.

5.1.2. Responsibility/Duties:

5.1.2.1. Establish annual and long-term objectives

5.1.2.2. Work with staff on accomplishing annual goals and objectives of the Commission

5.1.2.3. Determine the committee structure to carry out policies and programs

5.1.2.4. Selection of new commissioners

5.1.2.5. Attend meetings of the Commission, its committees and meetings of other organizations when appropriate

5.1.2.6. Present and interpret Commission policies, actions, programs and resources to the public, agricultural organizations, interested individuals, and elected officials.

5.1.2.7. Represent agriculture interests in policy work such as Farm, Fish, Flood; DNRP hiring; or other county committee work, etc.

5.1.2.8. Recommend removal of sitting Commissioners for cause to the Commission if needed.

5.1.3. Reimbursement

5.1.3.1. Commissioners may be reimbursed for out of pocket expenses associated with Commission meetings by

submitting a claim for expense form to the King County Water and Land Resources Division.

5.1.3.2. Eligible expenses are limited to parking, mileage, ferry expense and other meeting related expenses approved by the Staff liaison in advance.

5.1.4. Orientation and Training Manual:

5.1.4.1. The Commissioner training and orientation manual should include the following information:

- Ordinance 11417 creating the King County Agriculture Commission
- County Organization Charts
- Committee Job Descriptions
- Commission Roster
- Council District Map
- Guide to applicable Programs for previous or current year
- Claim for Expense form
- Applicable Comprehensive Plan Policies and Maps of APD
- KCC 21.A.04; 21A.08
- Ordinance 4341, establishing Farmland Preservation Program (FPP) and copy of FPP deed restrictions.
- Robert's Rules of Order
- Glossary of KC Ag and KC acronyms
- How to bring topics to Commission

5.1.5. Commissioner Selection and Appointment

5.1.6. Commissioner Dismissal:

5.1.6.1. Absences from meetings should be reported to the Staff liaison in advance of the meeting from which a Commissioner will be absent.

5.1.6.2. If a Commissioner will be absent for three consecutive meetings, the Commissioner should contact the chair to explain the circumstances.

5.1.6.3. A Commissioner who has been absent for three consecutive meetings or more than 50% in a twelve-month period can be terminated after receiving a warning letter from the Staff liaison and the Chair.

5.1.7. Commissioner Reappointment:

5.1.7.1. Commissioners may reapply for a second term. Commissioners are limited to two terms.

5.1.7.2. Requests for reappointment shall be submitted in writing to the Chair by December 1 of the last year of first term, for forwarding to the County Executive.

5.1.7.3. Requests for reappointment shall be considered based on the record of the Commissioner's previous term, including assessment of attendance and consistent participation; factors of geographic diversity and representation shall also be taken into account.

5.1.7.4. The Staff liaison will forward the Commission's recommendation to the County Executive, who has the ultimate responsibility for reappointment.

5.2. Operations:

5.2.1. Quorum: A quorum for the legal transaction of business shall consist of a majority of all members currently appointed and confirmed to serve on the Commission.

5.2.2. Amending the Policy and Procedures Guidelines: This document may be amended with a 60% majority vote of the Commissioners present at an official commission meeting.

5.2.3. Official Actions

5.2.3.1. All official actions shall include, but are not limited to:

- Advising King County Council and King County Executive on matters pertaining to agriculture policy and programs.

5.2.4. Agenda:

5.2.4.1. The Staff liaison shall prepare formal monthly meeting agendas for the full Commission in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair.

5.2.4.2. The Agenda is to be communicated to Commissioners at least five working days prior to the regular monthly meeting.

5.2.5. Conduct of Meetings:

5.2.5.1. Meetings shall be conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order.

5.2.5.2. At the discretion of the Chair, staff and visitors may address the Commission to participate in discussions. Depending upon the number of visitors wishing to speak, the Chair may limit the time for comment to a reasonable

period, but not less than three minutes.

5.2.5.3. Special meetings of the Commission may be called with proper notice to the public and Commissioners three working days prior to a special meeting.

5.3 Officers

5.3.1. Elections and Terms:

5.3.1.1. Officers shall be elected from the entire Commission at its first regular meeting in October, or as necessary to fill unscheduled vacancies.

5.3.1.2. Officers of the Commission shall include a Chair and a Vice-Chair. The Recording Secretary shall be the Staff liaison.

5.3.1.3. Officers shall assume office in January and serve through the calendar year.

5.3.2. Nominations:

5.3.2.1. Current Chair shall seek nominations from all Commissioners at least one month prior to officer elections. Chair shall call for additional nominees from the floor prior to a motion for officer elections.

5.3.3. Unscheduled Vacancies:

5.3.3.1 In the event of an unscheduled vacancy in the roster of Commission officers, the remaining Executive Committee member may call for nominations and full Commission approval to fill such vacancy.

5.3.3.2 Remaining Executive Committee member may recommend to the full Commission that the vacant position on the Executive Committee remain unfilled, pending seating of a recently elected Executive Committee

5.3.4. Duties of Officers:

5.3.4.1. Chair:

- Shall preside at all meetings of the Commission, and at other special meetings, as appropriate. The chair is an ex-officio member of all committees.
- Shall vote to break a tie.
- Shall create and dismiss standing committees, with approval of the Commission.
- Shall take nominations from Commissioners for seats on various committees.
- Shall be responsible for official Commission communications.

5.3.4.2. Vice Chair:

- Shall act on behalf of the Chair when Chair is unable to perform official duties
- Participate in agenda planning with Chair and staff liaison when necessary.

5.4. Committees:

5.4.1 The Commission shall have standing and ad hoc committees.

5.4.2 Committees may be appointed at the discretion of the Commission and the Chair.

5.4.3 Executive Committee:

5.4.3.1 Membership. The Executive Committee shall be composed of officers of the Commission.

5.4.3.2 Meetings. The Executive Committee shall meet as required to perform its duties.

5.4.3.3 Reports. The Executive Committee shall report as needed to the Commission and give full information on its proceedings, if any.

5.4.3.4 Responsibilities. The Executive Committee shall monitor work of the Commission with assistance of the Staff liaison. The Executive Committee shall be responsible to the Commission and reports to it.

5.4.4 Additional Duties.

The Executive Committee shall:

5.4.4.1 Maintain Commission focus on mission statements.

5.4.4.2 Maintain Commission focus on goals and objectives.

5.4.4.3 Communicate Commission priorities to the Staff liaison.

5.4.4.4 Consider community input in setting priorities.

5.4.4.5 Make recommendations consistent with existing policies, programs, laws and regulations.

5.4.4.6 Review proposals falling outside regular committee guidelines.

5.4.4.7 Prepare correspondence on advocacy issues with assistance from staff liaison.

5.5 Standing Committees:

5.5.1 Membership: Commission Chair shall call for nominations to serve on committees and the full Commission will approve committee membership.

5.5.2 Meetings shall be held as needed.

5.5.3 As needed, each committee shall report monthly to the Commission and give full information on its proceedings.

- 5.5.4 Each committee shall operate under policy guidelines adopted by the Commission. These guidelines shall be reviewed and approved as needed.
- 5.6 Agriculture Commission Code of Ethics
 - 5.6.1
 - 5.6.1.1 Agriculture Commission members, panelists, and staff members are presumed to have an above-average knowledge of, interest in, and familiarity with agriculture and agricultural issues in King County.
 - 5.6.1.2 Because this unusually deep involvement in agriculture may give rise to questions of conflict of interest and special considerations, the following code of ethics shall provide guidance in resolving such issues.
 - 5.6.2 In addition to this specific Agriculture Commission Code of Ethics, commissioners and staff members shall be subject to King County Code 3.04, Employee Code of Ethics.
 - 5.6.3 Confidentiality of Records
 - 5.6.3.1 Commissioners shall file a written Statement of Financial Interest with the Board of Ethics within ten days of appointment or by April 15 of each year.
 - 5.6.3.2 Statement of Financial Interest shall be kept in confidence, to be disclosed only to any committee charged with ascertaining a breach of the Code of Ethics or to any authority having power of removal.
- 5.7. Media Relations:
 - 5.7.1. Necessity and Purpose:
 - 5.7.1.1. Because commissioners and staff members have public relations functions, both in representing Commission policies and programs to the public and also in gathering information and feedback from the public, they are expected to have a sound knowledge of the overall workings of the Commission.
 - 5.7.1.2. When public media representatives ask commissioners or staff members for information and interviews, these guidelines shall provide help in formulating responses.
 - 5.7.2. Notify staff liaison immediately when commissioner is interviewed by media
 - 5.7.3. Each commissioner and staff member shall answer as fully and accurately as possible any questions regarding the established policies and programs of the Commission, the carrying on of Commission business which is a matter of public record, and any factual information on agricultural matter in general.
 - 5.7.4. Any personal opinion which the commissioner or staff member feels it is appropriate to offer shall be identified as such and shall not be presented as the Commission policy.
 - 5.7.5. No Commissioner or staff member shall make a unilateral commitment on behalf of the Commission.
 - 5.7.6. "Off the record" commentary should be avoided.
 - 5.7.7. No Commissioner or staff member shall make disparaging remarks about any individual or organization.
 - 5.7.8. If the requested information is confidential, the commissioner or staff member shall explain to the media representative why the information cannot be discussed and shall decline to answer the question; or shall relay only the message on the subject which the Commission has agreed upon, explaining that the message is what the Commission has prepared as a statement.
 - 5.7.9. Commissioners and staff members shall remain cordial and cooperative, even when under pressure, recognizing the importance of the freedom of the press and the interests of the public welfare.
 - 5.7.10. In order that the Commission shall be informed of the extent and topics of media contacts concerning its business, commissioners and staff members shall report all media contacts and the substance thereof to the Chair and the Staff liaison respectively in a timely manner.