

Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood 2.0 Implementation Oversight Committee

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, October 13, 2021 (IOC Fall 2021 Retreat #3 of 3)

8:00 am to 10:00 am (scheduled)

Video Conference Call via King County Zoom Account

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

I) Call to Order / Review Revised Agenda / Priorities Check-In

Meeting facilitator Tamie Kellogg began the meeting at 8:08 am and reviewed the revised agenda.

Priorities check-in discussion first centered on a fish biologist for the Agricultural Drainage Assistance Program (ADAP) remaining a priority for both fish and farm caucuses. The fish caucus had asked a fish biologist to be part of all phases of ADAP, not just implementation, due to such a position having a view on habitat that would lead to better fish outcomes. The fish biologist position is now housed at the Snoqualmie Watershed Improvement District (WID), which is a preferred priority for the farm caucus. This way, it can be assured ADAP has a dedicated, long-term biologist and the WID can manage their time and ensure they're staying on-project. It was noted that King County staff vacancies have contributed to the uneven presence of an ADAP fish biologist. It was a consensus of the IOC that a fish biologist position should remain housed at the WID and during all phases of an ADAP project. This is partly due to the unpredictable nature of County funding and the need for this biologist to be a sustainable position. It was also suggested this be required for permitting so it doesn't fall by the wayside during a project.

The flood caucus has sent out a revised priorities list, noting that their #6 item should now be worded as "creating a resilient watershed management plan." This aligns with the initial required deliverable from R-650A, and should be an outcome of the whole IOC and FFF process, not just of the flood caucus.

It was a consensus that IOC participation in updates to the County's flood management plan and Comprehensive ("comp") Plan be added to the priorities list. It was also agreed that ex officio state caucus updates, along with the County's Strategic Climate Action Plan (SCAP), Equity and Social Justice (ESJ), Clean Water Healthy Habitat (CWHH), and the DNR/Department of Local Services (DLS) joint work program, be discussed among individual caucuses before adding them to the priorities list. Tom Buroker noted state government will dig deeply into salmon recovery over the next three years. There should also be more money for multi-benefit projects – particularly for salmon; for farm and flood is uncertain. WDOE has proposed items that may be good for clean water specifically.

II) FFF Priorities: 2022 – 2024

It was noted that an IOC letter to the Executive has been added to the priorities list. This stems from a conversation on accountability: while there may be progress at the County on items, this is not always communicated to FFF. It was suggested more frequent meetings with County staff may help keep the IOC updated; a counter-proposal was for caucus co-chairs to meet with Beth leDoux and report to caucuses more often, since full IOC meetings are harder to organize. Tamie Kellogg added that there will be a place to discuss accountability later in the meeting.

III) Snoqualmie Sub-Area Plan / Q & A

Jesse Reynolds of King County DLS gave a presentation on the Snoqualmie "sub-area" plan, an extension of the County's comp plan. Reynolds is one of three sub-area planners at DLS. Reynolds noted this presentation is to

introduce the sub-area planning process and community needs list, as well as discuss existing plans, programs, or data that should be explored.

The Snoqualmie Community Service Area (CSA) is essentially the entire watershed: 21.5K people in 900 square miles including the APD, but not incorporated cities or towns. DLS also confers with the Snoqualmie and Tulalip tribes. The sub-area plan is a 20-year forward-looking document intended to adopt a community vision and the policies to support that vision. The concept has been around for a few decades and focuses mostly on land use. This is mostly a reversion to pre-Growth Management Act (GMW) principles, which are more comprehensive in what can be covered, such as smaller unincorporated areas. Sub-area plan policies have the same writ as comp plan policies. They include SEPA impact reviews, community needs lists which inform the 2023-24 budget, and CSA work programs. Work programs convey County actions and priorities for the year and include service partnerships and agreements with agencies with internal mechanisms for implementation.

Community needs lists are prioritized lists of County projects to support the sub-area plan's vision. The current list is scheduled to go through public input starting in January and King County Council (KCC) review later in 2022. Community engagements will be tailored to each community. Common themes for input so far include but are not limited to: growth controls, traffic/road capacity, better transit and infrastructure, undergrounding power lines, parks and playgrounds, agricultural support, affordable housing, homeless camps, internet access, and flooding. Comments are no longer being accepted online but can be emailed to Reynolds.

Reynolds had three questions for the IOC:

- **Q:** What is the best way to engage with FFF; who wants to be on the stakeholder list?
A: Announcements like this through caucus chairs to IOC members, people making sure they are subscribed to the FFF newsletter, and contacting Reynolds directly. The Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance (SVPA) is setting up a meeting with Reynolds, and the Tulalip tribe would like to as well.
- **Q:** What specific plans, programs, or data should be explored?
A: The agriculture strategic plan, and the 2022-2024 priorities list. The flood caucus is interested in housing, resilient infrastructure, and keeping Duvall connected. A lot of work on the agriculture and flood sides can be incorporated into this plan. The Snohomish salmon plan is very in line with CWHH; it would be a good idea to coordinate with the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum on this.
- **Q:** What are the lessons learned from a multi-objective pursuit like FFF?
A: FFF priorities should be looked at to ensure both this and the sub-area plan can be met under the County's planning process.

IOC members also had several follow-up questions:

- **Q:** Is a housing needs assessment being done along with a housing action plan?
A: A housing needs assessment would be done through the County's Department of Community and Human Services (DCHS) and not directly associated with the sub-area plan, but is something that should be looked at.
- **Q:** When will the County be ready to present to Valley cities?
A: DLS has met with all Valley cities except Duvall. There could be presentations early next year, with the caveat that the sub-area plan is for unincorporated areas.
- **Q:** How is the County going to look at flood resiliency for roads including priorities/policies?
A: We're exploring a connection with King County Roads. Under the GMA we don't get much road funding, but it is a concern we're aware of.
- **Q:** How would someone know about the online community input option? Will the community engagement sessions be an opportunity for new comment? How do you prioritize things?
A: I'm sorry our communications team didn't reach you on the input website; send me your email. Content from the survey is the starting point for the community needs list and sub-area plan. That list is ongoing as far as the input we get, but the sub-area plan has defined areas we must transmit to KCC.
- **Q:** Will the agriculture strategic plan be part of the sub-area plan?
A: The agriculture strategic plan is a separate project, but we should be coordinating.

-- BREAK --

IV) **Next Steps to King County Comprehensive Plan**

Tamie Kellogg asked if the IOC would like a full presentation on the comp plan from King County DLS. Consensus agreed; Kellogg said this presentation would be cued up as soon as possible.

It was also noted the IOC will get a chance to review the agriculture strategic plan in first quarter of 2022.

V) **Accountability**

Tamie Kellogg led an IOC discussion on FFF accountability, centering on three questions:

- **Q:** What are the components of accountability?
A: Follow-through and completion of set tasks. Transparency and visibility across agencies and not just in a silo. Setting metrics to attain delivery goals is important for outcomes, as well as a follow-up where the IOC gathers and tracks these items, to overcome them and push them forward.
- **Q:** How does accountability work in other settings and is there something to glean from that?
A: Each person's role should be clearly defined, with clearly defined expectations and responsibilities, communication, and backups who can be delegated to step in if needed. This helps sustain momentum. Goal development should be clearly defined in relation to timelines, with periodic check-ins along the way: checking in, readjusting, assuring when issues come up that all are aware and can consider process adjustments. There should be triggers for evaluation. Positive efforts and accomplishments should be focused on as well, to help build momentum to achieve tougher goals.
- **Q:** What would you like FFF accountability to look like?
A: Reporting is key and should be frequent. Take priorities and break out required deadlines, and from there work backwards to assign roles and responsibilities. Operational guidelines, key metrics for regular reports, also assure staying on track. It was suggested that FFF adopt a yearly work plan, with metrics and reporting back on accomplishments and challenges. The process and structure should be visible to all. Outcomes should be specific, measurable, and perhaps classified into short-term vs. long-term. Decision-makers and funders should be as informed as the IOC on this progress, to ensure their continued support. The County should be transparent about its budget process with the IOC. There should be a strategy, such as a letter, to communicate when objectives aren't being met, or a public "show and tell" for when things are going well.

There was additional discussion on pursuing grants vs. more permanent funding for FFF projects. Some noted that entities such as the Snohomish Salmon Recovery Forum and Snohomish Sustainable Land Strategy (SLS) have been successful in pursuing state and federal grants. A counterpoint was that focusing on permanent funding should be priority, that the lack of progress in the past year was due to a lack of stable funding.

Concern was voiced that the IOC has not received regular updates on the County's budget planning cycle and coming comp plan changes. The County budget and policy development processes are unclear to many. Concern was also voiced that the IOC and FFF always struggle to keep up with these processes, that updates should be brought to IOC attention at the right time, when they can still be addressed. The IOC should be kept updated on comp plan changes that may affect FFF work, instead of a presentation on the actual processes.

VI) Next Steps and Follow-Up

The next steps to follow up on today's discussion will go, at a minimum, to the caucus co-chairs. Co-chairs have already developed a beginning draft of an update including the comp plan update, the role of the IOC in the flood plan update, and FFF operational guidelines. This will institutionalize many of the items the IOC has listed for accountability. It was noted that SCAP and CWHH should not be forgotten either.

Co-chairs will also put together a draft letter addressing Flood Control District (FCD) participation in FFF. It was suggested FCD have a seat on the flood caucus, but not necessarily a voting seat on the IOC. However, that would be up to the FCD board, which will likely not deliberate on this until after the November elections. More feedback is sought to clarify if there is more intent in including FCD for technical expertise or as a funding partner. If the latter, this would mean a proposal to the FCD board. It was also suggested that in terms of communication, more would be accomplished with the FCD as a caucus member instead of an IOC member. It was agreed by several that FCD attending flood caucus meetings would be a step up from the current situation, and the letter, signed by co-chairs, should clarify a need for technical expertise as well as communication/support.

Tamie Kellogg advised at the November or December IOC meeting, the County should provide feedback on the IOC priorities list so the IOC can take some sort of action. Beth leDoux asked IOC members to let her know in the chat their preferred time frame availability for the next meeting, before or after Thanksgiving.

The meeting ended at 10:10 am.