

**Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood 2.0
Implementation Oversight Committee
MEETING NOTES**

Thursday, August 2nd, 2018
Chamber of Commerce, Duvall Visitor and Community Center
15619 Main St. NE, Duvall, WA, 98019

8:30 - 9:00 am: Continental Breakfast and Catch Up!
9:00 am - 12:00 pm: Meeting

NOTE: All PowerPoint presentations and meeting packets are available online through EasyProjects.

1) Introductions, Welcome by Co-Chair (*Tamie Kellogg, Josh Monaghan*)

- Ms. Kellogg, facilitator, called the meeting to order at 9:03 am.
- Mr. Monaghan, farm caucus co-chair, shared reflections from a recent conference. He stressed a difference between knowledge and wisdom, and a need for wisdom in today's world. Ms. Kellogg reviewed the meeting documents and today's objectives.

2) Public Comment I

There was no public comment during this period.

3) King County Interim Budget Update on FFF Collective Actions (*John Taylor*)

Mr. Taylor, assistant director of DNRP's WLR Division, spoke on the County budget. He said the approval process goes from January to November, with review and changes by the County Executive's office and Council. The County's SWM (Surface Water Management) fee is a major fund source, and Council often scrutinizes it, especially if a large rate increase is requested. The increase requested this year will be less than the 40% approved in 2016. He could not be more specific, as the Executive has not given final approval yet.

He reviewed several proposed FFF investments: increased ADAP funding, including improving agricultural drainage; addressing fish biologists' concerns; facilitation costs; more County Agriculture staff to develop the Agriculture Strategic Plan for the Snoqualmie Valley; continued support for the regulatory and buffers task forces; and funding large APD capital projects. He said all items would not be funded in this biennium; less urgent items will be prioritized for later years. The plan is to sequentially meet all actions in the agreement.

The budget is sent to the Executive's office June 30, who transmits it to Council on September 20, to adopt by December 1. Talks continue with Flood Control District (FCD), as some FFF items are under their purview. Mr. Taylor said FCD has never felt they hold a stake in the FFF recommendations; talks are underway with Councilmember Kathy Lambert to ensure some recommendations are included in next year's FCD budget.

Fish caucus co-chair Cindy Spiry asked about the increase in funding for ADAP and fish biologists. Mr. Taylor replied that enhanced ADAP funding is part of the current budget package, with a section on expanding ADAP to larger water bodies; this will likely be addressed in the May 2021-22 budget. Kollin Higgins, fish caucus County staff liaison, is working with WLRD's Stormwater section to explore the fish biologist issue and determine if there is need to hire one full-time. Cynthia Krass noted the Snoqualmie WID has a fish biologist on staff that anyone may consult if need be, though this would not be a full-time solution.

Lara Thomas said not having FCD participate in the flood caucus could be detrimental to the group's success. Josh Monaghan said two FCD staffers were critical to navigating regulatory task force issues at first, but elected not to participate further. He and Ms. Spiry agreed FCD needs to participate in FFF. Mr. Taylor explained that in the FCD executive committee's view, this is not an efficient use of staff time. Meredith Molli asked if FFF itself was a waste of tax dollars if it can't proceed without FCD involvement. Mr. Taylor conceded FCD involvement early in FFF was beneficial, but their executive committee has to work this out.

Micah Wait asked for clarification on a budget increase for large capital projects. Mr. Taylor said he wasn't certain there was an increase, but progress is being made on designs so projects can be funded. Joan Lee, Rural and Regional Services (RRS) section manager for WLRD, noted the base budget has increased over prior years. Mr. Taylor said some funds will go towards FFF projects, and others; capital funding that goes into RRS leverages two to five times what is put into the budget. He said more specific information about the budget and

SWM rate increase will be available by the next IOC meeting in fall.

4) Bundled Actions Update, Part 1

- **Large Cap Projects (*Jon Hansen*):**

Mr. Hansen, of WLRD's Ecological Restoration and Engineering Services (ERES) unit, presented on capital improvement projects in the Snoqualmie Valley. Tamie Kellogg advised the IOC to take time to "digest" the presentations, and recommendations need not be made now.

Mr. Hansen said several action recommendations addressed capital project implementation: demonstrable progress on 2-3 large projects inside the APD (and outside); improving efficiency; accelerating project completion rate to one per year. Past completion rate for a project, from proposal to construction, has ranged about three years. He said Hafner/Barfuse inside the APD, as well as San Souci and others outside the APD, are being worked on as part of the proposed 2019-2020 budget. Fish passage in King County-owned culverts is also being addressed. He said in the past it would take five to seven years of SWM funds to pay for one project. Work on San Souci is expected to begin this summer, with crews pulling out a levee illegally placed by residents.

He briefly reviewed project funding sources. Cindy Spiry asked if acquisition funding for the County's Land Conservation Initiative (LCI) is included in this. Mr. Hansen said while there is some project overlap between his group and the LCI, his group doesn't necessarily receive LCI funds. Joan Lee added there may be money for acquisitions now, which may affect projects later. The capital program can run \$20-30 million in a given year; \$3-4 million of that is SWM funding. Mr. Hansen said the goal is for a steady/timely fund stream, and river projects can be very costly.

He spoke more about Hafner/Barfuse. A recent feasibility study looked at channel migration, floodplain changes, and other factors. Hafner/Barfuse is a high-priority reach, with work beneficial to the amount of investment. Potential benefits include recovering the salmon population, improving habitat, and replacing out-of-date facilities. His group is looking at setting existing facilities back from the river, and improving habitat and flood protection. Recreation will also be addressed. He noted that if you respect natural river processes, you achieve better habitat.

Mr. Hansen reviewed progress on FFF action objectives Fish 1 and Fish 2: this is exemplified by progress on Hafner/Barfuse, initiation of several other projects, aggressive pursuit of funding, adding several ERES staff, and streamlining project approval, which will now include input from third party consultants. Mr. Hansen confirmed there is a broader range of projects being explored than those mentioned today. He clarified that ERES staff are not watershed-specific, and all work countywide. He said there is hypothetical potential to add more staff with additional funding.

There several questions about the modeling process. Mr. Hansen said with most projects the intent is to monitor the expected success of the project and make adjustments as progress is made. Hydraulic modeling is done, including worst-case scenarios. After a project, changes are observed and any lessons learned incorporated into future projects. Ms. Lee added that cumulative monitoring, of the effects of multiple projects over time, is largely done at the FCD level. In 2016, it was estimated that it would take a half-million dollars to monitor the entire Snoqualmie watershed this way, which is not yet in the budget. Lara Thomas said she wanted to see the long-term modeling, and ensure there is funding for adaptive management.

One question asked about assessment of fish passages. Mr. Hansen answered there is a proposal to enhance funding for this. John Taylor added that after a Supreme Court ruling, the Executive asked for a proposal to remove fish barriers countywide, and the upcoming budget will include a proposal for barrier removal. He said most funding for this will come from SWM. Dylan Brown of Councilmember Lambert's office asked to follow up with Mr. Taylor.

Another focus of questions was what difference the FFF process has made in the number of County projects being done. Mr. Hansen this would need to be studied and followed up on for a future meeting. Mr. Taylor said more projects would be done, but the agreement of the original FFF process was that all would support salmon recovery, regulatory relief for farmers, and boundaries for salmon recovery using agricultural land; that the causes are not mutually exclusive.

- **Regulatory Task Force (*Eric Beach*):**

- Mr. Beach, task force coordinator, reviewed their progress. Their scope of work covers about 20 overlapping priority issues. Four issues have completed review: bypass requirements for small waterways; fish mortality in de-fishing; artificial channels streamlined farm plans; and scoping the Endangered Species Act (ESA) to address risk to Chinook salmon in expanding ADAP.
- Two recommendations are being submitted to the IOC for consideration; relevant issue papers will be distributed to the IOC on August 3, with feedback and questions due to Eric by August 17. Revised issue papers reflecting feedback will be sent to the IOC prior to its fourth-quarter meeting. Assessment of implementation requirements for the recommendations will be conducted by the County and partners prior to the fourth-quarter meeting.
- John Taylor asked how common farm plans are in the Valley. Mr. Monaghan said about 25% have a farm plan. Mr. Beach said about 70% of artificial channels are dry at time of construction; they would still go through the usual ADAP process, just with an expedited farm plan process.
- It was asked whether the County's Noxious Weeds Program works with ADAP to address weeds on farms. Mr. Beach replied that he believes this is a WDFW issue; Mr. Monaghan added that it's part of the farm planning consultation process. Bobbi Lindemulder said this should be addressed, as she has been told it's not a priority.
- Denise Krownbell asked what ADAP was; Mr. Beach offered to put her in contact with Lou Beck in the County's Stormwater section, that an "ADAP 101" briefing and field trip can be arranged. Ms. Krownbell agreed she would prefer a field trip prior to making a recommendation. Mr. Beach agreed to be in contact on the issue.
- It was suggested that Mr. Beach reach out to Eric Stockdale with Snohomish County to consult on facilitating culvert replacements.

****BREAK****

5) Bundled Actions Update, Part 2

- **Buffers Task Force (*Beth leDoux*)**
 - Ms. leDoux, task force coordinator, reviewed their progress. A kick-off meeting was held June 20, and a 10-person technical team has been selected. This team is reviewing literature to find middle ground on buffer size, instead of extreme sizes. The agriculture team is working on a cost/benefits of buffers analysis paper. The force's October 17th meeting will, in collaboration with the Tulalip tribe, include a "state of the salmon" update.
 - There were no follow-up questions.
- **Agriculture Strategic Plan Task Force (*Patrice Barrentine*)**
 - Ms. Barrentine, task force coordinator, briefly reviewed the force's progress.
 - Lara Thomas asked if flood resiliency, looking forward long-term instead of just now, will be included in this group's work moving forward. Ms. Barrentine said this does fall under what she understands their scope of work to be, but that the current phase of their work is focused on assessment of what is happening on farmlands.
 - Bobbi Lindemulder asked about the University of Washington's flood studies in the Snohomish basin, which she would like to see expanded into King County. Josh Monaghan agreed this should be discussed. Ms. Barrentine said she and Richard Martin have spoken with Snohomish County on this, and will follow up.
 - Cynthia Krass asked if it were possible to nexus this process with the 2018 flood hazard management plan. John Taylor said the management plan and FCD are not always in alignment, that FCD is not fond of funding land use/climate change issues, but there will be funding for County staff to be included in flood hazard management.
 - Daryl Williams asked if the force's scope is the entire Snoqualmie Valley or just the APD; Ms. Barrentine's understanding is that it is just the APD. Josh Monaghan said King Conservation District (KCD) is working with Ms. Barrentine on a more countywide perspective, which may not be as highly detailed as the APD-focused work. There will be more data on this in the fall.

6) Progress Report on Full Collective Actions List (*Richard Martin*)

- Mr. Martin reviewed the Collective Actions List, now sorted by caucus name/objective number, i.e., Fish 1, Farm 3. He also noted a color-coding for action item status. "Green" indicates solid progress made and no foreseen challenges to completion, on about 1/3 of the list. Most of the remaining 2/3 were "Yellow," indicating progress is modest or not yet begun. The one "Red" item, indicating unlikely completion by the 2022 goal date, involves a trust for affordable farm worker housing. He

cited legal/regulatory restraints as the main hurdle. Lara Thomas stressed that affordable housing is a priority for the Executive, and if it is not addressed now, it may never be, as land is a diminishing resource.

- Bobbi Lindemulder noted several “yellow” items are subject to FCD funding approval. She asked the risk to funding these items if FCD continues to not engage in FFF. She asked if it is possible to send a letter voicing a strong desire for them to participate. Meredith Molli reiterated Mr. Taylor’s earlier comment that FCD does not believe they should be involved in policy discussions. Mr. Martin replied that FCD’s current policy would need to be changed for them to prioritize resources for farming (as requested in action item 15).

Mr. Monaghan stressed that non-County-staff IOC members need to carry more weight on this issue, and co-chairs should find a way to proceed. He asked what the IOC’s official ability is to send a letter, to ensure FCD hears their concerns. Mr. Taylor answered that as an advisory body to the Executive and Council, the IOC can communicate with the Executive and KCC, but not the governor or legislature. He noted that while FCD convenes meetings as FCD, they are all County Councilmembers. He said there would need to be a motion from the IOC to send a letter to the Council.

Cynthia Krass observed she has found attending FCD’s advisory committee meetings to be enlightening, stating they are the closest FCD has to a policy-making body. Mr. Taylor added that they also have a joint basin technical committee who frame discussions for the advisory committee, and flood caucus co-chair Angela Donaldson is on that committee. Ms. Thomas also agreed with sending a letter, adding that co-chairs should set up a meeting with KCC members like Kathy Lambert, Reagan Dunn, and their staff, to discuss with and convince Council on this issue. She said this is not just a staffing issue, but a political one as well. Mr. Taylor said these are not unreasonable requests, but there is just a peculiarity to the way FCD operates.

Ms. Kellogg asked if caucus co-chairs need to convene a meeting to further discuss sending a letter. She went around the table asking for individual IOC members’ input on the idea. All agreed sending a letter made sense, that it would be a benefit to have FCD at the discussion table. Micah Wait stressed a need for an actively engaged representative, as prior FCD representatives in the first FFF process were not very engaged. Daryl Williams advised being careful with the tone of the letter, to not upset FCD, and ensure they come to the table because they want to and not because they are being directed by a superior. Ms. Krass also suggested those IOC members who are part of non-profit entities set up “coffee meetings” with KCC members to facilitate a connection with them. Mr. Taylor said there was nothing wrong with this idea.

Cindy Spiry, fish caucus co-chair, agreed an FCD representative needs to be present, that FCD also works on multi-benefit issues and the FFF process directly correlates to their work. Denise Krownbell said the FCD representative should be the same person attending each time, not a rotating group. Mr. Taylor agreed a letter should be sent, that it should be helpful and collaborative, but the IOC should be aware FCD has only one staffer, who is overextended in her duties. He added he could not collaborate on the letter. Kurt Nelson noted that, as King County’s Rivers staff are the service provider for FCD, their presence is needed as well.

Ms. Kellogg reiterated, for clarity, the specific requests of the FCD letter: a meeting, careful tone, participation, and active engagement at multiple levels. She also noted Ms. Krass’s “coffee meetings” idea. She asked IOC members if they will support their co-chairs in sending this letter. General consensus was supportive. Ms. Kellogg directed this letter to be sent to IOC members as soon as possible prior to next meeting to allow time for review.

- Ms. Spiry questioned the color-coding of two items. She asked if Action Item #28 should be red instead of yellow, and if the IOC could get more clarification on staffing issues. She also asked if Action Item #14 should not be green, and if there would still be a dedicated staffer in place. Jason Walker added that having a dedicated biologist to assist ADAP was part of the FFF agreement, that allocating staff from different agencies may not be sufficient. Mr. Taylor said as a friendly amendment this item could be changed to yellow, and that discussion on it should continue. Once a final County budget is approved, and DNRP staff deployment is determined, the IOC could revisit the fisheries biologist capacity issue.

- Mr. Martin asked for feedback on if the current action list spreadsheet is helpful, and said there would be a good faith effort to have bundled issues progress. Mr. Monaghan asked members to communicate with caucus chairs to ensure important topics are covered next meeting.

7) Communications (*Richard Martin, Tamie Kellogg, Andrea Plischke*)

- Ms. Kellogg asked feedback on the proposed IOC meeting date calendar be sent to her and Ms. Plischke within a week. If anyone has a conflict with a proposed date, they are asked to propose an alternate date the same week. Ms. Plischke will send out calendar updates. Meredith Molli asked for time and date information to be in the body as well as title of the email.
- Ms. Plischke asked anyone with EasyProjects questions to follow up with her.
- Mr. Martin requested IOC members to review the “Structures and Responsibilities” document in their packet, and contact their caucus chair with any feedback.
- Ms. Kellogg asked anyone with alternate ideas for meeting facilities to send her an email.

8) Public Comment II

This item was not addressed due to time constraints.

9) Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 12:02 pm.

Next Meeting Date: To Be Determined (October 2018)

**Fish Farm Flood 2.0 Implementation Oversight Committee
Member Attendance List – August 2, 2018 Meeting
Duvall Community/Visitors' Center – Duvall, WA**

Brendan Brokes, WA Department of Fish and Wildlife (*ex officio*)

Tom Buroker, WA Department of Ecology (*ex officio*)

Cynthia Krass, Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance

Denise Krownbell, Snohomish Forum

Bobbi Lindemulder, farmer

Meredith Molli, farmer/Agriculture Commission

Josh Monaghan, King Conservation District

Libby Reed, Sno Valley Tilth

Cindy Spiry, Snoqualmie Tribe

John Taylor, King County DNRP/WLRD (*ex officio*)

Lara Thomas, City of Duvall

Micah Wait, Wild Fish Conservancy

Jason Walker, Snoqualmie Forum

Daryl Williams, Tulalip Tribes