Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood Implementation Committee

January 12, 2018

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

Chamber of Commerce Duvall Visitor and Community Center
15619 Main St NE, Duvall WA., 98019

Meeting Purpose: Orientation for the committee of the tasks at hand. Get input on how the committee will operate and their role of oversight, support and accountability.

8:30 am – 9:00 am	1. **Continental breakfast (30 min)** Catch up with each other and welcome the new members over a cup of coffee and a bite to eat!	All
9:00 am – 9:20 am	2. **Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review, and Updates (20 min)** a. Welcome b. Organizing principles (in binder)	Josh Baldi Tamie Kellogg
9:20 am – 9:40 am	3. **Where we left off (20 min)** a. FFF 1.0 signing event highlights b. FFF Activities since the agreement c. Collective Action Spreadsheet (in binder)	Janne Kaje Richard Martin
9:40 am – 10:00 am	4. **Implementation Committee Overview (20 min)** a. Roles and Responsibilities (in binder) b. Org Chart (in binder)	Tamie Kellogg
10:00 am – 10:45 am	5. **Task Force Workplans (45 min)** a. Regulatory Barriers (in binder) b. Agriculture Strategic Plan (in binder) c. Riparian Buffers (in binder)	Eric Beach Patrice Barrentine Joan Lee
10:45 am – 10:55 am	**BREAK** (**Remember to fill out meeting schedule survey**)	All
10:55 am – 11:30 am	6. **Break out into caucus groups (35 min)** a. Review of priority actions and timelines, identify questions or concerns b. Select a chair and discuss how you want to operate c. Review roles and responsibilities	All
11:30 am – 12:00 pm	7. **Wrap Up (30 min)** a. Report out from group discussions b. Discuss next steps c. Review proposed 2018 meeting schedule	Tamie Kellogg

Mutually Agreed Upon Principles. The members of the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm and Flood Advisory Committee mutually agree that agricultural viability and fishery recovery efforts are limited by coinciding societal needs that cannot be fully resolved through the FFF effort. Both agriculture and salmon recovery are limited by factors well beyond the scope of the APD or the FFF effort. In an effort to document the mutual understanding the FFF Advisory committee has gained, we fully support the following principles:

1. The Committee recognizes the importance of a viable agricultural community, ecosystem and salmon recovery, and flood safety. Planning, actions, and management in the Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District (APD) should promote without priority:
    a. Agricultural viability
    b. Ecological restoration
    c. Flood safety

2. King County has a legal obligation to protect farmland, support the restoration of salmonids, and protect residents and infrastructure from flood risks and impacts.

3. The King County Flood Control District has the authority to protect life and property from flood risks and funds capital projects in the Snoqualmie Valley as part of its strategy to do so.

4. The prime agricultural soils encompassed by the Snoqualmie Valley APD are an irreplaceable natural resource that is important to the community and economy of King County.

5. Salmonids are an irreplaceable natural resource of high value to the community, and have profound cultural significance to the Snoqualmie and Tulalip Tribes.

6. The APD is largely within the floodplain and floodway, an area of extensive flooding and in some locations, deep and fast erosive flows. Farmers need county support in taking action to reduce flood risk to their homes and agricultural operations in a manner that doesn't transfer risk to other property owners.

7. To meet the County's legal obligation to protect and restore salmonid habitat and protect residents and infrastructure from flood risk, at times it may be necessary to undertake projects or programs that result in the loss of farmland.

8. Losses and gains of habitat, farmland and flood risks need to be tracked and reported.

9. Buffer plantings provide multiple benefits for salmonids, including food and habitat, as well as better water quality (such as cooler temperature and reduction of pollutants reaching the stream through direct runoff). Buffers reduce the impacts of farming on water bodies, but the necessary size and composition of buffers to balance agricultural needs and constraints, salmon recovery, and water quality improvement requires additional analysis and discussion.

10. There are a limited number of available acres to substitute for the loss of high-quality, long growing season agricultural land in the APD.

11. There is no substitute for prime salmon spawning/rearing areas, especially the alluvial areas below the Raging and Tolt River confluences.

12. Both advocates for salmon recovery projects (large capital and buffers), and advocates for Snoqualmie Valley agriculture need the support and collaboration of each other for these efforts to succeed over the long-term.

13. The productivity of agricultural lands can and should be increased through capital actions as well as through potential regulatory changes.

14. Land conversion and development in upland areas has had negative effects on agriculture as well as salmon habitat on the valley floor.

Excerpted from **Fish, Farm, and Flood (FFF) Advisory Committee, Memorandum of Mutual Understanding, May 21, 2015**

FFF 2.0 Collective Action List (January 9, 2018)

Action	Appendix II: Recommended Actions			Appendix III Recommendations	FFF 2.0 Tasks to be Completed by End of 2020	Targeted Start Date	Notes
1	Farm	2	2	22	**Regulatory Task Force: develop and implement task force scope**	2018	
2	Farm	4	1		**Land Resources Strategic Plan Task Force: develop and implement task force scope**	2019	
3	Fish	6	1	20	**Riparian Buffers Task Force: develop and implement task force scope**	2018	
4	Farm	3	3	5	Farm safety; community outreach and zero rise flexibility	2017	
5	Farm	2	3	23	Improve drainage opportunities; allocate sufficient funding for drainage services	2017	
6	Farm	5	1	24	Watershed mitigation; establish on-site and "out of time" agriculture "mitigation bank" program	2017	
7	Farm	4	2		Farmland preservation; complete agricultural land use inventory every 3-5 years	2017	
8	Farm	4	5		Farmland preservation; establish an ongoing accountability system	2017	applies across all focal areas
9	Farm	2	1		Improve drainage opportunities; drainage recovery plan	2017	
10	Farm	6	5	10	Large cap projects; launch landowner flood monitoring system	2017	
11	Farm	6	1	11	Large cap projects; coordinate listening sessions	2017	
12	Farm	3	5	16	Farm safety; enhance inter-agency floodplain management communication/coordination	2017	
13	Farm	4	3	31	Farmland preservation; use modeling tools (e.g., EMDS) to prioritize farm protection options	2017	
14	Fish	1	1	17	Demonstrable progress on 2-3 large capital projects inside APDs; increase staff capacity	2017	
15	Fish	5	1		Restore funding for a fish biologist to assist ADAP	2017	includes Farm 2-1 (part)
16	Flood	5	1	7	Prioritize created flood storage from river projects for agriculture use	2017	
17	Farm	1	1	1	Water storage and flood retention strategies; conduct water storage literature review	2018	
18	Farm	1	2	1	Water storage and flood retention strategies; conduct enhanced water storage feasibility study	2018	
19	Farm	3	1	3	Farm safety; ensure all farms have an opportunity to construct farm pads/platforms	2018	
20	Farm	6	3	13	Large cap projects; clarify process for compensating landowners for project-related losses	2018	
21	Farm	3	4	15	Farm safety; model potential flood impacts of large scale tree plantings	2018	
22	Farm	2	1	21	Improve drainage opportunities; expand and simplify ADAP ("ADAP 2.0")	2018	combined with Farm 2-2
23	Farm	5	2	25	Watershed mitigation; establish off-site agriculture mitigation program	2018	
24	Farm	5	3	26	Watershed mitigation; develop partnerships to fund mitigation projects	2018	
25	Farm	4	3	30	Farmland preservation; conduct cost/benefit analysis of bank stabilization techniques	2018	
26	Farm	2	1		Improve drainage opportunities; design, permitting and implementation of alluvial fan pilot projects	2018	
27	Fish	2	1	18	Accelerate rate of restoration to one per year outside APDs; increase staff capacity	2018	
28	Fish	2	2		Accelerate rate of restoration to one per year outside APDs; revise internal KC program approval process	2018	
29	Fish	4	1, 2	34	Combined Waterways; support combined waterways pilot project, document impacts and apply adaptive management	2018	
30	Flood	2	1	5	Community outreach; zero rise flexibility	2018	
31	Flood	4	1	9	Pursue a housing trust for safe, affordable farmworker housing	2018	
32	Farm	3	2	4	Farm safety; develop a farm (flood) safety strategy	2019	related to Farm 3-1
33	Farm	6	2	12	Large cap projects; third-party evaluation of large-scale river restoration projects	2019	
34	Farm	6	4	14	Large cap projects; evaluate direct and cumulative impacts of large scale river restoration projects	2019	
35	Farm	4	3	28	Farmland preservation; inventory revetments/levees	2019	

FFF 2.0 Collective Action List (January 9, 2018)

Action	Appendix II: Recommended Actions			Appendix III Recommendations	FFF 2.0 Tasks to be Completed by End of 2020	Targeted Start Date	Notes
36	Farm	4	3	29	Farmland preservation; assess farmland bank erosion risk	2019	
37	Farm	4	1	32	Farmland preservation; establish goals for farmland preservation and habitat restoration	2019	
38	Farm	2	1		Improve drainage opportunities; beaver Management plan	2019	
39	Fish	1	2	19	Demonstrable progress on 2-3 large capital projects; revise internal project approval process	2019	
40	Fish	3	1	33	Conduct a low-flow assessment that addresses fish and irrigation needs	2019	same as Farm 1-3
41	Flood	1	1	2	Accelerate home elevation program (complete 90 in 10 years)	2019	
42	Flood	2	2	6	PP Infrastructure Elevation: Expand infrastructure elevation in constrained reaches	2019	
43	Flood	3	1	8	Assess opportunities to improve flood-safe road access	2019	
44	Farm	4	4	27	Farmland preservation; inspect revetments/levees annually	2020	

FFF 2.0 (Implementation Phase)
Initial Structure and Responsibilities
January 8, 2018

Implementation of the work outlined in the June 2017 FFF agreement will be coordinated by an Implementation Committee with several of the more complex issues addressed through three focused task forces. Individual actions that fall outside the spheres of responsibility for the task forces will be addressed primarily by technical staff as part of their annual work plans. The Implementation Committee will have balanced representation from each of the three caucus groups and key agencies. Task forces and action teams will be composed of technical experts best positioned to achieve tangible progress on the respective work plans; however, there will not be a requirement for balanced representation on those work teams. County staff and contractors will support and coordinate work of the Implementation Committee and task forces. The following reflects initial understanding of roles and responsibilities for the Implementation Committee, task forces and action teams. We expect this document to be modified over time as the Implementation Committee engages in this important body of work.

Implementation Committee

- Composition
  - Maximum of 15 members; recommended by key partners and appointed by DNRP Director.
  - Equal representation from the Fish and Farm caucuses is required; Flood representation will likely be less than Fish and Farm.
  - Ex-officio members from DNRP, WDFW, Ecology and WSDA; may choose to caucus with one of the three caucus groups.
  - Three co-chairs; one selected by each caucus group.
  - Supported by Facilitator (contracted by King County) and DNRP staff.
- Responsibilities
  - Co-chairs work with coordination team and Facilitator to develop meeting agendas.
  - Co-chairs rotate responsibility for leading meetings and represent issues raised by caucus members.
  - All appointed members have voting rights (excludes ex-officio members) and the goal is for unanimous decisions although minority opinions will be shared.
  - Members are expected to understand and communicate needs/concerns of their communities/stakeholders, whether in their role as a representative of a specific organization or as an individual.
  - Review and approve initial work plans for Task Forces and Actions Teams.
  - Review progress of task forces and individual action teams and assess progress against benchmarks/milestones.
  - Members will communicate questions/concerns/issues with their Co-chair and those issues will be discussed during regular meetings of the committee.
  - Recommend “mid-course” corrections in Task Force and action priorities, if necessary.
  - Approve annual progress report to DNRP Director (drafted by 2.0 Coordinator); highlight any elements of concern or needed intervention by DNRP Director/Executive.
- Meeting Frequency
  - Initial meeting January 2018.
  - Quarterly progress review meetings (schedule to be determined).
  - Caucus groups may choose to hold additional meetings and invite participation by additional, non-Committee members.
  - Engagement anticipated through end of 2020.

Task Forces (Regulatory, Riparian Buffer, Strategic Plan)

- Composition
  - Ideally at least one representative from each caucus on each task force.
  - Additional members with broad understanding of the issues.
  - Ad-hoc technical experts called upon to address specific issues.
  - Supported by Task Force Coordinator (technical expert from DNRP or contractor).
- Responsibilities
  - Develop and track progress on work plan.
  - Identify personnel and other resources to accomplish tasks.
  - Accomplish tasks identified in approved work plans.
  - Report progress to Implementation Committee and request approval for significant departure from work plans.
  - Strive to achieve consensus, but minority reporting may be necessary if unable to reach agreement.
- Meeting Frequency
  - Initial meeting February 2018.
  - Subsequent meetings as needed (to be determined by task forces).
  - Annual meeting to review progress in November of each year.

Actions Teams (as needed; work items not included within Task Force work plans)

- Composition
  - Broad spectrum of technical experts from Tribes, agencies, partners and DNRP.
- Responsibilities
  - Develop work plans to complete actions not incorporated into task force work plans (not all actions will require formal work plans).
  - Incorporate actions into annual work plans.
  - Identify issues that warrant engagement by Implementation Committee.
- Meeting Frequency
  - As needed.

FFF Coordination Team

- Composition
  - Coordinator appointed by WLRD leadership.
  - Work supported by WLRD technical and administrative staff.
  - Overall program support provided by internal steering committee (John Taylor, Tamie Kellogg, Joan Lee, Janne Kaje, Richard Martin).
- Responsibilities
  - Provide necessary staff to support work of the Implementation Committee.
  - Work with FFF 2.0 Facilitator to coordinate quarterly Implementation Committee and caucus group meetings.
  - Coordinate meeting logistics and keep meeting minutes.
  - Provide quarterly reports on action item progress to Implementation Committee.
  - Report progress to WLRD and DNRP directors.
  - Track progress of task forces and action teams and coordinate reporting to Implementation Committee.
  - Lead development of reports and other documents that result from work of Implementation Committee.
  - Work with DNRP admin staff to manage program data and budgets; make necessary adjustments in staff allocation and funding to ensure adequate DNRP capacity.
  - Identify needs and pursue funding to support implementation of FFF work plans.
  - Develop reporting tools (e.g., dashboard) to easily track task progress and provide ready access to reporting tools for Implementation Committee members and other FFF 2.0 personnel.

Facilitator

- Responsibilities
  - Collaborate with Co-chairs to develop agendas (conference calls).
  - Facilitate regular meetings of Implementation Committee.
  - Provide guidance on priority setting and conflict resolution.
  - Document meetings.
  - Review reports and other documents that result from work of Implementation Committee and task forces.

Task Force Coordinator/Contractor

- Composition
  - WLR staff or contractor.
- Responsibilities
  - Provide necessary coordination, support and leadership for task force work.
  - Report progress to FFF 2.0 Coordinator.
  - Identify needs and pursue funding to accomplish Task Force work plans.
  - Draft reports and other documents that result from work of task forces.

Task force: Addressing Regulatory Barriers to Agriculture

Statement of Purpose

Address the regulatory constraints to agricultural production that were identified by the FFF committee in their 2016 agreement. The task force has also been assigned a role in implementing other specific committee recommendations that include regulatory components.

Timeline

January 2017 (possible sooner) – December 2019

Resources Needed

Dedicated project manager in King County Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD) Agriculture Program (1.0 FTE) with expertise in regulations to research and present the issues, suggest possible solutions, and draft products. The project team will also include subject matter experts from WLRD, Department of Permitting and Environmental Review (DPER), and King Conservation District (KCD). The work will also require dedicated staff time as needed from other agencies. The project manager will convene interested members of the FFF committee as needed to work on specific issues.

Background/Problem Statement

Addressing regulatory constraints to agriculture is an ongoing process in King County. In addition to the issues that surfaced in the FFF process, regulatory and permit issues have been identified by the Agriculture Commission, the King County FARMS Report, the Local Food Initiative, the recently completed report "Farmers' Perceptions of Regulatory Constraints to Farming in King County," and through examples brought forward by customers at DPER. The Agriculture Permit Team and several topic-area subcommittees of that team have worked over time to refine processes, propose regulatory changes, clarify interpretations, and improve understanding of and communication about regulatory issues across county departments and with state and federal permit agencies.

Some of the regulatory constraints to agriculture are closely associated with salmon habitat protection (including water quality) and flood management. These regulations are in place to protect valued resources or public health and safety, and it is not the purpose of this task force effort to diminish that protection. Addressing the regulatory constraints to agriculture might include permit process improvements, interpretation or clarification of the requirements, or technical or financial assistance in compliance. Changes to the regulations themselves might be proposed for regulations that are inappropriate or ineffective in an agricultural landscape or where the goal of the regulation could be achieved through an approach that has less of an impact on agriculture. Generally, the county codes that address these issues are driven by state or federal regulations, and thus this effort will require collaboration with external agencies.

Furthermore, any proposed changes will have to be informed and supported by stakeholders representing fish and flood management interests. Therefore, members of the FFF committee will be called upon to assist in recommending solutions and supporting them through negotiations or legislative processes.

Scope of Work

Task 1. Hire Project Manager and Convene Interdisciplinary Project Teams

Hire a project manager. Identify funding and obtain commitments for staff support from Rivers, Science, DPER and KCD, and assign appropriate staff for each of the topics to be addressed.

Task 2. Prepare Technical Analysis

The project manager will convene a group of FFF stakeholders to help clearly articulate a problem statement for each of the regulatory priorities that merge from the FFF process. The project manager will then work with the interdisciplinary project teams to analyze each issue from the farm, flood and fish perspectives: refine the problem/conflict; purpose and effect of the regulation; how the regulation constrains agriculture; who needs to be part of the discussion; which agencies have jurisdiction; possible approaches; level of complexity. Highest priority regulatory issues as identified at the Feb 10 FFF meeting:

- Drainage regulations that make maintenance expensive or time consuming or otherwise restrict the ability to improve drainage of farm fields (see recommendations #21 and #22)
- Zero Rise limitations on constructing farm pads, buildings and other farm improvements (see recommendation #5)
- Mitigation required when farmers maintain drainage ditches or build a farm pad or other structure in a wetland or a buffer of a wetland or stream (see recommendations #24 and #25)

Task 3. Convene FFF stakeholders to assist in developing solutions

For each issue, once initial analysis is written up, the Project Manager will reconvene the group of FFF stakeholders along with the issue analysts to work through the issue in more depth.

Step 1. Make sure the appropriate agencies are included in the discussions and review process.

Step 2. Review the analysis and come to agreement on what the problem is.

Step 3. Brainstorm possible ways to address the problem, e.g., process change, negotiated agreement with other agencies, interpretation, public rule change, proposed change to how standards are applied, proposed change to standards, technical or financial assistance in compliance, landscape level agreements, etc.

Step 4. Discuss pros and cons of possible approaches, including feasibility, and develop preferred solution.

Step 5. Solicit review by all applicable agencies, interested members of the FFF Advisory Committee, and the Agriculture Commission Regulatory Committee, and take comments into account.

Step 6. Reach agreement on a solution and willingness to support the concept through implementation.

Step 7. Agree on implementation strategy; project team works to implement; FFF stakeholders review project team's work and products as needed.

Task 4. Develop a Process for Future Collaboration on Regulatory Conflicts

The project manager will work with the FFF stakeholders to recommend a process to resolve future regulatory conflicts efficiently through collaboration among the stakeholders.

Priority Topics and Participation

Drainage

- Clarify when artificial ditches need permit
- Maintenance of larger waterways
- Bypass requirements for small waterways
- Turbidity standard – when and where measured
- New drain tiles
- Off-site mitigation (related to Mitigation topic)
- Maintenance associated with alluvial fans
- Beaver management
- Cultural resources review requirements
- De-fishing requirements and methods
- Multi-year permitting
- Ability to redo maintenance in future years
- Pursue ESA take coverage?
- Replacing aging/failing flap/flood gates

King County Internal Team

- Agriculture Team
- ADAP
- DPER
- Ecologist
- Rivers

Participants

- KCD
- Ecology
- WDFW
- Tribes
- Corps
- NMFS
- FEMA

Zero Rise

- Additional flexibility in zero rise threshold
- New way of calculating or accounting for zero rise
- Participate in evaluation of the effect of tree
- planting on zero rise (see recommendation #15)
- Ongoing program to assist with non-fill options

King County Internal Team

- Agriculture Team
- Rivers
- DPER

Participants

- Ecology
- FEMA
- KCD

Mitigation for impacts to Critical Areas

- Need mitigation strategies that minimize impact
- on farmable land
- Credit for mitigation done in advance
- Off-site mitigation
- Area-wide mitigation strategy – large projects
- count as mitigation for ag activities elsewhere

King County Internal Team

- Agriculture Team
- DPER
- Ecologist
- Interagency Review Team and grant agencies
- Snoqualmie Forum
- Snohomish Technical Committee

Participants

- Ecology
- Corps
- Tribes
- WDFW

Regulatory Task Force Work Plan[1] and Timeline

1. IDENTIFY KING COUNTY WLRD AND DPERS STAFF PARTICIPATION ON THE TASK FORCE**;** Obtain commitments for staff support from Rivers, Science, RRS, Stormwater and DPER, Health. **WLRD managers**

2. BEGIN INFORMAL OUTREACH TO POTENTIAL STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPANTS; WID/SVPA, AG. COMMISSION, WDFW, ECOLOGY, KCD, USACE. Gain an understanding of the participant priorities, approaches and perceived obstacles to achieving the stated objectives in the 34 recommended actions and Task Force goals. **Beach –**complete

3. ANALYZE REGULATORY HIERARCHY/PRINCIPLE RESPONSIBILITIES FOR FEDERAL, STATE AND COUNTY AGENCIES WITH OVERSITE, DELEGATION OR PERMITTING AUTHORITY THAT INFLUENCE THE TASK FORCE OBJECTIVES; Diagram the roles and responsibilities and identify the individuals in each agency with lead roles. Research the statutory authority and requirements. **Beach** *in progress*

4. SUMMARIZE ISSUES, DEVELOP PROVISIONAL PROBLEM STATEMENTS, ANALYSIS OF THE PRIORITY ISSUES; for use as initial starting points, informing the task force and to guide initial discussion. Incorporate informal stakeholder outreach findings. **Beach** *in progress, completes prior to assembling Task Force in January.*

5. ASSEMBLE THE TASK FORCE; participants will be invited based on the decisions of the **FFF 2.0 Committee**. Agree upon objectives, timelines, meeting frequency, review process and other team norms **Beach** *facilitates* **Task Force members** *engagement* (January 2018)

6. REVIEW THE SCOPE OF THE TASK FORCE, ENSURE THAT THE CORRECT ISSUES ARE PROPERLY FRAMED; Make assignments for additional analysis. **Beach** f*acilitates*, **Task Force members** *engagement* (February 2018)

7. AGREE ON IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY & DEVELOP SUITABLE, EFFECTIVE APPROACHES; Priorities, timelines, responsibilities, review and follow up, adaptive management **Beach** facilitates, **Task Force members** engagement (Spring 2018)

8. CONDUCT ISSUE ANALYSIS; Discuss and develop within the task force; write review document. Vet with regulatory agencies, stakeholders and FFF 2.0 Committee, revise in response to feedback **Beach** *manages process, technical writing*, **Task Force member's** *engagement* (Spring 2018)

9. IMPLEMENTATION; with periodic Task Force evaluation of progress, effectiveness and barriers. Adapt approach as necessary to achieve objectives. Review progress with, and seek guidance from, the 2.0 FFF Committee as required. **Beach** *manages process*, **Task Force member's** *engagement* (June'18-Dec'19)

10. DEVELOP AND FORMALIZE A STANDING PROCESS TO ADDRESS REGULATORY CONFLICTS. This may involve an inter-agency MOU or other mechanism to clearly articulate the steps to reach an outcome **Beach** *develops with* **WLRD Mgt., DPERS, King County attorney, Individual Regulatory Agency Mgt.** *in consultation with* **Task Force members** (last ½ of '19)

[1]SMALL CAP indicate Task**, Bold** designates participating individuals/groups, *italic* identifies role

Initial Issue Focus

Topic	Possible Elements
Drainage	• Clarify when artificial ditches need permit • Maintenance of larger waterways , Bypass requirements for small waterways • Turbidity standard – when and where measured • New drain tiles • Off-site mitigation (related to Mitigation topic) • Maintenance associated with alluvial fans • Beaver management • Cultural resources review requirements • De-fishing requirements and methods • Multi-year permitting, Ability to redo maintenance in future years • Pursue ESA take coverage • Replacing aging/failing flap/flood gates
Zero Rise	• Additional flexibility in zero rise threshold • New way of calculating or accounting for zero rise • Participate in evaluation of the effect of tree planting on zero rise • Ongoing program to assist with non-fill options
Mitigation for impacts to Critical Areas	• Need mitigation strategies that minimize impact on farmable land • Credit for mitigation done in advance • Off-site mitigation • Area-wide mitigation strategy – large projects count as mitigation for ag activities elsewhere

Regulatory Task Force Membership

Core Team

Name	Affiliation	Caucus
Bob Vos	Ag Commission	Farm
Josh Monaghan	King Conservation District	Farm
Erin Ericson	WID	Farm
Paddy Irwin	Farm Bureau	Farm
Elissa Ostergaard	Snoqualmie Watershed Forum	Fish
Matt Baerwalde	Snoqualmie Tribe	Fish
Derek Marks/Ryan Miller (TBD)	Tulalip Tribes	Fish
Tim Woolett	City of Carnation	Flood

Subject Experts

Name	Affiliation	Topic
Diane Meyers	NW Resource Law	Regulatory Structure
Kollin Higgins	WLRD-Science	ESA Considerations
Lou Beck	WLRD-SWS	Ag Drainage
Megan Webb	WLRD-RRS	Mitigation- banking, in lieu,
Richelle Rose	WLRD-RFPM	Flood; Zero Rise, Regulations, Farm
Pesha Klein	DPER-CAO	K.C.C. re Critical Areas
Jenna Friebel	WDFW	Skagit 3Fi
Karen Wolf	KC Executive Office	Comprehensive Plan
TBD	Ecology	Water Quality

Working Assumptions

1. King County code revisions (proposal, development, transmittal to DPER or executive) are within the scope of this Task Force
2. Identifying opportunities for other regulatory shifts
    a. Tribes, being sovereign, would engage in the regulatory discussions at the Implementation (FFF 2.0) Team level as well as being consulted during vetting of proposed regulatory shifts
    b. Resource Agencies; WDFW, Ecology, US Army Corps of Engineers would be consulted when specific project level permitting requirements arose. The capacity to meaningfully engage these entities in general or programmatic approaches to permitting or amending statute should be explored although ability to influence may be limited
3. The task force setting provides an opportunity to convey, discuss and mutually understand the regulatory structure, permitting processes and available pathways/achievable outcomes.
    a. Participants are expected to convey these findings to their respective caucuses.
    b. Increased shared understanding should increase trust, temper expectations and result in more effective land management outcomes.
4. The Task Force agrees upon regulatory strategies/recommendations by consensus. The recommended actions will be forwarded to the 2.0 Committee in a written communication that is
    a. Vetted with the pertinent subject experts and regulatory participants
    b. Agreed upon by all the Core Team members

Logistics

* Monthly meetings; ~ 2 hours in length, located in Snoqualmie Valley (WID in Carnation, Snoqualmie Tribe offices, King County Libraries (Snoqualmie, Fall City), Beach facilitates/coordinates
* Agenda and Materials will be distributed a week prior for review, input & revision
* Detailed minutes and assignments distributed within a week following monthly meetings. Copies to FFF 2.0 Implementation Committee and WLRD management steering team (Martin, Lee, Sleight, Kaje, Taylor)

Process

For each issue,

1. An initial issue analysis is written up, reviewed by the team and revised based on the discussion and appropriate vetting to ensure that the analysis includes appropriate scope, likely outcomes of alternative management actions and available avenues to address the issue
2. Core team identifies how to address the problem, e.g., process change, negotiated agreement with other agencies, interpretation, public rule change, proposed change to how standards are applied, proposed change to standards, technical or financial assistance in compliance, landscape level agreements, etc. Discuss pros and cons of possible approaches, including feasibility, and develop preferred solution.
3. Solicit review by all applicable agencies, interested members of the FFF Advisory Committee, and the Agriculture Commission Regulatory Committee, and take comments into account.
4. Reach agreement on a solution, achievement strategy and commitment to support the concept through implementation.
5. Initiate the process, monitor progress, engage as necessary to continue pathway to completion

Example implementation may include

1. Identifying pathways for creating General, Programmatic or Pamphlet permits,
2. Introducing legislation either at County or State level.
3. Seeking “no-take” consultations with Federal Services for ADAP related projects

Task Force: Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Land Resource Strategic Plan

Statement of Purpose

This document is a scope of work for producing an Agricultural Strategic Plan for the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District (APD).

The purpose of the agriculture strategic plan is to improve the long-term productivity of farmland, bring more acres into production, especially food production, and increase opportunities for farmers to develop the necessary infrastructure to support or increase their farm businesses. This will happen through assessment of specific farmland resource property needs and assets in the SVAPD and creating an implementation plan for project improvements to land (e.g., drainage) and water access. It will complement other related efforts, such as King County's Local Food Initiative which is an economic development and marketing plan for food and agriculture in the region.

The strategic plan for Snoqualmie Valley agriculture will represent the agricultural needs in future Fish Farm Flood (FFF)-related decision-making, similar to how the Salmon Recovery Plans and the Flood Plan represent the needs for salmon recovery and flood risk reduction, respectively. The plan will also specifically inform the development of acreage targets for permanently protected farmland and acreage for restoration (recommendation #32).

Membership

The Advisory Committee will be a committee of the Agriculture Commission and comprise representatives from the Kitchen Cabinet, KCD, Agriculture Alliance (Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance [SVPA], SnoValley Tilth [SVT], and the Watershed Improvement District [WID]), FFF Advisory Committee members, Agriculture Commission, King County staff, a fish biologist, and others. The advisory committee members will be able to take action on behalf of their agency or entities as issues arise in the development and implementation of the Plan. The Advisory Committee:

- will provide guidance to the Project Management Team
- approve the detailed scope and review and approve elements of the
- plan as they are developed, and
- approve the final plan for consideration by the Agriculture
- Commission, the King Conservation Board and the King County
- Council.

Timeline

2016 Establish membership, convene meetings, apply for funding, and report to FFF on progress to date.

2017 Receive funding, hire project management team, fine-tune scope with membership and advisory committee's direction, start implementation of Task 1 and 2, and report to FFF on progress to date.

2018-2021 Implementation of Tasks 1-6; report to FFF on progress to date.

Resources Needed

- Project Management Team: 1 FTE WLRD project manager and 2 - 3 field
- staff, including KCD participation, non-profit partner (will require
- funding).
- Budget
    - Staffing (see project team bullet above)
    - $40,000 annually for materials, supplies, meeting room rental, transportation, GIS, data management, etc.

Problem Statement

The Snoqualmie Valley does not have a strategic plan for agriculture. In the Fish Farm Flood (FFF) process, it has become clear that agriculture needs a strategic plan for increasing farmland productivity on par with the Salmon Recovery Plan and the Flood Plan, which identify specific goals and projects in the Snoqualmie Valley to meet the needs for fish recovery and flood risk reduction. The SVAPD Strategic Plan will provide data and analysis, contain specific proposals for projects, funding strategies, and a timeline for implementation needed for equitable negotiation and problem-solving in current and future multi-objective planning processes like the ongoing FFF process.

Background

Foundational principles:

- Farmland is a limited resource that should be protected.
- King County has a strong policy basis, and a mandate under the Growth Management Act, to protect farmland.
    - Designation of APDs; strong Comprehensive Plan policies
    - Farmland Preservation Program
    - Local Food Initiative
- Population growth will continue to put pressure on farmland, while at the same time increasing the importance of farmland to provide food.

- SV farm production is diverse including pasture, specialty crops (fruits, vegetables, honey, herbs, turf grass, nuts), grains, and livestock. Different crops may require different infrastructure such as season-extension hoop houses or farm pads.
- Climate change will likely present challenges related to water availability, flooding and impacts from diseases and pests. However, research to date indicates that this region's agriculture has a tremendous capacity to adapt through management options and new crops. Relative to other important farming regions, Northwest agriculture may be more successful in adapting to climate change, thereby increasing the importance to protect the land. More research is needed, and should be pursued, but that is not within the scope of this plan.

Existing policy and studies that complement and drive this work:

- Survey and report developed for King County by University of Washington graduate students in spring of 2015 on regulatory impediments to farming [some of these will inform the work of the Regulatory Task Force]
- Local Food Initiative recommendations
- King County Food and Farm Roundtable recommendations
- KCD and King County drainage survey conducted in spring 2015
- King County's Snoqualmie River Hydrologic and Hydraulic study results
- WSDA and WSU research and other work on regional climate change impacts to agriculture
- King County mapping of agricultural crops – 2013
- King County mapping of farm pads and homes in the Snoqualmie floodplain
- Landowner conversations led by the Agriculture Alliance in 4th Q of 2015 and 1st Q of 2016

Scope of Work

This scope of work is laid out as a plan for the entire APD to be done all at once. An alternative approach could be completing the planning process for sub-areas of the APD sequentially, thereby allowing for implementation in completed areas while planning continues in remaining areas.

In either case, the planning process should contain the following elements (See Figure 1):

Task 1.	Designate a Project Management Team and select an Advisory Committee
Task 2.	Compile all existing mapped information
Task 3.	Develop and implement landowner outreach
Task 4.	Assemble landowner information into data categories
Task 5.	Prioritize items for implementation plan and funding
Task 6.	Share implementation plan with Snoqualmie Valley APD landowners and FFFAC for support

Task 1. Designate Project Management Team and Select Advisory Committee

King County will select a Project Management Team and an Advisory Committee. The Project Management Team will develop the specific project management plan that will detail the scope of work, roles and responsibilities, milestones, schedule, deliverables, communication plan, decision process, budgets and other elements required to keep a project of this scale on track. The Team will also be responsible for carrying out planning and compiling all the elements into the Agriculture Strategic Plan.

The Advisory Committee will be a committee of the Agriculture Commission and comprise representatives from the Kitchen Cabinet, KCD, Agriculture Alliance, FFF farmers, Agriculture Commission, King County staff and others. The advisory committee members will be able to take action on behalf of their agency or entities as issues arise in the development and implementation of the Plan. The Advisory Committee will provide guidance to the Project Management Team, approve the detailed scope, review and approve elements of the plan as they are developed, and approve the final plan.

Deliverables*:*

- *Detailed project plan, ongoing project management throughout the project, and effective communications plan*

Task 2. Compile All Existing Mapped Information

Compile existing maps and data. This may include the location and condition of, or other information about, agricultural infrastructure.

1. Drainage
    a. ditches
    b. tiles
    c. flap/flood control gates
    d. pump stations
    e. revetments
2. Property improvements and assets
    a. farm pads
    b. farm access roads
    c. high tunnels
    d. irrigation systems
    e. water rights
    f. homes, and whether they are elevated above BFE [draw upon the Lower Valley Needs Assessment recently completed by King County]
3. FPP Properties
4. Primary agricultural transportation corridors
5. Active commercial farms in the Snoqualmie Valley APD *(estimate around 180?)*
6. Riparian buffers, restoration and mitigation projects

7. Leased farmland
8. Existing wildlife corridors or other known habitat areas
9. Existing beaver activity and areas of potential future beaver activity
10. Areas of high quality agricultural soils that are not currently farmed
11. Areas that have low agriculture potential and thus could be kept out of ag production permanently with little impact to current or future farm operations
12. Known patterns of flooding
13. Field level changes regarding zero rise (How much organic matter is added annually? Is field level lower than it used to be due to subsidence? GPS field level.)
14. Other as determined by Advisory Committee

Deliverables:

- *Compilation of available data; base maps that can be used in meeting with farmers and community groups for further collection of information*

Task 3. Landowner Engagement

The Project Management Team will develop and implement a landowner engagement strategy with the Agricultural Alliance, building on the work that the Agriculture Alliance does in the fall of 2015.

A) Collect information from farmers about agricultural assets, obstacles and existing conditions and characteristics of farms and farmland in the SVAPD. Using the maps created in Task 2, collect additional information from farmers on all of the elements listed in Task 2, and also collect information on landowner needs, such as assistance with permits or leasing. Review information with landowners or tenants and Snoqualmie Valley FFF Advisory Committee members.

B) Engage in discussion about FFF and the Agriculture Strategic Planning process to give people a chance to be heard and to learn what they think about the issues identified in FFF.

Deliverables:

- *Meeting with King County, KCD, advisory board, and Agricultural Alliance*
- *leaders*
- *Landowner outreach strategy developed and implemented including*
- *outreach timelines, Agricultural Alliance meetings, advisory board*
- *meetings, public meetings*
- *Individual discussions or small group meetings held with landowners in*
- *different subareas of the APD*

Task 4. Assemble Landowner Information into Data Categories

Data collected will be catalogued and mapped by APD subarea and/or by shared need (e.g., tiles, water, buffers). In this way, needs can be easily assessed by type of problem and by area in order to facilitate ease in planning implementation of improvements and seeking funding. For example, if ditch cleaning is the problem on seven surrounding properties, a project to tackle all properties at once may be recommended.

Deliverables:

- *Catalogued information*
- *Maps of layered data by need and area*
- *Summary of data analyzed*

Task 5. Analysis and Recommendations

The Project Management Team will analyze the information collected and develop recommendations for specific on-the-ground actions (such as multiproperty drainage projects) and for actions to improve processes (such as specific regulatory changes). The team will also produce a prioritized implementation plan including timeline, funding, roles and responsibilities. The Strategic Plan will be reviewed by the Advisory Committee, the Agricultural Commission, KCD, King County, and the Agriculture Alliance. Comments will be incorporated and the plan endorsed by these parties.

Deliverables:

- *Draft report reviewed and endorsed by King County, KCD, Advisory*
- *Committee, Agriculture Commission and Agricultural Alliance*

Task 6. Share Strategic Plan with SVAPD Landowners and FFFAC for Support

Public meetings will be held to share the plan and gather public feedback from farmers and landowners in the SVAPD. After gathering feedback and making needed adjustments, the Strategic Plan will be finalized and published.

Deliverables:

- *Agricultural Strategic Plan reviewed by Snoqualmie Valley APD farmers and landowners, revised, finalized and published. Approved by King County Council?*

Task Force: Addressing Snoqualmie Riparian Buffers

Statement of Purpose

The buffer task force goal is to provide the foundation and guidance for a scientifically credible, context-sensitive, locally derived riparian buffer implementation strategy that will have been developed with the participation of parties represented by the FFF advisory committee, and any needed additional representation, and that will provide positive outcomes for both fish and farms. The task force has also been assigned a role in implementing other specific committee recommendations related to riparian areas.

Objectives include:

1. Establish a buffer task force to help implement the tasks and timeline in this SOW that is supported by decision-makers
2. Ensure robust conversations with land owners, the agricultural community and restoration interests occur through the agricultural alliance to ensure nuanced recommendations that strive for uplift for both fish and farms
3. Assemble a literature review of Best Available Science (BAS) related to the functions of riparian buffers, with emphasis on literature on buffers in low gradient river floodplains, smaller stream channels, and agricultural areas
4. Create an Agricultural Riparian Issues Technical Memo that describes the benefits and challenges associated with planting riparian buffers within agricultural areas. The issue paper will be informed by a review of literature specific to identified benefits and challenges (e.g., contamination of crops by wildlife that utilize buffers; benefits of shade for livestock).
5. Identify data gaps that, if filled, could substantially affect task force recommendations.
6. Recommend riparian restoration prioritization approaches that incorporate landscape conditions including:
    a. Solar aspect and channel orientation (e.g., east to west vs. north to south)
    b. Alluvial Reaches
    c. Catchment sizes
    d. Stream widths
    e. Fish use
    f. Groundwater influences
7. Recommend innovative riparian planting approaches to address site specific constraints and opportunities associated with existing land uses, with a primary focus on impacts and benefits to agricultural uses:
    a. Drainage maintenance
    b. Crop type and needs
    c. Livestock
    d. Harvestable or ‘working’ buffers of various kinds (berry, restoration plants, etc.)
    e. Grazeable buffers

f. Beavers
g. Existing revetments
h. Existing farm access roads
i. High ground adjacent to river banks
j. Agricultural land productivity (potentially derived from the Agricultural Land Resource Strategic Plan)
k. Lands with agricultural easements that limit revegetation

8. Evaluate analytical tools for use in analysis of alternatives and outreach efforts with the larger public.
9. Create a logic model, supported by the advisory committee, which incorporates BAS, landscape features, and site constraints to determine: buffer width targets and appropriate buffer designs.
10. Apply the logic model to the SVAPD landscape and create a geodatabase that identifies and maps variable width and type of buffers throughout SVAPD. Estimate the amount and type of agricultural lands that would be displaced by riparian buffers, or potential gains in longterm agricultural productivity as a result of strategically placed buffers.
11. Participate in the implementation of other Committee recommendations, including the modeling of flood impacts associated with large tree plantings (recommendation #15), development of mitigation planting solutions that reduce the loss of farmable acreage to mitigation requirements (#24, #25), and informing the development of acreage targets for permanently protected farmland and acreage for restoration (#32).

Note: *The buffer solutions that were developed throughout the FFF process generally fall into two categories: 1) how to prioritize what and where to plant and understanding the associated impacts to the agricultural land base, and 2) how to implement planting projects (e.g. mitigation credits, conservation easements, landowner compensation). This SOW does not include the development of an implementation plan, but creates an approach for reaching agreement around how to prioritize buffer configurations (e.g. size, location, species composition). Once this SOW is completed, a follow-up effort would be needed to create an implementation plan that would incorporate the other FFF solutions that address implementation issues.*

Membership

Ideally the Task Force would be comprised of 12-15 members. It is anticipated that the Task Force will meet at least monthly and possibly more, as necessary, for 18-24 months. The Task Force will review and adopt supporting documentation and consider input from jurisdictional and stakeholder outreach. Each Task Force Member will be expected to represent the work of the committee to their representative bodies and reflect input of their representative bodies back to the Task Force. Task Force members may include representation from the following entities:

a. Tulalip and Snoqualmie Tribes
b. Snoqualmie Valley city

c. King Conservation District
d. FFF Ag Advisory Committee members or
e. Agricultural alliance (AC, SVPA, SVT, PCC)
f. Snoqualmie Watershed Improvement District
g. Environmental (WEC, FW, WFC, MTSG, Stewardship Partners, Adopt-A-Stream)
h. King County Local Food Initiative
i. King County Public Health
j. Washington Department of Ecology
k. Washington Department of Fish/Wildlife
l. Washington State Department of Agriculture
m. Washington State Conservation Commission
n. Washington Recreation and Conservation Office
o. Seattle City Light
p. Snohomish County
q. Snohomish Conservation District
r. Snoqualmie Watershed Forum
s. Snohomish Basin Salmonid Recovery Technical Committee
t. Puget Sound Partnership
u. WSU (Researchers and Ag agents)
v. National Marine Fisheries Service

Timeline

2016 Apply for funding, establish Task Force and Technical Team membership, create detailed work schedule, and report to FFF on progress to date.

2017 Receive funding, fine-tune scope with Task Force direction, start implementation of Tasks 1 through 4, and report to FFF on progress to date.

2018 Complete all tasks and report to FFF on progress to date.

Resources Needed

- Estimated Project Team (2.5 FTEs: 0.5 FTE WLRD project manager, 1.5 FTE composed of several WLRD technical and ag staff, 0.5 FTE KCD partnership)
- Budget
    - Staffing (see project team bullet above)
    - $20,000 facilitation

Background and Problem Statement

Salmon recovery has been a King County priority for over a decade and the 2005 Snohomish River Basin Salmon Conservation Plan (Salmon Plan) signified a strong commitment to that effort. A primary recommendation of the Salmon Plan is to restore and enhance streams and rivers with substantial riparian buffers to improve water quality and restore natural habitat

processes for salmon. In addition to the Salmon Plan, the state has two Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)[1] water quality clean up plans, one covering temperature and another covering several other water quality parameters, and many federal and state grant funding sources for salmon recovery and water quality projects emphasize the need for large-width buffers.

In King County's ongoing Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood initiative, the potential of riparian restoration actions to possibly displace hundreds or even thousands of acres of agricultural land has raised questions about the ability to implement restoration in a way that supports salmon recovery, without cumulatively resulting in a dramatic reduction in the available acres for growing food or otherwise damaging agricultural productivity. In addition to the loss of farmable acres, riparian buffers can also: complicate field drainage maintenance, harbor wildlife that may damage crops, create obstructions to flood flows, and shade crops. Riparian buffers also provide benefits to agriculture, such as shade for livestock, controlling bank erosion; and creating habitat for pollinators.

The Salmon Plan calls for buffers to be planted along streams and rivers to restore riparian functions and improve degraded water quality, and recommends a width of 150 feet on all salmon bearing waterways. The Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District (SVAPD) contains well over 100 miles of waterways, all of which are likely used by anadromous fish to some degree, but roughly half of that length is provided by small tributaries, many of which have been highly modified for agricultural drainage. In the SVAPD, 57% of the land that lies within 150 feet of waterways is in active agricultural use, the vast majority associated with very small tributaries rather than larger streams or rivers. As in many other agricultural areas, riparian conditions in the SVAPD are heavily degraded, but securing 150- foot buffers on privately owned working lands has proven difficult. Also, roughly 80% of the floodplain is in private, agricultural ownership.

To date, many of the riparian restoration projects establishing buffers have been voluntary and primarily funded by a mix of grants from local, state, and federal agencies. Many of those grant programs have recently changed their criteria and require riparian restoration projects to meet science-based minimum requirements, such as minimum buffer widths that exceed 100 feet. Although the Salmon Plan promotes 150-foot buffers on salmon bearing streams, the largely opportunistic approach to working with land owners often results in much narrower buffers than the Salmon Plan recommends (generally less than 35 feet in width). While 35 feet is generally an inadequate buffer width to restore habitat for salmon as well as meet water quality standards, concern over the loss of farmland with even a 35-foot width buffer continues to be expressed in the agricultural community.

---

[1] As an example, the summer of 2015 drought produced alarming low flows and elevated temperatures which in many instances were the lowest flows and highest temperatures on record.

The concern about the loss of farmland is fueled in part by the lack of a credible, science-based approach that is more nuanced than "one size fits all" 100 or 150-foot buffers on all salmonid streams. Absent a plan that is crafted with the local context in mind, meaningful progress toward the overall riparian restoration goals in the Salmon Plan and Ecology's TMDLs seems unlikely. Conversely, if this effort results in a scientifically credible analysis that demonstrates meaningful ecological gains from narrower buffers in specific sites and circumstances, more riparian restoration projects in the Snoqualmie may become eligible for funding sources that are currently limited to larger width plantings. Goals towards preservation of farmland and water quality protection might also be more expeditiously achieved. Whatever the outcome, reaching agreement among the tribes, farmers, regulators and stakeholders such as local cities and the environmental community in the development of a watershed-specific riparian management plan will be critical to task force success.

Scope of Work

The following is a list of the tasks, which are described below in more detail.

Task 1. Project Team and Task Force Formation
Task 2. Stakeholder Outreach
Task 3. Literature Review of Best Available Science for Riparian Areas in Agricultural Landscapes
Task 4. Create an Agricultural Riparian Issues Technical Memo
Task 5. Alternative Analysis
Task 6. Report, Near Term Action Plan, and Adaptive Management
Task 7. Project Management

Task 1. Project Team and Task Force Formation

The King County Executive or delegate will convene a Task Force that includes members of the FFF Advisory Committee and other organizations (as noted above) to develop Task Force recommendations.

Staffing of the Task Force will be provided through a Technical Team provided by the Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD), including WLRD's Science and Technical Unit, Agriculture Unit, and the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum staff, and the King Conservation District. WLRD will also explore expanding the project team based on the availability of tribal, regulatory, and stakeholder staff. The Technical Team will produce the primary documents for the project, collaborate with the Task Force and participate in stakeholder outreach. The Technical Team will include a facilitator to help design and execute the Task Force's process/meetings.

Deliverables:

- *Task Force is formed*
- *Technical team is formed*
- *Facilitator is hired*

Task 2. Broader Stakeholder Outreach

The Technical Team will prepare an outreach plan for input from the Task Force prior to outreach plan implementation. The plan will specifically address purpose and audience for outreach efforts and the related approach(including schedule, venue, notification, required staff support, meeting focus). The outreach plan will include consideration for the various entities listed in Task 1 (whether or not the entity sits on the Task Force) as well as outreach to the general public. The outreach effort will likely include a field trip to look at local examples of different buffer designs and approaches.

Deliverables:

- *Draft outreach plan for Task Force Review*
- *Final outreach plan addressing Task Force comments*
- *Hold outreach meetings to implement plan*

Task 3. Literature Review of Best Available Science for Riparian Areas in Agricultural Landscapes

Establishing an understanding of any changes to the previously documented Best Available Science (BAS) for riparian habitat restoration (~2005) is the critical starting point to inform the appropriate buffer targets including widths and composition for various stream sizes and land uses.

Task 3.1 Review WDFW's soon to be updated and released literature review for its Management Recommendations for Washington's Priority Riparian Habitats and compare against KC's existing riparian Best Available Science documents that support KC's existing regulatory framework for critical areas. Undertake a literature search for very recent papers that may have been missed by previous efforts and review them. The review should use peer reviewed literature wherever possible, and focus on research related to the functions provided by different buffer widths, species compositions, vegetation densities, differences between relatively small stream sizes, versus larger streams and rivers, and primary water quality and ecological functions (e.g., water temperature/shading, leaf litter fall, instream cover) in agricultural areas.

Task 3.2 Prepare a BAS synthesis that incorporates the WDFW and KC BAS documents, as well as additional peer-reviewed studies, that focuses on buffers functions and benefits associated with various widths of buffers. This effort will be summarized in the format of an annotated bibliography.

Task 3.3 Based on the annotated bibliography, the Technical Team will produce a report that summarizes the pertinent findings of the literature review. The report will include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of existing science, identify data or knowledge gaps, and if needed, recommend additional research needs. This will serve as the scientific foundation for the rest of this project.

Task 3.4 The Draft BAS will be provided to a peer review team for review and comment. The peer review team will provide feedback to the Technical Team.

Task 3.5 The Technical Team will present the findings to the Task Force and, based on questions and comments received, may revise the document for clarity or to provide additional substance.

Deliverables:

- *Annotated Bibliography of BAS*
- *BAS Technical Report summarizing findings*

Task 4. Create an Agricultural Riparian Issues Technical Memo

Based on the BAS Technical Report, the Technical Team--with significant input from the Task Force-- will prepare a Technical Memorandum on the agricultural benefits and challenges of buffer plantings in the agricultural areas of King County, including potential on-site and off-site effects of riparian plantings. The paper will draw significantly from the work of the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood Advisory Committee in identifying and framing key issues. The paper will also be informed by a BAS style review of pertinent literature related to agricultural issues pertaining to buffers (e.g., studies of food security risks related to fecal contamination of crops by wildlife or changes to water surface elevation caused by mature forests in the floodplain). The Technical Memo will also describe how a decision model that integrates landscape and site specific characteristics of buffers in agricultural areas landscape and site specific characteristics of buffers in agricultural areas would be useful for analyzing and exploring alternatives for applying variable size buffers.

Task 4.1 The Technical Team will create a draft Agriculture Riparian Issues Technical Memorandum. This memo will describe the benefits and the potential negative effects of riparian buffers with respect to agricultural land use. This paper will also identify considerations for specific challenges related to agricultural activities into the design of riparian areas.

Task 4.2 The Draft Agriculture Riparian Issues Technical Memorandum will be provided to the Task Force for review and comment. The Taskforce will provide feedback on any additional benefits and/or challenges as well as areas that might benefit from additional literature review.

Task 4.3 The Technical Team will incorporate comments from the Task Force and a final version of the Memo will be distributed to the Task Force. A comment/response tracking format will be used so that commenters will know how their comments were addressed.

Deliverables:

- *Draft Agricultural Issues Technical Memo*
- *Comment/Tracking response document*
- *Final Agricultural Issues Technical Memo*

Task 5. Alternative Analysis

Task 5.1 The Technical Team will identify analytical tools to compare and contrast alternative approaches (logic models) to the development of variable buffer widths that have the greatest potential for salmon and aquatic species conservation and preservation of a robust farmland/soils base in the Snoqualmie Valley. Analytical tools will be reviewed for their technical strength as well their transparency for use in decision making processes.

Task 5.2 Develop a logic model and that integrates the BAS Technical Report findings, the Agricultural Riparian Issues document, as well as the local context and on-the-ground practicalities to develop a range of potential future buffer conditions (including widths, composition, height, other factors) for all stream types in the SVAPD. The logic model should be able to characterize to what extent the different future buffer characteristics fully meet ecologically functioning conditions for aquatic species preservation, and if not fully functioning, the rationale for not achieving full ecological functionality. The logic model should also demonstrate the loss or gain of agricultural productivity as a result of various buffer characteristics.

Task 5.3 The Technical Team will compile the draft output from the analytical work into tabular, graphic, and map formats comparison of alternatives. The areas and types of areas affected by the various future buffer conditions will be quantified using measures such as affected acreage in total, acres in FPP, acres in actively used agriculture under alternative approaches to buffers. Similarly, estimated gains in water quality and fish conservation will be reflected in formats that allow for comparison of alternative approaches and asses if there are alternatives that provide equal or better ecological functions than current buffer recommendations. The Technical Team will present the draft results to the Task Force. The Technical Team will work with the Task Force to refine the alternative analysis.

Deliverables:

- *Draft Alternatives Analysis Technical Memo. Includes initial documentation of the logic model, with descriptions of the riparian functions met under various buffer widths and stream types, effects on agricultural uses, and comparative analysis of several alternative approaches including mitigation banking.*
- *A compilation of input received and action taken as a result of input.*
- *Final Alternatives Analysis Technical Memo. Includes documentation of the draft and final logic model with descriptions of the riparian functions met under various buffer widths and stream types and the rationale for each decision in the model and any changes made between the draft and final model. The analysis related to effects on agricultural lands and considerations for each alternative will also be shown. Geospatial results (tables, graphs and maps) of applying the logic model to the SVAPD will be included.*

Task 6. Report, Near Term Action Plan and Adaptive Management

Develop a summary report that captures the work of the Task Force and landowner conversations/outreach, data analyses, alternatives and recommendations. Include an Executive Summary and detailed near term implementation plan. Include measures that will be used to track plan process and changing conditions in the watershed relative to future scenarios.

Deliverables:

- *Three drafts and one final report*

Task 7. Project Management

Develop and manage a project plan that will detail the scope of work, roles and responsibilities, milestones, schedule, deliverables, communication plan, decision process, budgets and other elements required to keep a project of this scale on track.

Deliverables:

- *Detailed project plan, and ongoing project management throughout the project.*

Fish Farm Flood 2.0 Implementation Oversight Committee
Member Attendance List – January 12, 2018 Meeting
Duvall Community/Visitors' Center – Duvall, WA

Gary Bahr, WA Department of Agriculture (*ex officio*)

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

Hannah Cavendish-Palmer, Sno-Valley Tilth

Angela Donaldson, Fall City Community Association

Cynthia Krass, Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance

Bobbi Lindemulder, farmer

Meredith Molli, farmer/Agriculture Commission

Josh Monaghan, King Conservation District

Scott Powell, Snohomish Forum

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

Lara Thomas, City of Duvall

Jason Walker, Snoqualmie Forum

Daryl Williams, Tulalip Tribes

Amy Windrope, WA Department of Fish and Wildlife (*ex officio*)