

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

Thursday, January 24th, 2019
Chamber of Commerce, Duvall Visitor and Community Center
15619 Main St. NE, Duvall, WA, 98019

1) **Introductions, Welcome by Co-Chair** (*Tamie Kellogg, Angela Donaldson*)

Meeting facilitator Tamie Kellogg called the meeting to order at 9:16 am.

Flood caucus co-chair Angela Donaldson welcomed all present, voicing thanks for their spirit of collaboration toward common goals. She said FFF's importance to her is shown through improving regional resiliency and sustainability from natural hazards. She reiterated the importance of measuring success and knowing where all participants are in reaching caucus and collective milestones. She highlighted the importance of today's exercise where participants will craft a 10-second "elevator speech" to explain FFF to outside individuals.

2) **Public Comment Period**

There was no public comment during this period.

3) **Milestones Discussion** (*Tamie Kellogg, Caucus Co-Chairs*)

A) **Presentations & Discussion of Caucus Milestones**

Ms. Kellogg reiterated an intent stated in the original transmittal letter, that phase 2.0 of FFF is to include work on better understanding of milestones and how to achieve them. She directed attention to the meeting handouts, which include milestones defined for/by each caucus. She said after engaging in a dialogue on each caucus's success measures, a fourth quadrant of the handout, to include milestones for collaboration, would be developed through a short meeting exercise.

Cindy Spiry, fish caucus co-chair, reported on that caucus's desired success measures:

- 1) Accelerate progress on Haffner/Barfuse project.
- 2) Build and maintain pipeline of prioritized projects, to ensure there are enough projects in progress to keep them all moving.
- 3) Enhance basin steward and King County Snoqualmie basin staff capacity, in particular by adding another basin steward.
- 4) Report on prioritized project progress, by County staff, to Snoqualmie Watershed Forum.
- 5) Request more FFF budget support, for implementation of actions.
- 6) Consider/pursue multi-benefit projects by ensuring the County's Rivers staff/FCD are involved.

Josh Baldi, Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD) director at DNRP, noted County expectations should be made clear, to ensure he can hold DNRP staff accountable to them. Richard Martin added the objective here is to, if most milestones are achieved by end of 2020, that this process would be considered a success, so it's important to agree on what success looks like. Josh Kubo, fish caucus County liaison, further clarified that "3-5 projects per year" under measure #2 above refers to projects in the APD.

Meredith Molli observed the "actions list" in today's handout seems to differ from the action list from the FFF 1.0 agreement. It was clarified that this handout was a briefer version of the original actions, edited by each caucus, but which shouldn't differ in intent from the originals. However, IOC members were encouraged to speak up with any concerns. It was noted that a more detailed version of this shorthand list is still being finalized for distribution soon.

Josh Monaghan, farm caucus co-chair, said there should be, in defining project progress, a distinction or "crosswalk" between projects and their feasibility, as feasibility studies are needed for far more projects than are actually completed. (The FFF agreement states progress on 2-3 large projects shall be made per year in the APD, while the success measures state 3-5 project feasibility studies per year should be done.)

Micah Waite asked about an apparent absence of third-party project reviews in the lists. Janne Kaje and Ms. Kellogg replied that while the shorthand list in this handout does not reflect all nuances of the agreed-upon action items, those details/items are still going forward. This table/list focuses on “bundled” action items, particularly drainage and capital projects. Ms. Kellogg added that these “missing” items could be added back into the table if wished. Daryl Williams noted that third-party reviews primarily focus on hydrologic impacts, which are not needed on all projects. Joan Lee further added that third-party review is standard practice for all WLRD capital projects.

Mr. Monaghan then reported on three of the farm caucus’s measures of success:

- Implementation funding and detailed/strategic drainage management plans for top four sub-basins.
- Project plans and clear regulatory pathways for agricultural drainage projects not currently covered by ADAP in top four sub-basins.
- A clear public “how-to” guide document for agricultural drainage activities.

Mr. Monaghan noted six of their items are closely tied to action item “Farm 2,” and the success of the regulatory task force. He said a goals statement at the head of “Farm 2” in Appendix II of IOC members’ binders is too vague, so the caucus spent time more clearly defining success for “Farm 2.” However, the caucus is holding off on sharing this new language should other caucuses wish to make similar revisions. Their intent is to bring more specificity to farm action item success measures in higher-level statements.

Mr. Baldi added that as part of WLRD’s new biennium budget, there is a report due to KCC in September on how to scale up the Agriculture Drainage Assistance Program (ADAP). He has met with KCD and the WID on this, and suggested at June’s IOC meeting the IOC could help review this report, since there is a lot of overlap between that work and FFF. Ms. Kellogg agreed to follow up with Mr. Baldi on this.

Ms. Donaldson reviewed the flood caucus’s success measures, which all address property protection:

- Assure proper assessment of evacuation routes and hydro-gauge accuracy for flood warning systems.
- Flood storage improvements.
- Collaboration with FCD, which is ongoing; however, their budget is not part of FFF.
- More home elevations are budgeted and executed.
- Partner with Agriculture Commission; there is a draft farm preparedness plan in progress for flooding, which the caucus hopes to communicate with farmers.

There were several questions and comments following Ms. Donaldson’s report.

- Mr. Waite asked how many homes are at risk for flooding in the Valley; she replied 128 in the lower and about 300 in the upper. There is currently funding for about 2 home elevations per year.
- Ms. Spiry asked to clarify FCD’s budget, if allocating technical staff to FFF would happen. Ms. Donaldson said these staff duties would need to be defined, as it may not be deemed fiscally responsible by the FCD board. However, non-meeting communication with these staff is still an option. Ms. Kellogg suggested this particular success measure may need amending.
- Mr. Baldi clarified that the regional hazard management plan – not the flood hazard management plan, as earlier said by Ms. Donaldson – is being updated. The regional plan includes a section for floods. There have been talks with FCD to update the separate flood hazard management plan document; an update for the Green River flood hazard management plan will also feed into these efforts.
- Some discussion followed on a lack of FCD participation in FFF. There was consensus that FCD participation in FFF is needed.

- Ms. Donaldson said that as part of the flood plan update, there is a citizen group that helps develop issue papers, some of which may be useful. Ms. Kellogg asked if the IOC wishes to consider anything relative to the flood plan update. Mr. Baldi advised tabling discussion on this until April's IOC meeting, in hopes of an update if the County and FCD can agree on moving forward with the hazard plan. Ms. Kellogg agreed to loop back to this next IOC meeting and put on the agenda if there is an update available.
- Ms. Donaldson noted the FCD does weigh multiple benefits, like habitat, when considering projects, and seeks out partnership funds for said projects. She reminded all that she is the rural King County representative on the FCD advisory committee, and can bring concerns to that committee's attention.
- Cynthia Krass urged members to remember that salmon recovery benefits are possible through comprehensive drainage improvements, and urban KCC members should be approached as well.
- Daryl Williams said there may be opportunities to design off-channel flood storage through a new WRIA 7 committee at Department of Ecology; there may be funding available for projects. Joe Burcar added that this is under a new "streamflow restoration" program at Ecology.

B) Full Group Work on 4th Quadrant – Collaboration

Ms. Kellogg directed IOC members to break into smaller groups to determine success measures for collaboration between the three caucuses. Results of this exercise included the following initial brainstorm of potential measures:

- Each IOC member being able to fluently talk about other caucuses' priorities.
- Knowing who in a caucus to contact on a specific issue.
- Each caucus's interests no longer in separate "silos;" recognizing they all interconnect.
- Action/progress we can see.
- Being cheerleaders for each other's success, such as writing grant support letters.
- Restoration organizations actively engaging farms and farm organizations.
- Buffer Task Force: having variable buffers funded and implemented.
- Many action items being funded/implemented, and long-term success in reaching sought metrics.

****BREAK****

4) Action Updates and Recommendations

A) Large Capital Projects: Hafner/Barfuse (*Janne Kaje, Fauna Nopp*)

Mr. Kaje gave a brief background on FFF agreements related to large capital projects in the Snoqualmie basin. There are two main locations in the basin suitable for Chinook salmon recovery projects – near Fall City and Carnation – where salmon spawn due to gravel from the Raging and Tolt rivers. King County is trying to address landowner concerns, like reclaiming farmland into habitat, and possibly changing river/flood behavior. These led to several specific FFF action recommendations, such as listening sessions, and third-party review of project plans.

Ms. Nopp, a capital projects manager for WLRD, introduced her presentation on Hafner/Barfuse. This is the first capital project done under FFF 2.0, and combines two projects in close proximity, but on opposite sides of the Snoqualmie River, which combined provide many potential gains. She said a goal of this presentation and discussion is to ensure continued IOC support, common understanding, and involvement with the project, which is still in preliminary stages.

She explained the benefits expected from the project:

- Address high-priority habitat restoration needs for Chinook salmon, by removing revetments and building setback protection to improve riparian, river edge, and off-channel habitat.
- Address agriculture and floodplain management by reducing maintenance of existing flood facilities.
- Increase safety on nearby Neal Road.
- Reduce surrounding property flooding.
- Reduce adjacent farm field erosion.

The project site is over 100 acres located approximately 0.5 miles downstream of the Fall City bridge. The Barfuse area, which is owned by King County, defines the left bank area, while the right bank (Hafner) bordered by Neal Road is privately-owned land. Negotiations are underway with the owners of land potentially affected by the Hafner project, with the goal of securing a conservation easement on property that comprises the project footprint.

A design goal of the project is to create complex side-channels, in contrast to the relatively simple “single-thread” mainstem of the Snoqualmie River and provide room for channel migration with the floodplain. Because the river here is single-thread, it fills quickly during floods, does not store wood or sediment, and any large debris deposited in the reach is typically washed away during high water. This has resulted in road damage and scouring. The current proposal removes almost 3,000 total lineal feet of levee, and adds culverts, a pilot channel, and wood structures to direct flow, protect the banks, and create fish habitat. Native floodplain forest trees and shrubs will soon be planted on current agricultural land on the Barfuse side so there is structure in the water when the river migrates, which will slow flow and decrease erosion. This fall, the Snoqualmie tribe will plant a buffer strip along the farmland/forest edge and planting will be implemented in phases, which will allow farmers to continue to farm the property for as long as possible. On the Hafner side, it is proposed to set back flood and erosion protection, and add a revetment to protect the road and a nearby farm. The idea of the pilot channel is being discussed; while costly, there is concern that if not done now, there won't be time for the river to create this habitat on its own.

Ms. Nopp reviewed expected water level changes based on preliminary modeling. She noted that there is not precise enough data available yet to do hydraulic modeling; however, the project must stay within their regulatory/permitting requirements. She said some areas would expect to see an increase in flood elevation, and for some of these areas this is actually desired; in others, levels are expected to decrease by six inches or more. Overall, there should be more areas where water level decreases, but there are still areas to be watched closely.

She reviewed several additional benefits to agriculture and flood protection:

- Protection of Neal Road.
- Reduced water velocity at Fall City Farms.
- Increased gravel storage within the floodway, which should reduce deposition in farmland.
- Possible farm pads nearby.
- Possible elevation of nearby farm fields with material excavated during construction.
- Possible farm storage and garden/nursery in the least flood-prone portions of the Barfuse sections.

Ms. Nopp said total expected project cost is about \$15.5 million. Funding sources may include SWM (Surface Water Management) fees, Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) grants, Department of Ecology, Floodplains by Design, Cooperative Watershed Management, FCD, or PSAR. There is also a construction grant to be applied for at the start of 2020 which requires a 30% completion of engineering plans for the project. Construction would be expected to begin by 2022.

She finished by reviewing an expected timeline for the project:

- 2019: Planning and Preliminary design, early input from stakeholders/community. Data collection, modeling, creating a communication plan. Milestones: Refining project elements, 30% design completion, and riparian/floodplain plantings by fall 2019.
- 2020-2021: Final design, incorporating input. Public meetings and listening sessions, SEPA notice, third-party project review.
- 2022: Construction. Updating and informing community about project and construction activities, such as road and river closure.
- 2023-31: Checking in with landowners, monitoring cumulative impacts of project.

Many questions and comments followed:

- Daryl Williams noted some funds under the Hirst decision may be available for this project.
- Ms. Nopp does not anticipate any change to the flood boundary from the project, and was not yet certain if a CLOMR (Conditional Letter of Map Revision) process would be used to reflect surface water changes/impacts.

- Micah Waite thought it useful to see details about the levee removal, setback construction, engineered log jams (ELJs).
- Lara Thomas said she'd like to see a Valley-wide communication plan, to discuss ecological, farm, and flood costs/benefits of the project.
- Meredith Molli said when more modeling is done, she'd like to see numbers for total lost farm acreage, and farmlands that might be impacted due to changes in flooding.
- Josh Monaghan stressed the importance of water velocity to local farmers.
- Cynthia Krass requested Ms. Nopp talk about the project to the communities she represents, as they will have many questions.
- There were several questions to clarify specific technical aspects of the project.

Tamie Kellogg asked how best the IOC can support this project. Ms. Molli said an understanding of agricultural impacts would help her support it, through regular updates. It was also suggested when there is more detailed modeling available, these updates dive deeper than usual. Ms. Nopp agreed, and that it would be key to bring in her technical team to field questions. Other ideas included communication with and support from the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum, the SVPA, the WID, and landowners. This, and regular reports, would aid confidence to support the project.

B) Buffers Task Force (*Beth leDoux, task force coordinator*)

Ms. leDoux reported on two draft “white papers” by the task force: synthesis of riparian buffer science, and positive/negative buffer impacts to agriculture. The main takeaway from the agricultural impacts paper is that the meanings of “positive” and “negative” vary from location to location. With the science synthesis paper, the team sifted through research to find data applicable to the Snoqualmie Valley. They developed six key habitat functions (water quality, food, etc.) that buffers provide fish, and determined the buffer size range and composition needed for each. She stressed there is no “one size fits all” solution.

She said a key feedback request was to summarize the large amounts of data. This was done through tables sorted by function, appended to the main report. She said her request today is for the IOC to review and provide high-level comments: major misses, confusing paragraphs, clarifying comments, etc. She would like to incorporate these in two weeks, and have the results be the final documents with which the task force moves forward in its work. She will email links to updated versions of the papers.

C) Agriculture Strategic Plan Task Force (*Patrice Barrentine, task force coordinator*)

Ms. Barrentine reported half of the seats on this task force are now filled, thanks to Ms. Krass and the SVPA. The first meeting is planned for March. A planned full-time employee (FTE) position at King County has been converted to positions for a contractor and intern; these job descriptions will be drafted soon and it is expected the positions will be hired by March. She said the task force is also working with Pierce and Snohomish Counties for a regional approach. The task force is targeted to complete its work in 18 months, and will thus “hit the ground running.”

D) Regulatory Task Force (*Eric Beach, task force coordinator*)

Mr. Beach reviewed past, ongoing, and future task force efforts.

Work to Date (2018):

- Clarify when artificial channels need a permit.
- Examine de-fishing and bypass requirements for dredging.
- Consider Endangered Species Act (ESA) coverage for ADAP.
- Onsite mitigation: understand requirements; clarify requirements for re-dredging, examine potential for advance mitigation.
- Beaver management; understand County and tribal efforts.

Current/Near-Term Work (2019):

- February: Review alluvial fan management options; understand County efforts to revise code to allow work.
- March: Review stormwater actions for ADAP 2.0 expansion. Identify areas where code revisions or interagency agreements are needed to implement program. Reach agreement on program scope, scale, and deliverables.
- April: Mitigation strategies, on-site and off-site.
- Set of draft recommendations to IOC at 2nd or 3rd quarter meeting, depending on progress.

Upcoming Work (Late 2019-onward):

- June: Cultural resources review requirements.
- July: Turbidity standards – understand and develop dredging BMPs.
- September: Flood regulations; examine zero-rise options.
- October: Possibility of multi-year permitting.
- 4th Quarter IOC Meeting: Present set of recommendations.

There were several follow-up questions and comments. Joe Burcar asked which King County code has a prohibition on alluvial fans; Mr. Beach said KC code has only permissions, not prohibitions, and it does not address the subject. Daryl Williams said they are still waiting for the County and FEMA discussions to determine what FEMA will require in terms of zero-rise standards. Cynthia Krass asked how the task force is “memorializing” its accomplishments, especially among permitting agents. Mr. Beach said this is done via the issue white papers, but does need to be addressed further and kept on the front burner.

5) Communications (*Tamie Kellogg*)

A) Review/Input on Communication Plan Goals, Objectives, Key Messages

Ms. Kellogg directed attention to the FFF communications plan handout, listing its goals and objectives. She said the intent is to look at these and give feedback. She encouraged people to provide feedback electronically.

She reviewed the three sections of a second handout detailing “communication messages”: (1) information gleaned from prior County Executive communication team works (websites, FAQ, etc.); (2) information created by Ms. Kellogg and WLRD communications manager Saffa Bardaro, to get key messages for FFF 2.0; and (3) information from the FFF transmittal letter and Memorandum of Mutual Understanding (MOMU). This document will also be sent out electronically for feedback.

B) Communication Messaging Exercise

Ms. Kellogg directed everyone to pair off and practice sharing a short “elevator speech” about what FFF is in a brief soundbite, so an unfamiliar person might understand it. Between today and next meeting, they were instructed to practice this on people who know about FFF and who don’t, and report back on what did/didn’t work. Initial feedback indicated this was hard due to trying to keep things concise and not get sidetracked.

6) Closing/Adjourn (*Tamie Kellogg*)

Ms. Kellogg said starting at next quarter’s meeting, at the request of co-chairs, after each meeting there will be a larger quarterly one-page draft summary compiled with highlights, etc. The goal is to produce the first after today’s meeting. A draft of this document will be shared at the April IOC meeting.

Josh Baldi reminded all that he is replacing John Taylor as DNRP-WLRD representative in this process. He praised the collaborative efforts of the IOC and said FFF is high on the radar of both the Executive and DNRP director Christie True.

Ms. Kellogg adjourned the meeting at 12:07 pm.

Next IOC Meeting: April 4th, 2019 – Duvall Visitor Center, 8:30 am to 12:00 pm

**Fish Farm Flood 2.0 Implementation Oversight Committee
Member Attendance List – January 24, 2019 Meeting
Duvall Community/Visitors' Center – Duvall, WA**

Josh Baldi, King County DNRP/WLRD (*ex officio*)

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

Joe Burcar, WA Department of Ecology (*ex officio*)

Angela Donaldson, Fall City Community Association

Cynthia Krass, Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance

Denise Krownbell, Snohomish Forum

Bobbi Lindemulder, farmer

Meredith Molli, farmer/Agriculture Commission

Josh Monaghan, King Conservation District

Cindy Spiry, Snoqualmie Tribe

Lara Thomas, City of Duvall

Micah Wait, Wild Fish Conservancy

Daryl Williams, Tulalip Tribes