

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

Thursday, April 4th, 2019
Chamber of Commerce, Duvall Visitor and Community Center
15619 Main St. NE, Duvall, WA, 98019

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

Meeting facilitator Tamie Kellogg called the meeting to order.

Farm caucus co-chair Joshua Monaghan opened with a quote he remembered Cindy Spiry reciting: “When we go alone we go fast, but if we go together we go far” (quoting an old African proverb). This work is powerful when done together. The measurement work will set a strong foundation to be clear about what success looks like, but there’s amazing stuff happening along the way from this collaborative work. Cynthia shared some examples during a recent presentation and there were two that stood out to Josh: 1) comprehensive agricultural drainage – they’re looking at sub-basins as a whole to reduce costs and create bigger benefits to fish; and 2) fish screens – some irrigation intake pumps aren’t safe for fish, but they’re expensive so how do we talk to the farmers? As a result of relationships from FFF, Matt Baerwalde gave Cynthia a list of farms and asked if she could help. She did, and the outcome of this collaboration is that they expect to have 100% of mainstem irrigators screened by 2020 with financial support from Ecology, a CWM grant and DNRP cost share. This wasn’t in the FFF agreement but happened as a result of it. Josh urged the committee to keep looking for similar opportunities to collaborate.

Josh B asked if there was a way for this type of success to be celebrated and there was general agreement that it should be celebrated and talked about as a success resulting from the FFF effort.

Lara thanked Angela and Joan for their help building relationships, and said she met someone from the Roads Division for the first time in 17 years.

2) Public Comment (*Tamie Kellogg*)

There was no public comment.

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

A) Caucus Co-Chairs

Angela (Flood) – Flood 3 is the top priority. She met with Jennifer, the Roads Strategic Planner, and discussed the Roads Needs Assessment. They also talked about finding multi-benefit partners to lift the assessment and get the feasibility off the ground by the end of next year, which is a huge success. Flood storage capacity is the next priority. Regarding elevations, Angela she said there is funding available but most are going on in the upper valley; the lower valley needs lift. The caucus would like to get an update on the Hazard Management Plan and Tamie said there is a placeholder for this on a future IOC agenda.

Josh K (Fish) – No big changes. Summarized what’s on the milestone tracking sheet.

Josh M (Agriculture) – Specific measures and details are the same; the last caucus focused on the goal statement. If successful, what would it look like?

B) Break Out Into Caucus Discussion of All Milestones

C) Share With Full Group

Josh M (Agriculture)

- 1) Fish 1 Goal: In the agreement, Fish has the big picture (2-3 projects) but details are not spelled out, while Farm has details spelled out but no big picture. In the materials, more details were built out so they had to figure out how those details tie back to the agreement. Are they new things? What they'd like to ask is for some way, maybe as part of the communications plan, to give a holistic understanding of how those pieces in the pipeline fit into the goal of 2 – 3 projects. They would like to have a clear package that can be shared with constituents. Also, when a new project opportunity comes up, what's the approach? How does farm/fish stuff get weighed?
- 2) Collaborative milestone Farm 4 – permanently protecting farmland. It's starting to bubble up so it's time to get a scope developed on it.
- 3) A collaborative milestone to add is sub-basin planning that includes fish, farm and flood concerns, rather than project by project.

Cynthia added that it's important to be clear that they've been trying very hard to stay within the bounds of what's included in the scope of bundled items, but there may be multiple benefits to the sub-basin approach. For example, there may alternative mitigation options that could result in reduced impact to farmers while providing enhanced habitat benefits. We want to start talking about what that might look like.

Lara doesn't think there's drift from the original agreement; rather now we're focusing in on a closer level and adapting. It's more about the intent of FFF 1.0.

Bobbi added that they want to understand the process for picking projects; she understands it can take time and unexpected projects can pop up. It's the same for agricultural drainage projects – they're adapting as they go. It has been helpful to go through the FFF process and get an understanding of how important communication among groups is.

Daryl said that when the County gave a presentation during the initial FFF effort showing proposed projects and the best options for constructing them, the presenter made it clear they could end up with something different than what was shown. What they were trying to do was give a range of total acreage that might be converted from active farmland into restoration work to see if it was acceptable to the farm community if other things got going. He thinks the County is trying to stay within the original acreage range. Some projects may not be done at all for a variety of reasons, so they're looking at the option to bring in other projects to fill those gaps. He also pointed out the initial FFF agreement didn't address projects other organizations may do on their own.

Micah (Fish)

- 1) Measure 3 of Fish – clarification regarding basin stewards: They're looking for 2.5 FTEs to move projects forward and get the pipeline going rather than the .5 that's listed. Perry said there's currently one steward and a half-time steward is being added this spring, but these are complex projects and there are additional requirements including more outreach so it will take more than 1.5 stewards to accelerate the progress.

2) Measure 2 of Farm: They're concerned about the language in the last sentence - "while minimizing impacts on the resources" – and suggested changing it to "while complying with all regulatory requirements" to make sure it's meeting the rules of the ESA and CWA.

3) Water quality: If we're expanding the drain tile system (Measure 3), we need to explore how effluent affects water quality. We know that low DO (dissolved oxygen) is an issue in the system and DO levels in water coming out of drain tile systems is typically low, so what are possible solutions? Possibly treatment on site, aeration, retention ponds, planting schemes. Cynthia said they're doing pilot monitoring programs on two sites and will share the results. Daryl added that they're also concerned with high nitrogen. Tamie suggested that they collaborate on the water monitoring and said there will be another meeting with the caucus liaisons and co-chairs to go over clarifications. Josh M added that there's real interest in adding more water quality evaluation to the drainage program.

Angela (Flood)

1) Roads: Talked a lot about roads and it is expected to lead to fruitful conversations in all the other areas. Main points discussed:

- sub-basin collaboration,
- incidence rates of road closures and homes that are landlocked,
- multi-benefit funding partners,
- prioritize the areas that are real pain points for farmers and people in the APD, and
- coordinate state/county/city road closures and gather data to allow for better prioritization and response to flood warnings.

Lara added that data collection is important, but it is equally important to share information and data collection methodologies. Not all agencies/communities are collecting important information, so they need better access to data that are being collected. If there's a big project down the road, where is the biggest benefit, the economy of scale? Lara stressed that the primary focus of the flood caucus is public safety and whether farmers and other valley residents are able to get in and out of the valley during flooding. There's also concern that home elevations in the lower valley are not proceeding as quickly as in the upper valley.

4) Communications

A) Communications Plan update, goal objectives and key messages (*Tamie Kellogg, All*)

B) Input on quarterly communications tool mock up

The intent is that the first one will have background information so it'll be very dense, but the rest won't be as wordy. Josh Baldi asked what the best format/distribution would be? Lara said it should be a multi-pronged approach (both social media and print version). The FFF website is also being updated and will contain a link to the communications tool. The next quarter's communication tool will just have current information.

C) FFF Communication messaging exercise

D) Share resources/documents and general updates

Josh Baldi said there's a proviso for the ADAP program that's due to Council by the end of September, so he has to have it sent to the Executive by the end of July. He read the proviso,

and in summary, it establishes an ADAP ongoing maintenance plan, including but not limited to:

- information on agricultural waterways in KC,
- a plan for a one-time inspection maintenance repair and clearing of all ag waterways within 7 years of acceptance of the maintenance plan, and
- an ongoing maintenance schedule for the inspection and maintenance of all agricultural waterways on a 7-year maintenance cycle.

Councilwoman Kathy Lambert is very supportive of the proviso and funding has already been increased. There is money for some pilots of non-traditional ADAP projects (beavers, floodgates, alluvial fans, etc.) as well as staff. There's also enough money for a fisheries person to advise on ADAP projects this summer. As the proviso response is developed, it's a great opportunity to tell the FFF story and recommend how to ramp up the program and do it while being consistent with the Regulatory Task Force work and advice from the IOC. Ultimately, the Department [of Natural Resources and Parks] has to agree with what goes to the Executive, but Josh would like partners (WID, SVPA, KCD) and anyone else interested to review and comment on the response so it will be as strong and representative as possible. IOC input is needed for the program to be successful.

Josh also discussed the Flood Hazard Management Plan Update – As Angela mentioned, the King County Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan update is currently underway and is due at the end of this year to FEMA (it will hold our current rating for the national flood insurance program); a better tool that would give more points is the Flood Hazard Management Plan (FHMP). The Executive approved [to update the FHMP] and sent a letter to Council and the Flood Control District requesting to initiate scoping for a 1.5 year process beginning in June of 2021. Josh plans to engage the IOC in that work (e.g. what will be included and what won't) and said the FHMP will feed into the 2023 comprehensive plan update.

Bobbi commented that Snohomish County is moving forward with an [Agriculture Resilience Plan](#). There might be a way for the IOC to access some of the work that has been done already and share information on consultants, etc.

5) Action Updates and Recommendations (*Tamie Kellogg*)

A) Regulatory Task Force Presentation (*Eric Beach*)

See PowerPoint presentation attached. There were no questions.

B) Buffers Task Force (*Daryl Williams*)

Daryl reviewed the Buffer Task Force meeting handouts and said the “synthesis document” should be finalized at the next meeting on April 17th. He also, as a reminder, read the original goals/responsibilities of the FFF 1.0 effort and summarized the tasks to be accomplished with the WDFW grant, namely the three deliverables (a literature review of the best available science for agricultural riparian areas, a technical memo of agricultural benefits and challenges of riparian buffer plantings in agricultural areas of KC, and develop a decision tool for planting riparian buffers on agricultural land in Snoqualmie Valley). The grant will end in December of this year unless an extension is requested and granted. At the last meeting, they established a smaller work group (Erin, Collin, Wayne, Elissa) to get together between regularly scheduled meetings to help think through the steps and generate products to bring to meetings for the IOC Committee to review and discuss.

C) Agriculture Strategic Plan Task Force (*Patrice Barrentine*)

The task force kicked off last Wednesday and will likely be meeting on the 3rd Monday afternoon of each month. Patrice will send updates to the Fish caucus since they don't have capacity to assign a representative to the task force. She'll also update KCD and some subject matter experts. See PowerPoint presentation attached.

Questions: Angela asked if there is anything in the Agriculture Resiliency plan that creates a preparedness plan for natural hazards? Patrice said she wasn't aware of it and Bobbi said no, it's more climate impacts related to groundwater, saltwater intrusion, sea level rise, flood impact needs, etc. It could be a component but it hasn't been a focus yet; they just finished the modeling. Angela believes it could be bundled with the flood safety initiative.

D) Large Cap Projects, Haffner Barfuse Update and Next Steps (*Janne Kaje*)

Fauna Nopp and her team have been visiting key audiences to talk about the Haffner Barfuse project and get feedback.

- Snohomish Basin Technical Committee - great feedback and strong support for the project.
- Fall City Community Association meeting (FCCA) - great turnout and people were very interested in hearing about the project. The FCCA wants them to come back when they're further along in the process. The next meeting will be at the SVPA on May 14th at 6:30 at the Senior Center.

At the last meeting a couple of questions came up. Regarding a communications plan for Haffner Barfuse, yes, there is one being developed and it will be shared once finished. Ideas from FFF 1.0 are being incorporated into the plan. Regarding modeling the project, there is a consultant on board and in the fall, maybe October, some initial results should be available. During the fall meeting there will be a more in-depth presentation. Perry added that he presented the Haffner Barfuse project to the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum and it was well-received.

6) Closing/Adjourn (*Tamie Kellogg*)

Tamie suggested having the meetings start and end 30 minutes later (9am – 12:30pm) due to delays causing the meeting to start late. Nobody disagreed so future meetings will be from 9am - 12:30pm as long as the venue is available at that time. Tamie also asked everyone to review the meeting dates for 2020.

Next IOC Meeting: Due to the August meeting being cancelled, the next meeting will be a full day, held on October 24th, 2019 at Carnation Farms, 9:00 am to 4:00 pm.

**Fish Farm Flood 2.0 Implementation Oversight Committee
Member Attendance List – April 4, 2019 Meeting
Duvall Community/Visitors' Center – Duvall, WA**

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

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

Tom Buroker, 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

Libby Reed, Sno Valley Tilth

Lara Thomas, City of Duvall

Micah Wait, Wild Fish Conservancy

Daryl Williams, Tulalip Tribes