

Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood 2.0 Implementation Oversight Committee

DRAFT MEETING NOTES

Monday, February 28, 2022

10:00 am to 12:00 pm (scheduled)

Video Conference Call via King County Zoom Account

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

I) Call to Order and Welcome / Updates

Facilitator Tamie Kellogg began the meeting at 10:04 am.

a) Introduction of Rick Shaffer, City of Duvall

Rick Shaffer was introduced as the new Snoqualmie/WRIA 7 Forum representative to the IOC.

b) Channel Migration Zone Update

Teresa Lewis of DNRP's River and Floodplain Management Section gave an update on a study analyzing the channel migration zone of the lower Snoqualmie. The study was initiated in 2020 and was anticipated to see completion in 2021. However, results of the study and mapping are delayed until later in 2022. A public meeting on the study will be held in Quarter 2 of 2022. Outreach to Valley partners on the status of the study is underway.

c) Washington State Updates

Daryl Williams, President of the WA State Conservation Commission (WSCC), referenced materials he sent to the IOC. A strategic plan for the next five years has been adopted, to be implemented by conservation districts with guidance from WSCC. There may be a boost from the legislature this year in funding for salmon restoration projects. Williams noted more effort is being made to assist lower income populations and increase program diversity. Every May, there is a strategic planning session to look at the current year; in a few months, WSCC will meet with conservation districts to plan for the coming year. Any feedback on this should be sent to Williams at least a week before the May 17 meeting. Tamie Kellogg will send a reminder to the IOC to submit their feedback.

II) Agriculture Land-Based Strategic Plan (*Patrice Barrentine, DNRP*)

Patrice Barrentine opened by praising the hard work of this task force, especially since January, and noted the importance of having this "third leg" of the FFF stool to match the existing plans for fish and flood interests.

a. Presentation

The agriculture strategic plan is unique in that it represents a sector and not full FFF interest. However, it does include multi-benefit proposals, and should be integrable with the IOC, caucuses, and represented organizations and agencies. Barrentine said all input and chances to review are welcome, but noted some feedback may not be incorporated if it doesn't come from the agriculture viewpoint, which is being emphasized. The task force will make final decisions about edits and revisions.

The first step of the plan process is the initial draft. This includes drafts of 22 issue papers, which IOC members will be asked to review. So far review requests have come from tribes (for drainage and wildlife), Department of Ecology (for drainage), Angela Donaldson (for flood issues), and the Snoqualmie Watershed Improvement District (for drainage). The drainage section, with six issue papers, is nearly complete. The task force is also working with WDFW via public disclosure request for numbers on beavers.

The next step will be internal quality assurance/control at King County, including graphics and so on. Then comes FFF caucus input, with a meeting of the IOC to distill caucus comments. IOC feedback will be incorporated before the draft becomes the public review draft. The public review draft will be for agriculture agencies/organizations, farmers, landowners, and other public-facing organizations to comment. This will occur in late Quarter 2 of 2022. (It should be noted that this timeline has been revised since the IOC meeting).

In Quarter 3 of 2022, the task force will incorporate comments and finalize the draft. Agriculture organizations represented in the task force would adopt the plan. Then, the plan would return to FFF and the task force would present on key changes since going to public draft. The draft goes to caucus co-chairs for review, then to the IOC to officially complete the task force and transmit a letter to the Executive. This would occur by Quarter 4 of 2022.

Barrentine asked the IOC how deeply they want to review the plan and its issue papers, and about strategies of concern for their caucuses. The task force wants to know what the IOC wants and what is doable. Tamie Kellogg said the IOC should consider if the current timeline for when the IOC/caucuses begin dialogue makes sense.

b. Q & A from IOC Members

- **Q:** A big comment window – July to September? That’s the worst time for farmers to review and comment.
A: It will be somewhere in that time window, as early as July.
- **Q:** In the draft is mention of acre-for-acre replaced for acreage lost. How far are you expanding the APD?
A: We don’t have a solid answer yet. We’ve been working with buffer task force recommendations to update the map and hope to have this ready in two weeks. We’re discussing some expansion. Specifics will be in the draft coming for IOC/caucus review in May.
- **Q:** Can you include brief summaries for people to determine which issue papers are relevant to them?
A: I can flag some key areas.
- **Q:** Are you looking for feedback from each IOC member or consolidated from the whole forum?
A: Both.
- **Q:** How do you want to receive feedback? What’s the best way?
A: When we get to the public review stage, I will send out a survey for feedback to be submitted.
- Tamie Kellogg asked the IOC if, aside from today’s comments, they support the plan moving forward as stated. No one voiced opposition.

III) King County Comprehensive Plan & FFF Nexus (Michael Murphy, DNRP; Chris Jensen, DES)

Chris Jensen, Comprehensive “Comp” Plan Manager in King County’s Department of Executive Services (DES), gave today’s presentation. Michael Murphy, DNRP’s liaison with the Executive’s Office for the plan, also spoke and was available for questions.

a. Presentation/Discussion

Work will continue over the next 2.5 years, with full review and adoption by King County Council (KCC) by April-June 2024. The scope is being developed by the Executive for transmittal to KCC for review in March. This will be followed by the Executive’s public review draft and a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

There will be multiple opportunities for stakeholder and public input/engagement on the plan draft throughout the process. The immediate task is defining a Scope of Work (SOW) for KCC review in April and May. Jensen noted this SOW should be considered a “floor” and not a “ceiling” for the draft process, a starting point to build on. Other input opportunities will include 45 days for the Public Review Draft and Draft EIS in Quarter 1 of 2023, and KCC’s review and refinement period from Quarter 3 of 2023 to Quarter 2 of 2024.

It was asked if the watershed planning process will be an appendix to the comp plan, and what parts need to be ready for specific deadlines. Jensen replied that as things progress, there will be a better idea of how things will be implemented. Tamie Kellogg asked IOC members to briefly review two synopsis documents, for King County policies R649/R650/R650A and an early draft of the comp plan. Joan Lee, section manager for DNRP’s Rural and Regional Services section and interim FFF project manager, also reviewed a summary of these policies.

Michael Murphy, liaison between DNRP subject matter experts (SMEs) and the comp plan team in the Executive’s Office, spoke. Murphy explained this role as not lobbying for a specific path, but turning an agreed-on path into policy and code language to go into the comp plan. The liaison also serves as a guide, interpreter, and timepoint guardian. Murphy said there is space in the comp plan for FFF, but now the need is to put “meat” on the policy details, preferably by July/August/September 2022. The goal is to have it 95-98% ready for public review by December 31. Final language should be ready by fall for the Executive to review it, so conversations need to happen now. Murphy added that DES’ Regional Planning Section wants its language 65% done by July.

Josh Baldi explained that the comp plan is where County land use policy is established. Baldi noted that FFF’s notion of continuous planning, and connectivity, collaboration, and awareness, should be operationalized in a way to inform other watersheds. It should be determined how to manifest this in the comp plan.

b. Breakout Rooms

IOC members were sent into breakout rooms to discuss the following questions:

1. Any thoughts or reactions to the above approaches?
2. Flood Caucus continues to support the concept of a Resilient Watershed plan – how best to integrate with other efforts including this Comp Plan Update, Flood Management Plan, etc.?
3. How do we help ensure the recommendations are durable and the trust that the new policies will live on? What would it take?
4. Level of resources to support the current comp plan update? Concept of an FFF sub-committee?
5. How might different futures for FFF inform the Comp Plan?

The breakout rooms reported back the following discussion highlights to the full IOC:

- **Room 1:** Policies live on, but plans don’t. Integrated watershed plans are the future of floodplain management; not just dealing with symptoms, but taking a holistic approach. Considered more effective and critical is to memorialize the benefits learned from FFF and create simple policy language allowing flexible perpetuity, instead of an inadaptable action list.
- **Room 2:** It needs to be ensured that recommendations and strategies are funded and fulfilled. That things are getting done, not just recommendations and a plan. More discussion is needed on the idea of a watershed plan and if the IOC will be who determines that goal is met. More context is needed on the watershed piece of the plan, what it is and isn’t. Clarification is needed on what level the IOC determines the plan is done, and watershed planning specifics.
- **Room 3:** There was discussion on regulatory changes desired involving entities external to King County. While agriculture interests are generally supportive of the FFF process, there is underlying concern that any changes to the comp plan will be too nebulous to have longevity in efforts to help agriculture. The concern is how to get the right language plugged into the comp plan to reassure agriculture interests about the future.
- **Room 4:** The focus was what’s most important from FFF in the comp plan, and what would be a realistic scale of work. There are key learned messages from the FFF process that should be implemented throughout the County. It needs to be determined where the strongest place in the comp plan would be to reflect that. A second focus was the ongoing role of FFF, and agreement there needs to be a continuing entity like the IOC. This entity could have some semblance of caucus structure and help navigate FFF interests and challenges going forward, but also discourage thinking of FFF as merely a “planning” process.
- **Room 5:** The focus was on how FFF has changed the County’s project review process. A continued framework for these broad-based reviews is critical and should be monumented. It’s also key to know how stakeholder interests are also heard and incorporated. A similar broad-spectrum review process is needed for the permitting phase for projects that don’t go through WLRD’s review process. There is much support for continuing a format for multi-stakeholder engagement in FFF, and to continue this work.
- **Room 6:** Non-IOC members have concerns about the short time frame to develop policies the IOC can agree on. They’d like additional information from staff about pros and cons to various options, such as what would be lost or gained. Also, agriculture protections in R649 aren’t necessarily achieved without the Agriculture Strategic Plan Task Force (ASPTF)’s completion, and the next step of IOC melding buffer task force and ASPTF acreage recommendations for the Snoqualmie APD. Deleting R649 before IOC work is done could lose agriculture balance with fish and flood interests.

IV) Briefing on Flood Management Plan Update (Jason Wilkinson)

Jason Wilkinson, DNRP’s project manager for the County’s flood management plan (FMP) update, reviewed its status. It was noted that due to time constraints, there would not be a chance for a dialogue today, but Wilkinson will return to the IOC for that in April. Follow-up questions will be sent to Wilkinson after this meeting. Wilkinson also noted that not much detail for the FMP has been determined yet.

The FMP serves to fulfill federal/state requirements and defines flood management policies in King County. It identifies and assesses flood hazards and prioritizes actions. It is the foundational planning document for the King County Flood Control District (FCD). 1993’s FMP update marked King County becoming more proactive in addressing flooding and habitat-friendly project design. 2006’s update laid strategies for all major basins and was foundational to creating the FCD. This also helped King County attain a FEMA status which gained a 40% discount in flood insurance for county residents. The 2006 plan’s guiding principles are consistent with multi-benefit integrated floodplain management.

The focus for the current update is an integrated floodplain management approach. This includes conducting community engagement through an equity lens, multi-benefit floodplain management, and climate change adaptation and resiliency. The scope will focus on describing/assessing hazards and risks, identifying risk reduction strategies, proposing actions to reduce risk, and providing an implementation strategy. It will also include evaluation of programmatic and capital topics such as levee certification and large wood management. A draft of the plan is expected in late 2023 to early 2024.

External engagement to update the plan will involve developing a community engagement guide to involve under-represented communities, tribal consultations, stakeholder advisory committees, cities, government agencies, non-governmental organizations, and engaging existing forums. There will be several open houses and public meetings.

V) Draft IOC Work Plan for 2022 (Tamie Kellogg)

This item was skipped due to time constraints.

VI) Follow-Up Items and Public Input (Tamie Kellogg)

It was suggested an IOC subcommittee form to address the comp plan policy update between IOC meetings. Anyone interested in serving on this subcommittee was invited to put their name in the chat. Materials will be sent out later. If anything further is needed, IOC members should contact their co-chair.

The meeting ended at 12:02 pm.