

FFF IOC Meeting Agenda April 28, 12:30 AM – 2:15 PM Zoom Meeting		
12:30-12:45	1. Welcome and Updates a. Introduce Lauren Silver, new SVPA Executive Director and IOC member b. Question on the written updates in the packet c. Josh Baldi Updates	Lauren Silver Josh Baldi
12:45-1:00	2. 2D Modeling Project Update a. Share the scope and ask input on engagement <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. How can you see this benefiting key FFF interests? ii. How do we engage the FFF community in this effort to ensure usability of the data when completed? iii. Are there key messages about this project that we should be sharing? Materials: PowerPoint Presentation, and 2D Modeling Grant SOW	Andrea Mojzak
1:00 -1:15	3. Update on Capital Habitat Restoration Projects a. Snoqualmie at Fall City Floodplain Restoration Project 2022 Construction Schedule Update b. Other habitat restoration capital projects c. Any questions? Materials: PowerPoint Presentation	Andrea Mojzak
1:15-1:30	4. House Elevation Program Update a. Update on the program and its activities in the Snoqualmie Valley b. Any questions?	Ken Zweig
1:30- 1:50	5. KC Comp Plan Subcommittee Update a. Share KC's updated comp plan timeline b. Comp Plan subcommittee provides a progress update and updated FFF Subcommittee timeline c. Questions?	Michael Murphy Angela Donaldson
1:50-2:00	6. WA State FFF Ex Officio Member Updates	Tamie Kellogg
2:00-2:15	7. King County Councilmember Sarah Perry (15 min) a. Introduction, interest in FFF, overview of current work and discussion.	Councilmember Sarah Perry

.....
The following SOW was submitted as part of King County's application to FEMA's Hazard Mitigation Grant Program in 2021. The SOW may be modified slightly during procurement and contract negotiations. Please do not distribute.

SCOPE OF WORK

CONSULTANT DELIVERABLE STANDARDS

This project will be delivered under the 5% Initiative. Deliverables produced from the hydraulic modeling and analysis will be submitted to King County for review and approval. Following King County review, Consultant shall make all deliverables available to King County in readily useable formats (PDF, KMZ, ESRI GIS, etc.). Consultant shall create and maintain a web-based story map to keep the Fish, Farm, Flood IOC and other stakeholders informed on project progress and activities.

TASK 100 – PROJECT MANAGEMENT

This task includes all work related to the management, administration, and coordination of Consultant activities for this study.

1. The Consultant shall manage the project scope, schedule, and budget including:
 - A. Monthly progress reporting that includes earned value analysis
 - B. Team meetings and project management meetings
 - C. Initial project schedule and monthly updates
 - D. Developing a web-based story map to track project activities and progress

DELIVERABLES:

1. Project schedule
2. Monthly progress reports including schedule updates
3. Presentation materials for meetings
4. Web based story map

TASK 200 – FIELD RECONNAISSANCE AND INITIAL OUTREACH

1. The Consultant shall conduct a detailed field reconnaissance of the study areas. Specific activities may include the following:
 - A. Field Reconnaissance: Conduct a field reconnaissance to determine floodplain conditions including areas protected by existing levees, and to identify the types and numbers of hydraulic structures (bridges, culverts, etc.), locations of key hydraulic controls, and other parameters necessary for hydrologic and hydraulic analyses.
 - B. Meetings with Stakeholders: Consultant will attend up to eight (8) half day meetings with FFF IOC and/or landowners to better understand issues related to road flooding and egress from the valley. Anecdotal reports of flooding and high water mark information will be recorded and concerns or experiences related to egress during floods will be identified.
 - C. Documentation: Provide clear documentation of all field reconnaissance and information obtained, including field notes, sketches, and photographs. Consultant shall prepare a memo summarizing the findings of the field reconnaissance and landowner meetings, including information on flood characteristics and relevant field notes.

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. King County will provide available site information for the field reconnaissance
2. King County will obtain land-owner permission for the field reconnaissance activities.

3. King County will provide a map of properties that have landowner permission for access.

DELIVERABLES:

1. Summary Memo of Field Reconnaissance

TASK 300 – AERIAL IMAGERY AND TOPOGRAPHIC DATA REVIEW

1. Aerial imagery and LiDAR topographic data for the Snoqualmie Valley were collected for King County in 2019 (Quantum, 2019). Consultant will review these data sets and provide recommendations for additional topographic data collection needed to support the proposed hydraulic modeling.

DELIVERABLES:

1. Recommendations for additional imagery and topographic data collection

TASK 400 – TERRAIN DATA AND BASE MAP DEVELOPMENT

1. The Consultant shall develop a composite topographic and bathymetric terrain surface for hydraulic modeling using the data described in Task 300. Specific tasks shall include:
 - A. Digital Modeling and Mapping: Generate digital elevation models and topographic mapping for the study areas data collected in Task 300. Topographic data shall meet map accuracy standards for representation at a scale of one-inch equals two hundred feet with a contour interval of two feet. Map scales may be modified upon agreement with King County.
 - B. Develop Base Maps: Using the digital elevation data, create base maps showing topographic contours and planimetric features such as structures and roadways. Map the boundaries of incorporated areas and label highways and major arterials for each study area. All mapping shall be referenced to the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD 83) horizontal datum and the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD 88) vertical datum. For each base map sheet, the Consultant shall also provide the conversion factor to National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929 (NGVD 29).
 - C. Index Map: Consultant shall provide an index map that illustrates the sheet layout of the maps for each study that has multiple sheets.
 - D. Certification of Topographic Maps: Consultant shall certify topographic maps.

DELIVERABLES:

1. Digital (GIS) topographic base maps formatted as E size sheets at a map scale as agreed upon with King County
2. Written statement certifying that the mapping meets National Map Accuracy Standards

TASK 500 – HYDROLOGIC ANALYSES

1. The Consultant shall develop hydrologic data for use in the hydraulic modeling. Specific activities will include the following:
 - A. Streamflow Data Time Series Analyses: Obtain available time series of short interval (15-minute to 1-hour) streamflow data for all flow gages available from sources including USGS, King County, and Snohomish County. Include all gages with 10 or more years of short interval data. At a minimum these will include data for USGS gages on the Snoqualmie River near Snoqualmie and Carnation, Snohomish River near Monroe, and the Skykomish, Raging and Tolt Rivers. Determine statistical relationships between data from these gages and use these relationships to infill missing or obviously erroneous data. Store time series data in HEC-DSS format with appropriate pathname identifiers describing source and adjustments.
 - B. Develop Hydraulic Model Inflow Relationships: Considering the flow time series described in Bullet A develop a proposed approach to define inflows to the hydraulic model for the historical period 1988 – present. Prepare a technical memo describing

the proposed approach and present the approach to King County and the FFF. Address feedback and comments from the County and FFF and finalize the hydrologic data development approach. Using the time series data described in Bullet A develop a time series of short interval hydrologic inputs to the hydraulic model for the period 1988 - present.

C. Flow Frequency Analyses: Conduct flow frequency analyses for the Snoqualmie River flow gages near Snoqualmie, Carnation, and Monroe. Estimate the 10-, 4-, 2-, 1- and 0.2 percent annual-chance flood flows at these gages and use these data to estimate peak flow quantiles at other Snoqualmie River locations in the study reach. In addition to annual flow frequency analyses conduct seasonal peak flow frequency analyses for the same locations for the late Spring (April – May) or early Fall (September – October) season (assuming one combined analysis season). In addition to flow frequency analysis conduct analyses to estimate water level frequency quantiles for the Snoqualmie River near Carnation and Snohomish River near Monroe for annual and seasonal periods.

D. Climate Change Estimates: Using data recently developed by the UW CIG for King County, determine appropriate multipliers for scaling existing conditions hydrologic data to reflect predicted climate change related increases for mid-century (2050s) and late-century (2080s) periods. Determine separate scalars for main stem Snoqualmie River and tributary locations as data allows.

E. Documentation: Provide documentation of the hydrologic analyses, including summary tables of discharges presenting discharge data for each flooding source and an explanation of the analyses approaches, assumptions, and uncertainties.

F. Supporting Data: Organize and deliver backup data and material used in the hydrologic analysis.

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. King County will provide hydrologic models and data as available for the study reach including climate change data recently developed by the UW CIG.
2. King County will coordinate review of the proposed hydrologic approach

DELIVERABLES:

1. Proposed approach for hydrologic data development
2. Time series data in digital (HEC-DSS) format
3. Digital copies (input and output) files for annual and seasonal flood frequency analyses
4. Documentation of the hydrologic analyses
5. Digital version of all backup data used in the analyses

TASK 600 – HYDRAULIC MODEL DEVELOPMENT AND CALIBRATION

1. Consultant shall develop a two dimensional unsteady state hydraulic model of the Snoqualmie River and floodplain from the USGS gage near Snoqualmie Falls to the USGS gage near Monroe downstream of the confluence with the Skykomish River. Specific activities will include the following:

A. Hydraulic Model Selection: Select an appropriate hydraulic model for use in this project. Two models are currently under consideration, HEC-RAS 2D and RiverFlow2D. Considerations will include: ease of use, software cost, available support, past applications in the basin, model run time, available features, ease of formatting hydrologic inputs, model stability, etc. Consultant shall prepare a presentation documenting advantages and disadvantages of the two potential models and present this to the County and stakeholders. In coordination with the Consultant and stakeholders the County will determine which model software to use for this study.

B. Hydraulic Model Setup: Using the selected 2D model software, develop a 2D hydraulic model of the Snoqualmie River and floodplain. The model shall have adequate conceptual detail to allow accurate simulation of flows ranging from the spring and fall season 2-year flood event to the 100-year flood based on the annual flow frequency analysis. Calibrate the model to at least 4 flood events including one smaller (spring/fall) flood event and at least two major annual flood events. Events for calibration will be selected in coordination with the County based on considerations such as the availability of high water mark data, the completeness of available streamflow gage data, and how recently the flood occurred.

C. Documentation of Model Development and Calibration: Upon completion of the model development and calibration Consultant shall prepare a report and PowerPoint presentation documenting the development and calibration effort and present this to the County and FFF stakeholders. The documentation will describe data sources, assumptions, approaches, results, and remaining uncertainties in the modeling. The report will also provide an estimate of the accuracy of the modeling for simulation of flood water surface elevations.

D. Respond to County and FFF review: Address concerns or questions raised by the County or FFF during review of the hydraulic model.

ASSUMPTIONS:

1. King County and FFF will provide all available high water mark information for the study areas to be used for calibration
2. County will provide existing hydraulic models of the study reaches, as available.

DELIVERABLES:

1. Hydraulic model software recommendation
2. Model development and calibration report and PowerPoint presentation
3. Digital versions of all hydraulic models (input and output files) and backup data used in the analyses

TASK 700 – DESIGN FLOOD EVENT MODELING FOR HISTORICAL AND FUTURE CONDITIONS

1. Using the results of Task 500, Consultant shall configure hydraulic models corresponding to the 10-, 4-, 2-, 1- and 0.2 percent annual-chance flood events for annual and seasonal periods for historical and future conditions. Specific activities include the following:

A. Historical Design Flood Event Modeling: Design flood event model inflows will be determined using a “pattern event” selected from the historic record for each annual and seasonal design flood event. Inflows to the model at the upstream study boundary (Snoqualmie River near Snoqualmie) will be taken directly from the historical observed record. Inflows at other locations will initially be taken from the observed record and subsequently adjusted such that observed water levels at the downstream gages on the Snoqualmie River near Carnation and Snohomish River near Monroe match the observed water levels for the historical pattern event. All inflows will then be scaled uniformly such that the peak water levels for the corresponding design event (i.e. 2-year annual, 10-year seasonal, etc.) at Carnation and Monroe match the computed water level flood frequency quantiles determined in Task 500. Repeat this same procedure for each of the annual and seasonal design flood events.

B. Future Conditions Design Flood Event Modeling: Develop future conditions design flood event simulations by scaling the annual and seasonal design event inflows using the climate change scalars determined in Task 500.

- C. Summary Documentation: Consultant shall prepare documentation that describes the design event modeling approach and any specific considerations or assumptions used in the modeling.

DELIVERABLES:

1. Design flood event models (inputs and outputs) for 5 flow quantiles, 2 seasons (annual and spring/fall), and 3 climate change scenarios (historical, 2050s, 2080s), a total of 30 simulations.
2. Summary documentation of design event modeling approach and model development
3. Backup or supplemental information as necessary for the modeling.

TASK 800 – EVALUATION OF CURRENT AND FUTURE ROAD FLOODING

1. Use the model results described in Task 700 to conduct an analysis of road inundation frequency, extent and magnitude for historical and future conditions. Specific tasks include:

- A. Road Flooding Analysis: Using the model results from Task 700 Consultant shall identify all locations of road flooding for each design event model run. Overlay the modeled maximum water surface elevation data with King County road centerlines and identify all road segments that are inundated.
- B. Mapping: Produce GIS shape files delineating the inundated sections of road for each of the modeled design events.
- C. Inundation Depth-Duration: In coordination with the County, King County Roads, and FFF, select up to 10 road locations for additional analysis. For these 10 locations determine the maximum depth of inundation and the total duration of inundation for each of the modeled scenarios. Also determine the extent of flooding as it relates to the road and its right-of-way. Consultant shall summarize these data in tabular format.
- D. Sole-access road inundation depth-duration: Identify all sole-access roads that would be impacted. For these locations, determine the maximum depth of inundation and the total duration of inundation for each of the modeled scenarios. Also determine the extent of flooding as it relates to the road and its right-of-way. Consultant shall summarize these data in tabular format.

DELIVERABLES:

1. GIS Shape files of road inundations locations for each modeled design event.
2. Tabular summary of road and sole-access road inundation and depth-duration for historical and future conditions.

TASK 900 – CUMULATIVE INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS

1. In coordination with the County and FFF, Consultant shall identify cumulative impacts of infrastructure in the Snoqualmie Valley. The Consultant Use the model results described in Task 700 to conduct an analysis of cumulative impacts of known infrastructure, known potential future infrastructure such as a cross-valley flood tolerant road, and large-scale habitat projects. This will allow the County to identify areas most affected by flooding based on current and future conditions and help prioritize focus areas for offsetting flooding impacts and potential mitigation. Specific tasks include:

- A. Cumulative Analysis: Using the model results from Task 700 Consultant shall input current and future conditions for flooding in current and future known infrastructure in the Snoqualmie Valley.
- B. Mapping: Produce GIS shape files delineating the inundated sections of road for each of the modeled design events.

- C. Summary Documentation: Consultant shall prepare documentation that describes the design event modeling approach and any specific considerations or assumptions used in the modeling.

DELIVERABLES:

1. Design flood event models (inputs and outputs) for 5 flow quantiles, 2 seasons (annual and spring/fall), and 3 climate change scenarios (historical, 2050s, 2080s), a total of 30 simulations.
2. Summary documentation of design event modeling approach and model development
3. Backup or supplemental information as necessary for the modeling.

TASK 1000 – FINAL REPORTING AND PUBLIC OUTREACH

1. Consultant shall produce a document summarizing the results of the analyses described above and incorporating all of the documentation prepared for this study. It is anticipated that the new documentation will be an executive overview which references the tech memos and other documents previously produced. Consultant shall also prepare a PowerPoint presentation documenting study objectives, methods, and findings. Consultant will present this information at up to two public meetings in the Snoqualmie valley:

DELIVERABLES:

1. Executive overview document, incorporating previously produced documents
2. PowerPoint presentation describing study objectives, methods, and findings
3. Attendance at up to two public meetings, additional outreach and subsequent meetings will be staffed by KC

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.