

AGENDA
King County FFF 2.0
Buffer Task Force Meeting #5
Wednesday, June 19, 2019
12:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Issaquah Library

Task Force Objective: The Buffer Task Force will create a variable buffer width decision-making framework in the Snoqualmie Valley that support salmon health and farming.

Meeting Purpose: Discuss and improve upon the draft flow diagram for each watercourse. Increase understanding of the Agricultural Strategic Plan and Regulatory TF responsibilities and deliverables, and the Synthesis of Science Appendix and Cliff Notes. Discuss next steps for arriving at estimate of buffer width numbers.

12:00 - 12:10	1. Welcome, introductions and grab a bite to eat!	Tamie Kellogg
12:10 - 12:50	2. Other FFF Task Forces Clarification of Goals and Assumption <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural Task Force <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Q&A • Regulatory Task Force <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Q&A 	Patrice Barrington & Eric Beach
12:50 – 2:20	3. Share and Discuss Draft Flowcharts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workgroup shares context and background of their effort to further develop the flowcharts. • Flow chart discussion in small groups • 3 Reflective questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are your reactions to the flow chart for that specific watercourse? Do you have recommendations to improve it? 2. Do you still have questions that have not been answered? 3. Do you have a recommendation for how to better incorporate farming impacts into our process? • Reconvene as a full group to discuss take-aways. 	Tamie Kellogg Collin Wahl
2:20- 2:45	Break (15 min)	
2:45- 3:10	4. Orientation to Synthesis of Science Appendix and Cliff Notes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q & A 	Josh Kubo
3:10 – 3:30	5. Fish Caucus Input on Functions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Q & A 	Josh Kubo and Fish Caucus
3:30	6. Wrap up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Steps – how to help us arrive at numbers. • Share updated timeline • Review the important dates and responsibilities below. • Anything we could do differently? 	Tamie Kellogg Beth LeDoux

4:00

- **Adjourn**

Important dates and Responsibilities for Task Force Members

- Please keep your organizations, colleagues, neighbors up to date on what's going on with the task force.
- Next Buffers Task Force Meeting August 21, October 16th, December 11.
12:00-4:00
- Next FFF Implementation Oversight Committee (IOC) meeting October 24th

Meeting Summary
King County FFF 2.0
Buffer Task Force Meeting #6
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019
1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Issaquah Library

Task Force Members in Attendance: Preston Drew, Bruce Elliott, Wayne Gullstad, Erin Ericson, Kurt Nelson, Elissa Ostergaard, Matt Baerwalde, Steve Van Ess, Daryl Williams

Facilitator: Tamie Kellogg

Introductions and Material Distribution

- Beth leDoux and Tamie Kellogg kicked off the meeting.
- Primary goals for June meeting:
 - o Review and update riparian buffer decision flowcharts (previously organized and developed by the BTF working group)
 - o Updates from other Farm-Fish-Flood Task Forces (Agricultural Task Force & Regulatory Task Force)
 - o Get oriented with information included in riparian buffer best available science Cliff notes and appendices

Agricultural Land Resources Strategic Plan Task Force Updates (presented by Patrice Barrentine)

- Details and information outlined in hand-out
- Milestones have been created and refined by the Agricultural Task Force team
- Goal: “improve 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”
- Create equity at the Farm-Fish-Flood table (comparable data-information evaluation, measures of progress/success, and detailed planning efforts)
- To complement the King Conservation District Agricultural Resiliency planning effort
- Aimed to address Farm-Fish-Flood actions including Farm 4 A & B as well as Action 2 & 3
 - o Focused on 14 priority topics
 - o Inform acreage targets for permanent farmland protection
 - o 25 year plan (alignment with a generation among the agricultural community)
- Deliverable will be an Agriculture Land Resource Strategic Plan that will “support, sustain, and improve the SVAPD ag sector”
- Expected completion around July 2020
- Questions and Answers:
 - o Q: What is the acreage targets focused around?
 - o A: To determination acreage targets of Ag land needed for protection as well as how much land needs to be improved or enhanced
 - o Q: Will there be a crosswalk with the Flood Hazard Management Plan update?
 - o A: Aiming to have a crosswalk between efforts
 - o Q: How will agricultural productivity be defined (referencing difficulties in defining during the FFF 1.0 effort)?

- A: Data and information has been collected on agricultural status and productivity; work-in-progress for determining productivity
- Q: Can items be added to the Priority Topics list?
- A: Yes, by August 2019
- Q: What data and information is missing for the Agricultural Land Resource Strategic Planning effort?
- A: There are several information needs including things like farm pad info, commercial farmland status, etc.
- Q: How will this effort address future farming practices and needs that may not be currently known?
- A: Aiming to determine agricultural needs for next 25 years
- Q: How will this effort integrate watercourse types and potential riparian planting efforts?
- A: Aiming to integrate with information and recommendation coming out of the Riparian Buffer Task Force

Regulatory Task Force Updates (presented by Eric Beach)

- Details and information outlined in hand-out
- Goal: “Identify actions (from FFF 1.0) that will 1- Make drainage projects cheaper and easier (Farm 2), 2 - Make farms safer during floods (Farm 3), and 3 - Minimize the impacts of mitigation action on farmable lands (Farm 5)”
- Focused on 4 main topic areas: improvements to drainage infrastructure and activities, alluvial fan management, beaver management, cost reduction for drainage projects, clarification and interpretation of regulatory requirements, mitigation requirements
- Aiming to provide Farm-Fish-Flood Implementation Oversight Committee with a set of recommendations and strategies to address topic areas as well as high-level information which can be forwarded along to King County leadership
- Expected to be wrapped up by 2020
- Questions and Answers:
 - Q: What does improved drainage opportunities and regulation include?
 - A: Aiming to identify regulatory barriers, conduct projects to evaluate constraints, identify code language which may be barriers
 - Q: How will this effort fold into State and Federal regulatory requirements?
 - A: Most of the State requirements are based in the hydraulic code which may already have flexibility to support agricultural practices; County code may be the most limiting
 - Q: Shoreline Master Plan update and Critical Area Ordinance update have been delayed
 - A: Will follow-up to see the status of these efforts
 - What does alluvial fan management entail?
 - Potential management strategies will be built on the report from King County Stormwater Services, which evaluated projects and alluvial fan management efforts

Flow Chart Exercise

- BTF workgroup worked on organizing and integrating comments into the riparian buffer decision flow charts from the previous BTF meeting-exercise; aimed to integrate site attributes, waterway features, and elements that can influence riparian buffer recommendations

- Difficulty in integrating all of the site attributes and riparian buffer characteristics into a decision flowchart; aimed at simplifying the flowchart to include primary questions and attributes (focused on which questions make the most difference in riparian characteristics and recommendations)
- Fish Caucus worked on aligning riparian buffer functions and Snoqualmie Valley watercourse types in an effort to inform which riparian functions should be prioritized among watercourse types
- Potential need to clarify alluvial reaches and the characteristics of these areas
- Break-out session/exercise focused on three questions:
 - o What are your reactions to the flow chart for that specific watercourse? Do you have recommendations to improve it?
 - o Do you still have questions that have not been answered?
 - o Do you have a recommendation for how to better incorporate farming impacts into our process?
- **Report out from exercise:**
 - o Mainstem watercourses
 - Easily digestible and clearly understood
 - Clarification that recommendations will likely be ranges and bins rather than specific numbers
 - Possibly consider changing the medium-sized buffers to large for mainstems (two sets of large recommendations)
 - Needed clarification of alluvial reaches; possibly use river miles with description of characteristics in that reach (e.g., 6 river miles downstream of Tolt and Raging river confluences where significant gravel deposition occurs results in higher mainstem gradients and dynamic channel migration characteristics)
 - Potentially change “is the bank erodible” to “is the bank armored” for clarity
 - Most of the land management and farming impact considerations likely align with subsequent riparian buffer implementation
 - Possibly align land management and farming impacts with lower ends of buffer recommendation ranges (more constraints = lower end of buffer range)
 - o Large watercourses
 - Since large watercourses are most important for priority function needs, these watercourses likely have minimal flexibility in widths and lengths
 - May want to consider including aspect, orientation, or shade potential if temperature moderation is considered important in large watercourses
 - Need to better incorporate buffer impacts to adjacent agricultural lands
 - o Small watercourses
 - There is a question of if the small channels are really talking about an alluvial reach or an alluvial fan associated with a transition zone from the valley wall to the floodplain.
 - Question if any watercourse within the alluvial reach of the mainstem should have a large buffer
 - Desire to understand if the question of the watercourse originating inside or outside of the floodplain is really important. Since the next question is about sinuosity is it possible to really have sinuous watercourses that originate inside the floodplain?
 - Can the question around alluvial reach/fan be the starting question? Do alluvial areas occur in watercourses that originate inside the floodplain.

- Thought that starting with shade potential may be the best way to organize the small channels
- Capturing the agricultural questions around small channels is tricky. While considering the tillage of the adjacent lands is important it may not be the way to get to understanding agriculture impacts.
- Artificial watercourses
 - Data Gap-Is the channel dry in summer
 - Data Gap-Do we have data to show that channel bifurcations/connections for artificial channels are hot spots?
 - We should explore how grass filter strips could be used in place of typical riparian shrubs/trees
 - How do these areas get maintained overtime if we are putting trees/shrubs in the way?
 - Should look at if we can establish plant composition at this stage versus during implementation.

Orientation to Synthesis of Riparian Buffer Science Cliff Notes and Appendices

- Cliff notes provide a high level synthesis of reviewed literature with information on the primary drivers of riparian functions and how riparian buffer characteristics may vary across various watercourse types
- Appendices provide detailed information of how riparian buffer functions vary with riparian buffer width and length
- Appendices provide information from each reviewed reference on attributes like riparian composition, watercourse size, gradient, location, and results/findings
- Information from appendices can be used to determine potential riparian buffer recommendations for watercourses across the Snoqualmie Valley APD

Next Steps and Wrap up

- Next meeting is August 21st from 12-4
- The Buffer Task Force workgroup will get together to continue developing the riparian buffer decision flow charts.