

Participant Agenda
King County FFF 2.0
Buffer Task Force Meeting #6
Wednesday, Aug 21, 2019
12:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Carnation 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 review workgroup edits to flow diagrams incorporating TF input on each watercourse. Discuss the initial recommendations of buffer widths based on the synthesis of science.

12:00 - 12:10	1. Welcome, introductions and grab a bite to eat!	Tamie Kellogg
12:10 – 12:25	2. Staying connected to the FFF purpose. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context, reminders, discussion, and questions. 	Tamie Kellogg, Beth leDoux, and Workgroup Members
12:25 - 1:25	3. Share updated flow diagrams for each watercourse. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlight changes made to the flow diagrams based on the June Task Force and August Workgroup. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Josh – Mainstem, Large, Medium ○ Beth – Small ○ Kollin- Artificial and Oxbow • Q and A? Can these flow diagrams move forward? Do you have any suggestions or recommendations about how we convey this information? Is there a different way to share this? 	Josh Kubo, Beth leDoux, Kollin Higgins
1:25 – 2:50	4. Share and discuss initial estimates for buffer width. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial width based on type of watercourse> level of confidence> function. (Includes a 10 min Break) • Discussion and questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are your reactions to the flow chart and synthesis of science initial recommendations for each specific watercourse? Do you have any questions? Are there other considerations we should know about? 	Beth leDoux, Tamie Kellogg
2:50- 3:30	5. Pulse Check Exercise	Tamie Kellogg
3:30-4:00	6. Wrap up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and discuss timeline and identify our next steps. • Please ensure important dates are on your calendar, next BTF mtg October 16. • What went well and what could we do differently? 	Tamie Kellogg
4:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjourn 	
<p>Important dates and Responsibilities for Task Force Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please keep your organizations, colleagues, neighbors up to date on what’s going on with the task force. • Next Buffers Task Force Meeting, 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 #7
Wednesday, August 21st, 2019
12:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Carnation Library

Task Force Members in Attendance: Matt Baerwalde, Preston Drew, Erin Ericson, Chris LaPointe, Elissa Ostergaard, Steve Van Ess, Daryl Williams

Facilitator: Tamie Kellogg

Introductions and Material Distribution

- Beth leDoux and Tamie Kellogg kicked off the meeting.
- Primary goals for August meeting:
 - o Review updated riparian buffer decision flowcharts (updated flow charts have been reviewed by the Buffer Task Force working group)
 - o Review logic tables aimed at aligning the riparian buffer best available science synthesis with potential riparian buffer width recommendation
 - o Review draft buffer width recommendations
 - o Riparian acreage allocation group exercise

Staying Connected to the Purpose of the Buffer Task Force and the Farm-Fish-Flood efforts

- Common goal is focused on establishing ecologically meaningful voluntary riparian buffers that consider impacts to agriculture in the Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District
- It will be integral to pair the Buffer Task Force recommendation with an implementation plan; however, the implementation plan is not a deliverable of the Buffer Task Force
- Tulalip Tribes thoughts (Colin Wahl):
 - o It is difficult for the Tribes to deviate away from buffer width recommendations outlined in regional best available science documents
 - o The participation of the Tribes with the Buffer Task Force is aimed to help develop variable width riparian buffers to support riparian plantings as well as align potential external funding options
- Department of Ecology thoughts (Ralph Svrjcek):
 - o Riparian planting funds coming from Ecology are largely limited to the 100ft riparian buffer recommendations unless there is an agreed-upon structure to define smaller buffer
 - o Ecology is working on variable-width buffer recommendation
 - o Currently, Ecology will only fund projects with larger riparian buffers (≥ 100 ft)
 - o Ecology is working on developing agricultural best management practices focused on riparian plantings and water quality benefits (focused on the Clean Water Act)

Updated Logic Flowcharts and Supporting Information

- Logic flowcharts were based on attributes prioritized by the Buffer Task Force
- Need approval from the Buffer Task Force on the logic flowcharts in order for King County to conduct a GIS exercise to determine potential land removed from agriculture across the various riparian buffer width recommendations
- The glossary has been updated to include requested clarifications and additions

- Buffer Task Force working group has spent time reviewing flowcharts and preliminary buffer width recommendations
- Small watercourses (presented by Beth leDoux): changes in flowchart were focused on simplification as recommended by the Buffer Task Force
- Medium watercourses (presented by Josh Kubo):
 - o Logic flowchart similar to small watercourses with buffer width recommendation ranges larger than small watercourses; meant to capture range between large and small buffer widths recommendations
 - o Need to follow-up and determine if some of the watercourses binned as mediums may belong in small or large; potential watercourses that may belong in different watercourse types should be sent to Beth leDoux and the Buffer Task Force team
 - o It may be important to consider the initial water quality of a watercourses (Steve Van Ess); the implementation plan may be a good place to integrate site-specific conditions
- Large watercourses and mainstem watercourse (presented by Josh Kubo): flowcharts have not had any changes since the last Buffer Task Force Meeting
- Artificial watercourses (presented by Kollin Higgins): changes in flowchart were focused on simplification as recommended by the Buffer Task Force
 - o Suggested that artificial watercourses may not need riparian buffers (Preston Drew)
- Oxbows (presented by Kollin Higgins):
 - o Background information: Snoqualmie oxbows full of non-native predators, generally poor salmon habitat, nutrient issues (especially phosphorous), and temperature issues
 - o Importance of continuous and connected riparian buffers
 - o Focus on shade and water quality
 - o Buffer Task Force has requested clarification on which oxbows have a higher likelihood of providing salmon habitat (oxbows closer to the mainstem); potentially consider connected oxbows as backwater habitats (maybe lump with mainstem or create an updated oxbow flow chart); Buffer Task Force suggested that oxbows be separated based on proximity to mainstem and likelihood of connectivity

Draft Riparian Buffer Width Recommendations

- Initial acreages communicated during the Farm-Fish-Flood effort were based on 150ft riparian buffers; 5000 acres are within the 150ft buffer and 2650 acres are specific to agricultural land use
- Draft riparian buffer width recommendations
 - o Buffer ranges for each ecological function were organized for each watercourse type
 - o Buffer width ranges were organized into confidence bins based on certainty of a given buffer width range to provide high levels of ecological function
 - o Primary ecological functions driving buffer width maximums were identified and used as basis for recommendation
 - o Potential buffer width recommendation were organized by confidence level and based on primary driving ecological function
- Small watercourses (Buffer Task Force discussion of recommendations)
 - o 100ft request on small watercourses in not reasonable (Preston Drew)
 - o The recommendations are a starting point for the Buffer Task Force to modify to find mutual-agreement (Daryl Williams)

- Several salmon species are near extinction and it's important that each factors contributing to decline is addressed; riparian planting are one piece of the puzzle; agricultural needs are important and so are Tribal fishing needs (Daryl Williams)
- How will the Farmland Preservation Program be integrated into process? (Steve Van Ess); possibly in the implantation plan
- There has been a long history of tree removal and thus there will be a lag-time in achieving the benefits of riparian restoration and protection (Matt Baerwalde)
- Will the recommendation be the maximum potential riparian buffer widths? (Erin Ericson); These will be the maximum buffer width recommended by King County for voluntary plantings and related funds (Beth leDoux)
- Suggested that the best available science supports a minimum buffer width of 15ft rather than 30ft on small watercourses (Erin Ericson); follow-up needed for these buffer width ranges
- Will there be suggestions for buffer width minimums? Minimum recommendations may not be adequate in providing functions
- Small watercourses may only require small trees
- Medium watercourses (Buffer Task Force discussion of recommendations)
 - Range meant to bridge riparian buffer width recommendations between large watercourse and small watercourse
 - Potentially include a range or minimum recommendations (Preston Drew)
 - Potentially use fish use or fish data to help determine confidence level (Colin Hume)
 - 75ft recommendation in mediums would limit potential for continued drainage maintenance (Erin Ericson)
- Large and Maintsem watercourses (Buffer Task Force discussion of recommendations)
 - Since microclimate is likely not impacted by whether or not the bank is armored, it may makes sense for large watercourses to only use one confidence level (Colin Hume)
- Artificial watercourses (Buffer Task Force discussion of recommendations)
 - Will shade be important during the summer when channels are dry? Shoulder seasons (late spring & early fall) are important for temperature impacts to instream water and fish
 - Climate change may impact the shoulder seasons
- Oxbows (Buffer Task Force discussion of recommendations)
 - Potentially include oxbows that are in close proximity to mainstem with mainstem buffer width recommendation
- Thoughts and overarching perspectives
 - Length may be a modifier with longer riparian buffers having relatively narrower widths
 - Needed agreement of buffer width ranges and confidence level assignment
 - The draft recommendations are a starting point which will be adjusted and negotiate by the Buffer Task Force members
 - Fish Caucus needs to meet to discuss buffer width recommendations (Daryl Williams)
 - The Buffer Task Force needs information on landowner participation in current voluntary plantings and what percentage of landowners are planting
 - The draft riparian buffer width recommendations seem like an unreasonable request (Steve Van Ess)
 - Concerns that these recommendations will end up in regulations (Preston Drew)
 - Concerns with the County keeping its promises to landowners (Preston Drew)

- It has been communicated since the beginning of Buffer Task Force that the buffer recommendations would be for voluntary plantings and with no discussion of integration with regulatory buffer requirements (Daryl Williams)
- The Buffer Task Force would like a summary of the current rules and regulations that pertain to riparian buffers in the Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District
- Example group exercise (How would each Buffer Task Force member allocate 1000 acres of riparian plantings across watercourse types?)
 - Aimed to help clarify how different Buffer Task Force members prioritize various watercourses and buffer widths among the Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District
 - Exercise results: majority of members prioritize mainstem and large watercourses for riparian plantings; some members consider artificial, small, and oxbows to need minimal buffers

Next Steps and Wrap up

- Build on best available science, logic flowcharts, and buffer width recommendations
- Identified need for detailing implementation ideas/concerns; need to write down and articulate what may belong in an implementation plan
- Needed clarity on acreage and details specific to Farmland Preservation Program
- Buffer Task Force members have expressed the need to fully review buffer width recommendations
- Follow-up meeting with the Fish Caucus and Farm Caucus to discuss buffer width recommendations
- What would be the best way to see the acreage number for the riparian buffer width recommendations?
 - Tables/Figures
 - Maps of potential confidence levels across watercourses
 - Scenarios of maximums and minimums