

IOC Fall Retreat
October 12, 2021
8:00-10:30 PM (Zoom Meeting)

Meeting Purpose: Begin setting the FFF table for 2021-2024. Define FFF collective priorities over the next several years and identify the resource needed to accomplish.

1. Chairs Welcome and Icebreaker (10 min)

2. Caucus Priorities (75 min)

- a. Caucus Breakout Group Discussions – Re-confirm specific caucus priorities. Within the milestones, are they all equal priorities?
- b. Define priorities that require additional funding or resources (people).
Read Ahead Materials - Key Communications messages, IOC 9/20 meeting notes, 2021 Updated Caucus Milestones
Deliverable: Draft caucus priorities.

15 min Break - compile priorities and email to participants and post.

3. IOC Priority Focus Areas (15 min)

- a. Full Group Discussion of FFF collective priorities
Deliverable: Draft FFF priorities for inclusion in the funding letter.

4. Next Steps and Follow-up (10 min)

- a. Identify follow-up actions needed from this conversation.
- b. Agenda review and prep for
Deliverable: Follow-up to do list.

IOC Fall Retreat
October 13, 2021
8:00-10:00 PM (Zoom Meeting)

Meeting Purpose: Reconfirm the collective priorities over the next several years. Draft a letter on funding request needs for the collective priorities. Review and edit a draft letter for FCD participation in FFF.

1. Finalization of FFF Priorities (30 min – if needed)

- a. Quick check-in with IOC members
- b. Full group discussion to reconfirm FFF priorities discussed at the 10/12/21 IOC meeting. Are there any refinements needed?

Deliverable: Final FFF priority recommendations.

2. FFF Funding Needs for 2021-2024 (40 min)

- a. Individual and group activity (20 min)
 - Individual - What would you tell the King County Executive is needed for FFF?
 - Group discussion What would you tell the King County Executive is needed for FFF?
- b. Provide input to draft a letter of recommendation for funding/resource needed to achieve the FFF collective priorities. (20 min)

Deliverable: Draft funding letter.

10 min Break

3. FCD Participation (30 min)

- a. Review and provide input on a draft letter of recommendation to ask for Flood Control District participation in FFF IOC.
- b. Discuss pathway to submit the letter.

Read Ahead Materials – Draft FCD letter.

Deliverable: Draft of letter for participation of FCD..

5. Next Steps and Follow-up (10 min)

- a. Identify follow-up actions needed from this conversation.

Deliverable: Follow-up to do list.

These milestones were created by each caucus in 2019. In preparation for the September 2021 IOC meeting, responsible parties provided updates to the milestones, caucuses reviewed updated milestones and provided clarification of intent and proposed refinements

Fish 1: Move Forward 2-3 Large Restoration Projects Inside the APD (May 24, 2019)

Goal:

By the end of 2020, make demonstrable progress on two to three large capital projects in the APD and achieve efficiencies and certainty within the WLRD large capital project internal review process. Project planning, plantings and other initial project actions should not be considered primary construction (e.g., levee removal and excavation).

We are behind in meeting our Salmon Plan habitat restoration goals. In order to catch up, we need to move forward two to three large capital projects in the Snoqualmie APD, specifically in the two alluvial fan reaches (i.e., Raging River to Paterson Creek and Tolt River to Harris Creek).

[second paragraph copied from Appendix II)

Fish 1 - Action 1:

Measure 1: Accelerated Progress on Fall City Floodplain Restoration Project

<p>1.1 Quarterly updates and briefings on Hafner/Barfuse progression given to the IOC.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: DNRP/WLRD (Janne Kaje/Fauna Nopp)</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: Ongoing through Dec/ 2020</p> <p>100% Complete look like: Updates continue through construction</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>Risk to Completion: None</p> <p>Next Steps: Continue briefings through completion</p> <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>1.2 Complete riparian and floodplain planting plan and initiate plantings.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: DNRP/WLRD (Andrea Mojzak)</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: fall 2019</p> <p>100% Complete look like: Planting plans developed for Fall City Restoration footprint and plantings initiated</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>Risk to Completion: None</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain, monitor, and keep expanding plantings • Upland planting remains to be done

	<p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>1.3 Funding secured for full project construction.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: DNRP/WLRD (Andrea Mojzak/Janne Kaje) and WRIA 7</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: applications submitted 2020; funding received 2021</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>Risk to Completion: None</p> <p>Next Steps: None</p> <p>Actual Completion Date: Summer of 2021 with award of grants</p>
<p>1.4 Construction completed.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: DNRP/WLRD (Fauna Nopp/Jon Hansen)</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: 2022/2023</p> <p>Progress: 0% 10% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>Risk to Completion: None known</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Going to bid for contractors • Two season construction project 2022-2023 <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>

<p>Fish 1 - Action 1: Measure 2: Build and Maintain a Pipeline of Prioritized Projects (several projects at different phases) Agreement language Fish 1 – Action 1– “Increase King County funding to boost staff capacity (e.g. basin stewards and/or CIP staff) and capital funding for large restoration projects inside the APD.”</p>	
<p>2.1 Prioritized list of projects with potential funding strategies and timelines.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: DNRP/WLRD (Janne Kaje/Andrea Mojzak) and WRIA 7</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: 2019</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>100% Completion looks like:</p> <p>Status for King County:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside of ADP Tolt is focus of large restoration projects • Inside APD – developing prioritized list <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Securing footprints

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity to advance projects • Not getting report outs from other project sponsors • COVID slowing down progress on projects <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recalibrate project list for 2021-2022 biennium and forecast for 2023-2024 • Project symposium <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>2.2 Large restoration project ready for funding every biennium (including design and construction costs).</p>	<p>Responsible Party: WRIA 7 Proposed Completion Date: Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%* *This is on ongoing request</p> <p>100% completion looks like: Large capital projects are methodically being funded for every biennium, this includes every project phase</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having a large project ready every biennium – this is related to footprint and capacity (staff) <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete feasibility studies <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>2.3 Feasibility of 3-5 projects conducted every year to allow for flexibility in project selection and progression.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: WRIA 7 Proposed Completion Date: Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>100% completion looks like: 3-5 feasibility projects done every year – this includes King County and other salmon recovery partners (e.g. Wild Fish Conservancy)</p> <p>Risk to Completion: Staff and funding capacity</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pull projects partners data together • Project symposium <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>

<p>Fish 1 - Action 1: Measure 3: Enhance Basin Steward and KC Snoqualmie Staff Capacity - Agreement language Fish 1 – Action 1– “Increase King County funding to boost staff capacity (e.g. basin stewards and/or CIP staff) and capital funding for large restoration projects inside the APD.”</p>	
<p>3.1 Current Snoqualmie Basin Steward position maintained.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: DNRP/WLRD (Janne Kaje)</p>

	<p>Proposed Completion Date: Ongoing through December 2020</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <p>Actual Completion Date: Complete since summer of 2019, Hiring of Andrea Mojzak</p>
<p>3.2 Additional ½ FTE Snoqualmie Basin Steward included in 2019-20 budget.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: DNRP/WLRD (Joan Lee)</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: 2019</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>100% completion looks like: King County staff capacity is working to achieve the goal of 1 project inside and outside the APD each year. Working on salmon recovery projects in the lower Snoqualmie Valley</p> <p>Current Status: Additional Basin Steward works in Upper Snoqualmie Valley, Skykomish, and Bear Creek and seem to be the equivalent to 1/3 FTE.</p> <p>Risk to Completion: Insufficient resourcing</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <p>Actual Completion Date: summer 2019, Hiring of Denis DiSanto– upper valley and Skykomish</p>
<p>3.3 Details of King County ERES and RIVERS staff allocation to the Snoqualmie River watershed (e.g., hours, staff numbers, budget, schedule, etc.).</p>	<p>Responsible Party: DNRP/WLRD (Jon Hansen, Chase Barton)</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: 2018</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>Risk to Completion: Staff work across basins – making it difficult to track how much is allocated to the Snoqualmie</p> <p>Next Steps: Enumerate Chase Barton’s Team</p> <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>

Fish 1 - Action 1:

Measure 4: Report on Prioritized Project Progress

4.1 Quarterly progress reporting on prioritized project planning and implementation given to the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum.

Responsible Party: DNRP/WLRD (Fauna Nopp/Janne Kaje) and WRIA 7

Proposed Completion Date: Ongoing through December 2020

Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%

Risk to Completion:

Next Steps:

Actual Completion Date:

4.2 Quarterly updates and briefings of prioritized project progression given to the Fish, Farm, and Flood caucus groups.

Responsible Party: DNRP/WLRD (Fauna Nopp/Janne Kaje) and WRIA 7

Proposed Completion Date: ongoing through December 2020

Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%

Risk to Completion:

Next Steps:

Actual Completion Date:

These milestones were created by each caucus in 2019. In preparation for the September 2021 IOC meeting, responsible parties provided updates to the milestones, caucuses reviewed updated milestones and provided clarification of intent and proposed refinements.

Farm 2: Improve Drainage, Reduce Costs and Complexity of Drainage Projects, and Increase Certainty

Goal: Drainage is one important part of the managed ecosystem that sustains productive agricultural lands. By 2020 a comprehensive, permanent drainage program will be established that supports ongoing drainage maintenance on both historic agricultural lands and those currently in production. A well-rounded approach is necessary to achieve this process and includes: permanent and well-funded technical services, consistent financial support, additional mitigation alternatives, and a cogent regulatory strategy to include code interpretation or revision as required to achieve stated objectives.

We are committed to progress on a bundled timeline with Fish 1 goals. We acknowledge that natural systems are not static and for that reason promote as essential regular and measurable assessment. Pilot projects and other efforts to improve outcomes with scientifically supported data can be part of a collaborative approach to support both farmland restoration and salmon recovery.

Action 1. Create a routine pathway for ag drainage maintenance program to undertake comprehensive drainage assistance that extends beyond current ADAP to encompass all agricultural drainage infrastructure (i.e., ditches, tiles, floodgates) as well as other drainage challenges (i.e., beavers, alluvial fans) in modified and artificial waterways irrespective of pump size needed for the waterway. This program will establish routine management for all of these types of drainage infrastructures and the challenges of each type, while minimizing impacts on the resources.

Farm 2 - Action 1:

Measure 1: Restore funding for a fish biologist to participate in King County's Agricultural Drainage Assistance Program Team to improve water quality and habitat for fish on project sites while improving the efficiency of environmental permitting for the overall program.

Milestone 1.1 Fish biologist position responsibilities and staff assignments incorporated in the Comprehensive Drainage Assistance, Stormwater Services (SWS) annual work plan and included in annual budget.

Responsible Party: DNRP/WLRD (Richard Martin/Kate OLaughlin)

Proposed Completion Date: biologist in place start of 2019 field season

Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%

Risk to Completion: Risk is ongoing funding to support this position

Next Steps:

Actual Completion Date:

Farm 2 - Action 1:

Measure 2: A drainage comprehensive technical needs assessment to inform a "Drainage Recovery Plan" that involves the SVWID, KCD, and the Flood Control District.

Milestone 2.1 Overall drainage assessment, including basin delineation for top six basins.

Responsible Party: SVWID (Erin Ericson)

<p>Note: intent to coordinate DCPs with Flood Hazard Management Plan update (link to FCD).</p>	<p>Proposed Completion Date: December 2020 (remaining 5 project lists)</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>100% Completion looks like: Basin delimitation is completed highlighting the top 6 basins.</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No risk to completion <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Get draft Langlois plan out to agencies (King County) for comment Revise as necessary <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>Milestone 2.2 Detailed sub-basin drainage and restoration plans supported and for each of the top 6 sub-basins.</p> <p>Clarification: The plans will include, in addition to ditch maintenance and associated plantings; tiles, floodgates, pumps, alluvial fan and beaver management strategies. Comprehensive Drainage and Restoration Plans will be developed by the SVWID with collaboration from FFF signatories. A general HPA will need to be obtained from Region 4 WDFW*. This will integrate with the DNRP effort to expand agricultural drainage assistance into a comprehensive program designed to include all of the elements identified in the FFF 1.0 Report. *the intent of these plans are to find streamlined permitting pathways, including HPAs</p>	<p>Responsible Party: SVWID (Erin Ericson)(support from FFF signatories)</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: one sub-basin plan by December 2020</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>100% Completion looks like: The WID shares completed plans with FFF IOC and others for review and feedback- in particular, around conservation actions. Plans are supported and utilized.</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1 doesn't get done IOC doesn't support <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Langlois DCP is used as an example <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>Milestone 2.3 Funding plan for implementation of Adopted Plans including each of the top 6 sub-basins.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: SVWID (Erin Ericson) (KC financial and policy support)</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: December 2020</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>100% Completion looks like: A predictable and defined budget line item (FCD? KC?) that is dedicated to the implementation of DCPs</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not securing dedicated funding Not securing 2.2 <p>Next Steps:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete 2.1 and 2.2 • Funding feasibility study to explore options and partners for funding • Presentation for WRLD/DNRP management, council, FCD, maybe KCD – sharing out progress on creating viable agriculture in the SVAPD <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>Milestone 2.4 Sustained funding for development of remaining sub-basin plans.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: SVWID (Erin Ericson)(KC financial and policy support)</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: 2022/2023</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>100% Completion looks like: Funding for remaining sub-basin plans is secured</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding not identified • Time line for funding is too long <p>Next Steps:</p> <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>Milestone 2.5 Pathway articulated for landowners not in SVWID priority basins so they can pursue on their own if they choose to accelerate beyond SVWID’s schedule.</p> <p>Clarification: If we are successful developing and adopting specific plans for the top basins (some will be combined), Measure 3 and Farm 5 will be satisfied as well.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: SVWID/DNRP-WLRD (Erin Ericson, Eric Beach)</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: December 2020</p> <p>100% Completion looks like: Factsheets and flowcharts illustrating permit pathways for drainage projects.</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff availability and time • DLS – permitting review <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compile existing factsheets and flowchart. Route through review in this order - internal review; drainage partners, IOC <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>

Farm 2 - Action 1:

Measure 3: Opportunities to install and/or improve necessary drainage infrastructure including field tiles, flood gates, and pumps on modified waterways and activities not currently covered by ADAP.

Milestone 3.1 Quantify/identify waterways that qualify for this expansion.

Clarification:

This effort helped identified the pilot project locations

Farm 2, Action 1 Table

	ADAP [2012-present] (less than 4" pump)		ADAP 2.0 (>4" pumps)	
	Waterway channel type- modified	Waterway channel type- artificial	Modified channel type- larger waterways* (e.g. AMES, Tuck)	Waterway channel type- natural
Typical dredging and culverts	Current program	Current program		Not adding
Tiles new/old				Not adding
Beavers- D16 a,b,d (not c!)				Not adding
Alluvial fan				Not adding
Flood gates and pumps (assuming < than 10)				Not adding
Daylighting				Not adding

- Services included in current ADAP program
- Proposed new services within waterways currently served by ADAP.
- Proposed new services in larger, modified waterways.
- Natural classification waterways not included for proposed services.

Responsible Party: Regulatory Task Force (Eric Beach)/ Multiple parties responsible to work on this milestone
Proposed Completion Date: May 2019

Progress: 0% 25% 50% **75%** 100%

What does 100% Complete look like:

- Documentation of inventory has been shared a public facing document

Risk to Completion:

- Funding for drain tile quantification

Current Status:

- Confirm watercourses such as Griffin, Patterson, Cherry, Harris that qualify for modified waterways needing larger than 4" pump.
- At this time, Griffin Creek is slated for maintenance at this time and is slated to be a pilot project.
- KCD, SVWID, Ducks Unlimited continue to pursue drain tile projects (maintenance and replacement of existing). Age of infrastructure is concerning and currently only "found" through ADAP projects.
- Floodgates/Pumps – survey has been done by King County, one pump identified for pilot project – DD1 – led by WID. Contact Lou Beck

Next Steps:

- Tiles need to be quantified (have not yet been done as of 9/2021). Tiles will be inventoried as part of ADAP projects, and data will be shared with community drainage partners
- Identify a potential flapgate pilot project
- QA/QC of the inventory with partners
- Pull information into an accessible format for all – including inventory and summary or status of findings.

Actual Completion Date:

Milestone 3.2 Agreement on a clear permit pathway for streams and types of projects identified in milestone 3.1. This is either through a permit pathway that currently exists or identifies a new permit pathway.

Responsible Party: Regulatory Task Force (Eric Beach)
Proposed Completion Date: December 2019

Progress: 0% **25%** 50% 75% 100%

What does 100% Complete look like:

There is a confirmed permit pathway for each type of pilot project documented through a written response from DLS-

	<p>Permitting. This includes flapgates, culverts, pumps, large modified watercourses and tiles</p> <p>Current Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three Pilot projects (Griffin Creek, Cherry Creek and DD1 Pump) are underway at various stages of development that are seeking to identify permitting pathways. All 3 projects will be going through a habitat permit and it will help the projects teams document if this permit pathway is sufficient of or if there is a better way to do these types of projects. One is in pre-app, one is about to be submitted for pre-app and the other is in scoping phase. • All three expected to be funded through KC SWS dollars and grants. • Pilot projects are the way to figure out the permit pathway. This work is related to alluvial fan ordinance <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff Resourcing (DLS) • Unsatisfactory time horizon for solutions <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal clarity for WLRD IDP • Pre-application meetings for Griffin and DD1 pump pilot projects • SMEs made available for permit review (Cherry Creek specific) • Identify floodgate project <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>Milestone 3.3 Provide draft of inventory of pumps and floodgates including ownership and current condition to WID and stakeholders.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: DNRP/WLRD (Eric Beach, Lou Beck) Proposed Completion Date: June 2019 Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>What does 100% Complete look like: Current condition, ownership and maintenance schedule is included in the public facing inventory of pump and flapgates</p> <p>Current Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Floodgates/Pumps – survey has been done by King County, one pump identified for pilot project – DD1 – led by WID. Contact Lou Beck • Blue-green LiDAR completed early 2021 for the flow the whole Snoqualmie Valley <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff resourcing/time • Not identifying a permit pathway for flapgate projects

	<p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QA/QC inventory with partners • Pull information into an accessible format • More information around current condition – is the infrastructure operating as intended. What is the current condition 2021 and are the operating as intended? Do some kind of prioritization (how)? • Gather ownership information • Maintenance / replacement schedule is needed as well – cost and lifecycle. Start to develop cost analysis. • Model North APD flapgates – SWS/Lou Beck <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>Milestone 3.4 In a public facing format, show the steps and resources available (permitting, funding, etc.) for maintenance and replacement of pumps and floodgates.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: Regulatory Task Force (Eric Beach)</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: December 2019</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>What does 100% Complete look like: A public facing plan that lays out how this work is executed with resources and steps.</p> <p>Current Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waiting for pre-app for DD1 pump pilot project <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsatisfactory time horizon for solution <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete project(s) and write up learnings for public facing work <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>

<p>Farm 2 - Action 1: Measure 4: Address alluvial fan management in partnership with relevant agencies, KCD, and community-based organizations.</p>	
<p>Milestone 4.1 Stormwater Services report on alluvial fan management options submitted to DLS-PD.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: DNRP/WLRD (Brian Sleight)</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: December 2019</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <p>Actual Completion Date: Went to council summer of 2020</p>
<p>Milestone 4.2 Code language allowing for work on alluvial fans drafted by Department of Local Services - Permitting Division and transmitted to Council.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: Regulatory Task Force/DLS-PD (Eric Beach)</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: summer 2020 (transmitted to Council)</p>

<p>Clarification: Needs to be elevated to understand better what it takes to develop code language</p>	<p>Progress: 0%  25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>What does 100% Complete look like:</p> <p>Current Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledgement of the problem <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not fully understand what it takes to develop the code language Lack of staff capacity Lack of support to move code language forward <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> King County needs to develop action items to follow up on recommendations identified in the alluvial fan report Timeline and work items for code language development and getting it to approval – bring that to IOC <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>Milestone 4.3 In a public facing format, show the steps and resources available (permitting, funding, etc.) to address alluvial fan management.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: Regulatory Task Force (Eric Beach) Proposed Completion Date: December 2020 Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>What does 100% Complete look like: A plan has been put together that lays out funding, timeline and steps taken to complete and continue (as necessary) this work.</p> <p>Current Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alluvial fan mapping extending to full County outside of mainstem rivers floodplains <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unsatisfactory time horizon for solution <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put the plan together <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>

<p>Farm 2 - Action 1: Measure 5: Address beaver management in partnership with relevant federal agencies, KCD, and community-based organizations.</p>	
<p>Milestone 5.1 Code language allowing for landowner management of beaver dams prepared by Department of Local Services - Permitting Division and transmitted to Council.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: Regulatory Task Force/DLS-PD (Eric Beach) Proposed Completion Date: December 2019 (transmitted to Council) Progress: 0%  25%  50% 75% 100%</p>

	<p>What does 100% Complete look like:</p> <p>Current Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft permitting approach to beaver management – WLRD staff and DLS Permitting staff working together • King County working with community partners – coordinating beaver work <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff Resourcing • Difficult to acquire KC Permit <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pull work group together to make presentation to WLRD/DLS-PD management • Request update from Jen Vanderhoof about ideas for King County’s role in beaver management <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>Milestone 5.2 In a public facing format, show the steps and resources available to address beaver and dam management options.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: Regulatory Task Force (Eric Beach) Proposed Completion Date: summer 2020 Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100% What does 100% Complete look like: A plan has been put together that lays out funding, timeline and steps taken to complete and continue (as necessary) this work.</p> <p>Current Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need 5.1 completed to begin work on this <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff resources <p>Next Steps:</p> <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>

<p>Transmittal language Action 2. “The Regulatory Task Force will address any policy issues coming out of Action 1.” including:</p>	
<p>Farm 2 - Action 2: Measure 6: Evaluate the total cost of drainage and look for ways to reduce costs including regulatory-driven components.</p>	
<p>Milestone 6.1 King County staff are exploring what Comprehensive Drainage Assistance looks like and what is possible (see Table from FFF 1.0 Draft Agreement). Topic for Regulatory Task Force at spring 2019 meetings for discussion.</p> <p>Clarification: All pieces roll into 6.1 and 6.2</p>	<p>Responsible Party: DNRP/WLRD (Eric Beach) Proposed Completion Date: June 2019 Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100% What does 100% Complete look like: Ag drainage practices/actions are listed, current cost is estimated for drainage work, opportunities are identified for reducing costs, and regulatory hurdles are identified as well as opportunities to reduce those hurdles. The end result is</p>

	<p>reducing costs associated for performing drainage work, the time and permitting. This is about overall cost reduction not just cost to landowners.</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources (staff and money) • Landowner permissions for pilot projects • DLS-Permitting engagement <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This cost estimate measure has evolved into the Integrated Drainage Process (IDP) and coordinating with community partners. Looking at costs, getting cost estimates and identifying of cost reductions and cost share opportunities could come through this work. • Pilot project (Cherry Creek, DD1 Pump, Griffin Creek, learnings will help inform the project costs • Internal alignment in WLRD • Summary of drainage practices cost estimates <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>Milestone 6.2 In a public facing format, show the steps and resources available (permitting, funding, etc.) for agricultural drainage. Obtain policy sign off from DLS-PD and WDFW.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: Regulatory Task Force (Eric Beach) Proposed Completion Date: December 2020 Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100% What does 100% Complete look like:</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.1 isn't completed • Resources for documentation are limited/unavailable • Unacceptable timeline <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6.1 • Pilot projects • DLS-Permitting/WLRD collaboration team <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>Milestone 6.3 Establish effective communication informing landowners of agricultural drainage options.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: DNRP/WLRD (supported by SVWID, KCD, SVT, others) Proposed Completion Date: June 2020 Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100% What does 100% Complete look like: 6.1 is completed and learnings are shared out in a format the reaches landowners in a timely and efficient way. Key information will include expectations for obtaining permits, estimated costs and participating agencies.</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resourcing <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently doing it – need to continue to update communications as IDP (6.1) is developed and implemented Farm Practices Illustrated is part of the communication around options and costs for ag. drainage activities. Need to continue to develop chapters for this work. Streamline where the information is posted and how to find it. Special meetings with the KCD to pass the information along <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>Milestone 6.4 Caucuses will support implementation of Regulatory Task Force recommendations which may include: list the RTF items remaining from the transmittal letter promulgating ordinances to create specific resource-related pilot projects and funding BMP (planting, fish impacts, specific maintenance techniques, etc.) effectiveness monitoring by WLRD, KCD or the SV WID.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: Regulatory Task Force (Eric Beach) working with caucuses</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: ongoing through December 2020</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% (tbd) 100%</p> <p>What does 100% Complete look like:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of remaining RTF work items As hurdles to ag. Drainage are identified, pilot projects will be done to understand where the hurdle is and the options to address it. BMPs for ag. Drainage should be evaluated for effectiveness through monitoring. <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued resourcing to complete the recommendations <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of RTF items remaining from the transmittal letter Ag Caucus identifies items that need to be brought over into 6.4 from 6.1 – Ag. drainage practices that have regulatory hurdles <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>

<p>Farm 2 - Action 2: Measure 7: Explore utilizing the individual permit for turbidity standards that larger projects use. If there is a positive outcome, pursue a pilot project followed by widespread implementation.</p>	
<p>Milestone 7.1 Will be addressed in September 2019 Regulatory Task Force.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: Regulatory Task Force (Eric Beach)</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: December 2019</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p>

<p>Deliverable Note: A "permit" for turbidity is not the mechanism used to address water quality standards. The criteria for measuring turbidity, which is the concern identified in this measure, is addressed through BMPs. The ADAP BMPs describe the requirements for managing turbidity for drainage projects.</p>	<p>What does 100% Complete look like:</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <p>Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current BMPs are adequate - no further action is needed <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
---	---

<p>Farm 2 - Action 2: Measure 8: Research mitigation requirements for projects that need periodic maintenance. In the case of mitigation for re-dredging, find out whether farmers owe new net acres.</p>	
<p>Milestone 8.1 Develop issue paper following completed Regulatory Task Force discussions of "On-Site" mitigation completed in December 2018.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: Regulatory Task Force (Eric Beach) Proposed Completion Date: May 2019 Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100% What does 100% Complete look like: Q1: Interviews with agency staff completed, results documented in Regulatory Task Force issue paper. Q2: RTF completed issue paper June 2019; DLS-PD review and concurrence anticipated September 2019. Q3/4 (2020): Recommendation will be presented to IOC October 2019. Was presented to IOC in fall 2020 and received concurrence on letter submission to DLS permitting – agreed issue had been adequately addressed.</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <p>Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTF identified the requirements presented the requirement to DLS and achieved concurrence that recurrent dredging does not require additional mitigation. <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>Milestone 8.2 Options for mitigation work is specific to off-site mitigation questions.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: King County WLRD Proposed Completion Date: December 2020 Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100% What does 100% Complete look like: ability to use off-site mitigation as part of agriculture drainage projects</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding to explore the potential • No agreement from state/ co-managers <p>Next Steps:</p>

	Actual Completion Date:
--	--------------------------------

These milestones were created by each caucus in 2019. In preparation for the September 2021 IOC meeting, responsible parties provided updates to the milestones, caucuses reviewed updated milestones and provided clarification of intent and proposed refinements.

<p>Flood: By the end of 2020 complete feasibility study on priority flood-safe roads, secure funding for priority levee set-backs, improve communication with FCD and floodplain residents and increase rate of home elevations to at least 9 per year.</p> <p>Goal: Explore ways to improve efficiency and effectiveness to complete approximately 90 home elevations per year. Prioritize homes at greatest risk per first floor elevation, acknowledging that landowner readiness matters. Identify alternative to provide improved access during floods for the largest numbers of people while not impacting landowners/land uses. [paraphrased from Appendix II]</p>	
<p>Priority 1: Flood 3</p> <p>Measure 1. Improve Road Safety in Flood-Prone Areas</p>	
<p>1.1 Complete assessment of flood-prone roads, critical evacuation routes and adequacy of gages.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: DLS/RD (with agency partners) Proposed Completion Date: 2019</p> <p>Progress: 0% 10% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>100% Completion looks like:</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nurturing partnerships that have direct influence on work <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>1.2 Roads prioritized in transportation needs report and identify budget for at least 1</p>	<p>Responsible Party: FCD (CIP) Proposed Completion Date: 2020</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>100% Completion looks like:</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget is not defined <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advocate for a permanent seat on the IOC (rather than guest) with the FCD and DLS <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
<p>1.3 Feasibility of priority projects (includes fish passage and drainage concerns and addresses culvert case, climate change, non-stationarity, BAS)</p> <p>Clarification: Rephrasing the above to “improve resiliency thereby reducing risk by integrating multi-objective road safety projects”</p>	<p>Responsible Party: DES Proposed Completion Date: 2021</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>100% Completion looks like:</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p>

	Next Steps: Actual Completion Date:
--	--

Priority 2: Flood 2/5 Measure 2: Prioritize created flood storage capacity for decreased flood hazard	
2.1 Levee setbacks, Twin Rivers Golf Course	Responsible Party: Proposed Completion Date: Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100% 100% Completion looks like: Current Status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Twin Rivers backed out of purchase agreement. • Going well when Barfuse levee restoration moves forward in 2022. • New Floodplain Management Planner hired by River and Floodplain Management Section Risk to Completion: Next Steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement a watershed scale analysis study for watershed storage potential. • Alleviate pressure on the APD for high frequency, low severity floods that impact agriculture and roads. Actual Completion Date:
2.2 Kickoff FHMP (2020 update), which includes scoping for corridor plans that ID storage potential	Responsible Party: Proposed Completion Date: 2019 Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100% 100% Completion looks like: Current Status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM for the Flood Hazard Plan update has been hired Risk to Completion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacking communication with FCD and WLRD on scoping and implementation of the plan update Next Steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FFF Caucus priorities to be represented in the FHMP Actual Completion Date:
2.3 ID funding sources to implement scope	Responsible Party: Proposed Completion Date: 2020 Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100% 100% Completion looks like: Risk to Completion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Securing funding

	<p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocate with partners to prepare multi-objective project grant submissions for BRIC, Floodplains by Design, DOC, etc. funding sources for 2022 and 2023. <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
--	---

Priority 3: Flood 1
Measure 3. Complete 90 home elevations per decade

<p>3.1 Budgeted and executed.</p>	<p>Responsible Party:</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: Ongoing through December 2020</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>100% Completion looks like:</p> <p>Current Status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for 20 in a decade is allocated in FCD <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need RFMS to present the home elevation program to the IOC AND provide the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of living structures in the floodplain in the APD. • How many have been acquired? Elevated? • How many remain? • Gather input from IOC post-presentation to determine if there is a NEED and INTEREST for speeding the home elevations up. • FCD report likely highlighted financial barriers that could be communicated and additional needs could come from that updated information. <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
--	---

<p>3.2 Receive 2019 post-construction season update.</p>	<p>Responsible Party:</p> <p>Proposed Completion Date: 2019</p> <p>Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>100% Completion looks like:</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who should be the point person? • What is the cycle? • What do we need to do to move this communication into a more systematic, reliable process annually? <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
---	---

<p>3.3 Receive pre- and post-construction season updates</p>	<p>Responsible Party: Proposed Completion Date 2020 Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100% 100% Completion looks like:</p> <p>Current Status: Q1: Q2: Risk to Completion:</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • who should be the point person? • What is the cycle? • What do we need to do to move this communication into a more systematic, reliable process annually? <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>
---	--

<p>Priority 4: Flood Measure 4. Frame up Resilience Strategy for next biennium and beyond</p>	
<p>4.1 Create subcommittee to create outline and potential budget request for 2021-22 biennium (2020 budget process).</p>	<p>Responsible Party: Proposed Completion Date: 2019 Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100% 100% Completion looks like:</p> <p>Q1: Q2: Risk to Completion:</p> <p>Next Steps: Wait for Ag. Strategic Plan to be completed and then correlate scope and collaboration scheme.</p> <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>

<p>Priority 5: Flood 4 Measure 5. Farmworker housing</p>	
<p>5.1 Ensure that this element is in the Agricultural Land Strategic Plan and create path for real progress.</p>	<p>Responsible Party: Strategic Plan TF (Patrice Barrentine) Proposed Completion Date: ongoing through December 2020 Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</p> <p>100% Completion looks like: Per report from Eric Beach; there is adequate farmworker housing in and surrounding the APD.</p> <p>Risk to Completion:</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <p>Actual Completion Date:</p>

5.2 Schedule regular updates for the IOC on all milestones to ensure accountability and progress or understanding for road blocks.

Responsible Party: Strategic Plan TF (Patrice Barrentine)
Proposed Completion Date: ongoing through December 2020
Progress: 0% 25% 50% 75% **100%**

Risk to Completion:

Next Steps:

Actual Completion Date:

SNOQUALMIE VALLEY FISH FARM FLOOD ADVISORY COMMITTEE

June 12, 2017

The Honorable Dow Constantine
King County Executive
401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 800
Seattle, WA 98104

The Honorable Joe McDermott, Chair
King County Council
516 Third Avenue, Room 1200
Seattle, WA 98104

Dear Executive Constantine and Councilmember McDermott:

This letter contains the recommendations of the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood (FFF) Advisory Committee (Committee), which was convened in November 2013 as a response to Comprehensive Plan policy R-650 and which constitutes the watershed planning process contemplated in R-650a adopted by the King County Council in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update (added as Appendix I to this letter). The recommendations contained in this letter and the attached appendices are intended to assist the Executive and Council to advance and balance three important county goals at a watershed scale: restoring habitat to aid salmon recovery, supporting farmers and preserving farmland, and reducing flood risk for farmers and other Snoqualmie Valley residents.

This letter and the attached matrix of recommendations represent the culmination of three years of dedicated and committed work by the Committee, and establish the foundation for additional work by a future stakeholder group. We look forward to the Executive and Council's response to these recommendations, and many of the organizations that have participated in phase one of the FFF process look forward to continuing to work together on these issues.

The Committee was comprised of thirteen individuals of diverse backgrounds and perspectives, including local farmers as well as representatives of the Tulalip and Snoqualmie tribes, the King Conservation District, the Wild Fish Conservancy, the City of Duvall, the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum, the Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum, Futurewise, and the Washington Department of Ecology. Two of the four farmers on the committee also represented the King County Agriculture Commission and the Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance. The Committee held 26 meetings over the course of three years, as well as numerous smaller work sessions and caucus group meetings along the way, breaking during the months of peak farm activity.

The Committee's work concluded in May 2016 with the package of recommendations attached to this letter. The geographic scope of the committee's work was the Snoqualmie River

watershed, focusing primarily on the 30-mile lower valley from the base of Snoqualmie Falls to the county line located north of the city of Duvall. More specifically, the committee's discussions focused on the roughly 14,500 acres of the Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District (APD), which is designated as Agricultural Land of Long-term Commercial Significance under the Washington State Growth Management Act.

The Committee's recommendations comprise:

1. Specific action recommendations with an emphasis on the next three years [Appendix II, III and IV];
2. Creation of three task forces and an associated body of recommended near-term work [Task Force scopes of work provided in Appendix V];
 - a. Riparian Buffers Task Force
 - b. Regulatory Task Force
 - c. Agricultural Strategic Plan Task Force
3. A memorandum of mutual understanding (Appendix VI); and
4. Letters from Participating Entities (Appendix VII).

The Committee's 34 recommended actions outlined in Appendix II and III represent: 1) flood risk reduction for valley landowners, 2) accelerating habitat restoration progress in key areas, 3) accelerating comprehensive agricultural drainage progress, 4) preserving the agricultural land base, and 5) integrated multi-objective solutions. These recommendations comprise a diverse list that addresses high-priority actions for salmon recovery, supporting farming and preserving farmland, and flood risk reduction.

The Committee recommendations demonstrate the fact that each interest group agrees to support each other's highest priorities. Therefore, making progress on the full spectrum of recommendations in a balanced way is absolutely critical for the success of the agreement. Recognizing this, this letter also addresses two key areas of agreement among participants in the Committee: one, that the stakeholder group for the second phase of the FFF effort must have balanced representation from Fish and Farm and Flood interests and two, that the Committee's recommendations be implemented in a balanced way, so that investments that support salmon recovery and farmers and farmland preservation occur concurrently.

Fish, Farm, Flood Phase II Committee: We are recommending that the County establish a reconstituted FFF Committee to oversee implementation of the recommendations included in this letter, and to provide support and accountability for the implementation phase of these recommendations.

The Fish, Farm, and Flood process was created because of a perceived imbalance between regional investments in salmon recovery and support for farmers and farmland preservation. Decisions around how flood control projects are undertaken can have impacts on both salmon recovery efforts and farmers, and so they were included as an important consideration in this

effort. Through working together for the past three years, the Committee has built trust between individuals and entities, despite differences in interests and perspectives.

A key element in organizing the work of Committee members was an alignment of members into one of the three primary interest areas (“caucuses”), which helped organize the thinking of each of these different perspectives in the process. Consequently, a Farm Caucus, Fish Caucus and Flood Caucus were formed. Each of the caucuses had the following membership of Committee members.

Farm Caucus

- King County Agriculture Commission
- Farm Landowner Representatives
- King Conservation District
- Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance
- SnoValley Tilth (not an official Committee member, but active in supporting the process)

Fish Caucus

- Snoqualmie Watershed Forum
- Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum
- Wild Fish Conservancy
- Tulalip Tribes
- Snoqualmie Tribe
- Futurewise

Flood Caucus

- City of Duvall
- Department of Ecology (also participated in fish caucus)
- King County Flood Control District

Because of the significant benefits associated with the caucus structure, we recommend that this process be formalized in the Fish, Farm and Flood Phase II Committee; and, to build on the investment made by FFF Phase I participants, we encourage the Executive and Council to appoint a significant number of Phase I participants to the Phase II committee. Additionally, while there would be three caucuses, the composition of the Phase II Committee should have equal representatives supporting salmon recovery and farm interests. We would recommend that the Flood Caucus have members representing organizations focused primarily on public safety, infrastructure development and protection, and without a policy position on salmon recovery or farming.

We recommend that the Executive and County have a Committee with no more than fifteen members, and that they select individual representatives from the following organizations for

each of the caucuses. The Committee recommends that the Executive and Council seek appointees who are collaborative and have substantive knowledge of the subject matter before the committee, and who will work in good faith with the committee.

Farm Caucus

- Individual Farmers
- Farm Bureau
- King Conservation District
- SnoValley Tilth
- King County Agriculture Commission
- PCC Farmland Trust
- Snoqualmie Valley Watershed Improvement District
- Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance
- Citizens' Alliance for Property Rights

Fish Caucus

- Snoqualmie Watershed Forum
- Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum
- Wild Fish Conservancy
- Tulalip Tribes
- Snoqualmie Tribe
- Futurewise
- Sound Salmon Solutions
- Puget Sound Keepers Alliance
- Stewardship Partners
- WA Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Department of Ecology
- US Army Corps of Engineers
- Mountains to Sound Greenway

Flood Caucus

- Snoqualmie Valley Cities
- Snoqualmie Valley Governments Association
- King County Flood Control District
- King County Sheriff
- King County Roads
- Housing Interests
- WSDOT

As an alternative to membership on the Advisory Committee, the organizations identified above could also be selected to serve on the task forces and pilot projects identified in the appendices to

this letter. Steering committees for task forces and pilot projects should also be balanced with representatives from the fish and farm caucuses, unless agreed to by the FFF Phase II Committee.

Bundling of Recommendations: At its final meeting in spring 2016, the Committee worked on drafting an initial timeline for some of the recommendations to illustrate how actions might be sequenced during the first three years -- the draft timeline is captured in tabular form as part of Appendix IV. Related to this timeline, a guiding principle of the Committee's recommendations is the need to achieve tangible gains for all three F's (fish, farm, flood) over time.

Work will be required by all interests to ensure balance and, ideally, concurrent progress will occur naturally, given the trust and mutual awareness that is in place. The timeline identified in Appendix IV is the best example we have of how to track concurrency and progress toward agreed upon commitments. And, we recommend that in order to achieve certainty of effective bundling (ensuring that future concurrent progress in the three areas is in fact occurring), the FFF Phase II Committee refer to the timeline to evaluate progress on the recommendations. We further recommend that the Phase II Advisory Committee develop a more complete calendar of critical milestones.

The concept of "bundling" was developed, received intense discussion, and has been agreed to by the FFF committee as necessary to maintain trust and fairness. A critical element of the Committee's final agreement was the specific "bundling" of two top-priority recommendations: 1) the acceleration of large capital habitat restoration projects in the key reaches of the Snoqualmie River within the APD (See Appendix II recommendation referred to by the Committee as Fish 1), and 2) developing a comprehensive drainage maintenance program that addresses the practical, financial and regulatory hurdles associated with various types of drainage issues and infrastructure (See Appendix II recommendation also known as Farm 2). The agriculture caucus stated clearly that its support for future large-scale restoration projects in the APD, such as levee setbacks, was contingent on achieving durable changes in the way that drainage systems are maintained on agricultural lands. In practical terms, given the 3-4 year timeline before ground is likely to be broken on the next large capital project in the APD, achievement of specific milestones on drainage improvements must precede the commencement of project construction.

The evaluation of progress on top tier bundled priorities will be the responsibility of the corresponding fish, farm or flood caucus. Each caucus should first discuss any concerns with the entire committee, but if that is not satisfactory, the caucus as a last resort may employ the mechanism of writing a letter to the King County DNRP Director, copying the Executive and Council, describing the situation and requesting a rebalancing of effort. The Director will be responsible for working with the committee to achieve rebalanced progress.

We are confident that the participants in the next phase of the Fish, Farm and Flood process will continue to build mutual trust and, hopefully, will never have to resort to the rebalancing

mechanism described above. However, we believe that it is in the interests of all parties engaged in this process that there is some recourse if the process were to falter.

It should also be noted that most of the items in Appendix II are unfunded, and that while bundling is focused on the top tier commitments, the Committee's intent was that there be a mutual commitment to pursue funding and resources to accomplish as many of the priorities in Appendix II as possible in the next 3 years. We feel strongly that King County and all of the signatories to this letter should be committed to finding the necessary resources to that end.

As participants in the Fish, Farm and Flood Advisory Committee, we, as individuals or through our respective organizations, pledge to support the recommendations attached to this letter. Specifically, we will support the recommended actions identified in Appendices II and III, the task force efforts, and the importance of bundling so that all F's achieve progress together. Moreover, we will stand up for and advocate for all of the actions identified in the recommendations and will rely upon the undersigned to advocate for all actions as well. Finally, through our work with implementing partner organizations, we will support the recommended actions that are reflected in this letter.

Bobbi Lindemulder
Farmer



Cindy Spiry
Snoqualmie Tribe



Daryl Williams
Tulalip Tribes



David Radabaugh
Dept. of Ecology, Floodplain Mgmt.



Heather Trim
Futurewise



Jarvis Keller
Farmer



Jason Walker
Snoqualmie Watershed Forum/City of Duvall



Josh Monaghan
King Conservation District



The Honorable Dow Constantine
The Honorable Joe McDermott
June 12, 2017
Page 7

Lara Thomas
City of Duvall



Lawrence Carlson
Farmer/Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance



Micah Wait
Wild Fish Conservancy



Scott Powell
Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum



Siri Erickson-Brown
Agriculture Commission



Enclosures

cc: King County Councilmembers
ATTN: Carolyn Busch, Chief of Staff
Melani Pedroza, Acting Clerk of the Council
Carrie S. Cihak, Chief of Policy Development, King County Executive Office
Dwight Dively, Director, Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget
Christie True, Director, Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)
Josh Baldi, Division Director, Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD), DNRP
John Taylor, Assistant Division Director, WLRD, DNRP
Joan Lee, Manager, Rural and Regional Services Section (RRSS), WLRD, DNRP
Janne Kaje, Regional Partnerships Unit Supervisor, RRSS, WLRD, DNRP

Includes input by the FFF Co-chairs, IOC, DNRP Communications Manager

DRAFT FFF 2.0 Communication Messages 4/3/2019

Why...

Among the top priorities for King County are protecting and enhancing farmland; restoring threatened salmon and associated habitat; and reducing flood risks to residents and infrastructure. However, balancing all of these critical priorities can be challenging in a shared landscape.

The 2012, King County Comprehensive Plan directed the Department of Natural Resources and Parks to create a collaborative, grass-roots effort to determine how to move forward toward achieving the goals of these sometimes competing priorities.

Who...

In 2013, King County Executive Dow Constantine assembled representatives from the Snoqualmie Valley to examine the issues that were creating obstacles and conflict, and to advise King County on how to overcome them.

These representatives formed the Fish, Farm, and Flood (FFF) Advisory Committee, which provided a variety of perspectives on agriculture, salmon recovery and flood risk reduction interests, and also included participation by tribal, state and local jurisdictions. In 2017, the FFF Advisory Committee forged the first major agreement in King County to strike a balance between farming interests, salmon recovery, and flood risk reduction. The Advisory Committee unanimously agreed on 34 recommendations that, once implemented, would significantly improve ecological function and habitat quality, while at the same time strengthening the agricultural economy and reducing flood risk.

Where...

The Snoqualmie Watershed covers primarily the lower 30 miles of the valley from Snoqualmie Falls north to the Snohomish County line. This area includes the 14,600-acre Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District and some of the most important habitat for Chinook salmon, which was listed as threatened under the endangered species act in 1999.

How...

Implementation of the suite of Fish, Farm, Flood recommended actions is guided by the FFF Implementation Oversight Committee (IOC). The immediate priorities of the IOC include:

- Development and implementation of a plan for comprehensive drainage maintenance.
- Creation of three task forces to carry out detailed work plans over the next three years.
 1. Regulatory Task Force
 2. Riparian Buffers Task Force
 3. Agricultural Land Resource Strategic Plan Task Force
- Increase the pace for salmon recovery efforts in the Snoqualmie Valley by accelerating the rate of completion of large-scale habitat restoration projects

King County is not working alone in its efforts to collectively protect fish, wildlife and farmland; farmers, tribal nations, non-profits, resource advocates, and the County work collaboratively to reach this common goal. The result has been slow but steady movement forward with actions to implement the recommendations of the Advisory Committee. The keys to success are to respect and honor the differences of all participants and recognize that achieving the individual goals of fish, farm and flood interests will create a collective good for the environment, people, and fish.

Includes input by the FFF Co-chairs, IOC, DNRP Communications Manager

Additional FFF 1.0 Advisory Committee and Implementation Oversight Committee (IOC) developed, and specific caucus group generated messages

Joint messages

1. The overarching goal is to prevent competing interests from achieving shared goals.
2. Reaching agreement required a lot of work, compromise and candor to not necessarily put aside differences but instead to learn about each other's perspectives, demonstrate mutual respect.
3. By supporting each other's priority actions, it created a stronger community.
4. The outcome of the first four years are 34 recommendations that will help restore salmon habitat, strengthen the agricultural economy, and reduce flood risks.
5. Recommendations are being implemented now by WLRD and through the IOC.
6. The Committee recognizes the importance of a viable agricultural community, ecosystem and salmon recovery, and flood safety. Planning and management in the Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District should promote without priority agricultural viability, ecological restoration, and flood risk reduction.
7. Both advocates for salmon recovery projects (large capital and buffers), and advocates for Snoqualmie Valley agricultural need the support and collaboration of each other for these efforts to succeed over the long-term.
8. Land conversion and development in upland areas has impacted agriculture as well as salmon habitat on the valley floor.
9. Losses and gains of habitat, farmland and flood risks need to be tracked and reported.

Fish Caucus

10. Salmon are an irreplaceable natural resources of high value to the community, and have profound cultural significance to the Snoqualmie and Tulalip Tribes.
11. There is no substitute for prime salmon spawning/rearing areas, especially the alluvial areas on the mainstem Snoqualmie below the Raging and Tolt River confluences.
12. To meet the King County's legal obligation to protect and restore salmon habitat and protect residents and infrastructure from flood risk, at times it will be necessary to undertake projects or programs that result in the loss of farmland.

Farm Caucus

13. The prime agricultural soils encompassed by the Snoqualmie Valley APD are an irreplaceable natural resource that is important to the local community and is the primary food crop producing region in King County.
14. The productivity of agricultural lands can and should be increased through management and regulatory actions.
15. It is very difficult to mitigate the loss of high-quality farmland in the APD.

Flood Caucus

16. The APD is largely within the floodplain and floodway, an area of extensive flooding and in some locations, deep and fast erosive flows. Farmers and local residents need county support in taking action to reduce flood risks to their homes and agricultural operations in a manner that doesn't transfer the risk to other property owners.
17. The King County Flood Control District has the authority to protect people and property from flood risks and funds capital projects in the Snoqualmie Valley.