

# KING COUNTY AGRICULTURE COMMISSION

## MEETING NOTICE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2015

4:00 – 7:00 P.M. AT THE ISSAQUAH FISH HATCHERY

125 WEST SUNSET WAY, ISSAQUAH

### PROPOSED MEETING AGENDA

(AGENDA ITEM TIMES ARE TENTATIVE)

4:00	<b>Call to Order</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions</li> <li>• Approval of Agenda</li> <li>• Approval of Minutes (September, October) p.5-17 p.18-27</li> </ul>	Nancy Hutto, Chair
4:15	<b>Public Comment</b>	Nancy Hutto, Chair
4:20	<b>Commissioner Appointments and Confirmation Process</b> p.28-46	Patrice Barrentine
4:25	<b>Introduction of Richard Martin, Agriculture and Forestry Incentives Program Manager, King County WLRD</b>	John Taylor, Assistant Director, WLRD
4:30	<b>Watershed Improvement District</b> p.47-48 Actions: Q&A	Cynthia Krass, SVPA
4:50	<b>Farm Fish Flood</b> p.49-58 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule</li> <li>• Update from Ag Alliance on stakeholder outreach</li> </ul> Actions: Q&A, Recommendations	John Taylor Cynthia Krass, SVPA
5:25	<b>Break</b>	
5:40	<b>Local Food Initiative</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achievements</li> <li>• Next Steps</li> </ul>	Mike Lufkin, Food Economy Program Manager
6:00	<b>Access to Farmland</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identified Need: Access to Land (Kitchen Cabinet, King Co Food and Farm Roundtable)</li> <li>• Current Properties</li> </ul> Actions: Q&A, Recommendations	Kathy Creahan, Regulatory Special Projects
6:35	<b>Tall Chief Petition and Letter from Farmers</b> p.59-62 Actions: Q&A	Nancy Hutto
6:50	<b>Updates</b> (approx. 5 min each) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• King Conservation District</li> <li>• Regulatory Committee p.63-66</li> <li>• KC Comprehensive Plan Public Review Draft</li> </ul>	KCD Staff Commissioners John, Kathy
7:00	<b>Adjourn</b>	Nancy Hutto

### Next Meeting: Thursday, Dec 10th

Regulatory Committee Meeting: Wednesday November 18th, 2015; hold 1-5pm

# 2015 Meeting Topics Calendar

Complete	Topic	Who	When	Outcomes	
				Letter advising County Executive	Notes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Washington State University's North Puget Sound Campus	Ann Goos	Jan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Commission advises support of WSU in the State legislative budget
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ag Commission Strategic Planning Part 1		Jan		Topics determined for year
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Integrating New Agriculture Commissioners		Jan		19 applications
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hafner Project Advisory Vote		Jan		Support Hafner Project for agriculture benefits
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Farmland Preservation Program Highlights		Jan		Informative
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Farm Fish Flood (FFF) Integrated Caucus Plans	Janne Kaje	Feb		Informative
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	System Wide Improvement Framework (SWIF) for the Lower Green	John Taylor Jennifer Knauer Lorin Reinelt	Feb	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	And letter to Flood District Commissioners support of agriculture in SWIF land use protections and priorities; 2) submitted Agricultural Goals Statement; and 3) SWIF Policy Statement additions
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture Land Use Recommendations for FFF	Kathy Creahan	Mar		Recommendation to FFF
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ag Commission Strategic Planning Part 2		Mar		Committees determined
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Review Integration of Agricultural Improvements into Farm Fish Flood	Kathy Creahan	Apr		Reviewed, contributed to and analyzed information
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Review Integration of Agricultural Improvements into Farm Fish Flood	Kathy Creahan	May		Did not take action through a letter

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	KCD's New Grant Program	Josh Monaghan	May		Informative
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	New Commissioner Reception		Sept		Informative
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comp Plan Overview	Ivan Miller	Sept		Informative
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	King County Comprehensive Plan - Ag	Kathy Creahan	Sept		Reviewed, contributed to and analyzed information
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Requested Letter Supporting Tall Chief Sale To Exec/ Council		Sept		Did not take action through a letter
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Farm Fish Flood Updates		Sept		Informative
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Code Change Proposal; Regulatory Committee; Compilation of Regulatory and Permitting Issues Affecting Agriculture	Randy Sandin Kathy Creahan	Oct		Reviewed, contributed to and analyzed information
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Pilot projects related to ADAP and tiles	Brian Sleight	Oct		Informative
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Farm Fish Flood Updates		Oct		Informative
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	King County Farming Regulations: Study and Report	Kate, Lauren, Meredith	Oct		Informative
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Food Economy Initiative Implementation	Mike Lufkin	Nov		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Land Lease and Accessible Farmland	Kathy Creahan	Nov		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Farm Fish Flood <b>Major Agenda Item</b>		Nov		
	Farmland Preservation Program (FPP) Acquisition Update	Ted Sullivan	Nov – moved to Dec		
	Farm Fish Flood Letter for Consideration/Policy		Dec		
	What's Going on with Ag in Other Counties?	Snohomish Skagit, Etc.	Dec		
	Commission Policies and Procedures: Review and Modify		Dec-Mar		
	Appoint a commissioner as the Alternate for KCD Advisory Board		Sept – delayed until January		
	Committee Formation and Meeting Schedule		Oct– delayed until January		

	<b>Tour</b> – Purpose of Commission, FPP, ADAP, Buffers, Salmon-Recovery, Drip Irrigation, Drought, WID, Reclaimed Water, Keller Ditch, Tall Chief, Ag Regulatory Changes		Oct-delayed until March		
	Joint Meeting with Rural Forestry Commission		Q1 2016		

# King County Agriculture Commission DRAFT Minutes from Thursday, September 17, 2015 Watershed Science Center, Issaquah

---

Commissioners	P	A	Commissioners	P	A
Nancy Hutto, Chair	X		Bob Tidball	X	
George Irwin	X		Bob Vos	X	
Eldon Murray	X		Siri Erickson-Brown	X	
Larry Pickering	X				

*P=Present; A=Absent*

Staff Present	
Christie True, DNRP, Director	Patrice Barrentine
John Taylor	Alan Painter
Joan Lee	Rick Reinlasoder
Ted Sullivan	Kathy Creahan
Mike Lufkin	Steve Evans
Ivan Miller, Executive's Office	Brad Clark, DPER, Sub Area Planner
Guests Present	
Anne Becker	Meredith Molli
Leann Krainick	Pat Mc Glothlin
Bruce Elliott	Ewing Stringfellow
Leigh Newman-Bell	Dave Casey
Shelby Jors	Erick Haakenson
Amy Holmes	Kathy Lambert, County Councilmember, District 3
Darron Marzolf	Jeff McMorris, Councilmember Lambert's Office
Josh Monaghan	

## Meeting Action Summary

- **May Meeting Minutes were approved**
- **Comprehensive Plan Presentation and Discussion: Zoning Studies with feedback from commissioners, DNRP current recommended changes**
- **Tall Chief Request for Letter of Support: failed 3-2 (quorum questioned); Will return next month for vote.**
- **KCD Advisory Board alternate member: tabled for next meeting**
- **Next Meeting October 8<sup>th</sup>**

## Meeting Highlights with Action Items in Text Boxes

---

**Called to Order 4:15 pm**

### Approval of Minutes

George Irwin made a motion to approve the minutes. Bob Vos seconded.

*May meeting minutes approved unanimously*

### Public Comment

Dave Casey, Changing Seasons Farm – Respectfully request delaying sale of Tall Chief. *Please see end of minutes for copy of Mr. Casey's written comment.*

George Irwin: Are you representing yourself or an organization?

Dave Casey: Myself and many others, but individuals. SVPA and SVT will not speak against this.

### King County Comprehensive Plan – Ivan Miller and Kathy Creahan

*Ivan Miller is the Comprehensive Planning Manager, King County Executive's Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget. Kathy Creahan is the Agriculture and Forestry Incentives Program Manager, Water and Land Resources Division of the Department of Natural Resources and Parks.*

***Please see meeting packet for corresponding presentation and materials presented.***

**a) Overview** – Ivan Miller:

John Taylor is managing all of DNRP's edits and changes. Brad Clark is here as well and he is overseeing DPER's changes.

The Comp Plan covers a wide variety of topics such as the urban growth boundaries, and channels the vast majority of growth into urban areas in order to protect the natural resource lands as much as possible.

Refers to map in packet to show designation of boundaries.

George Irwin: What is the difference between should and shall?

Ivan refers to the glossary at the end of the comp plan and shares that there is a language hierarchy of action:

1. Shall (must do it)
2. Should (try to do it, funding dependent)
3. Encourage
4. Consider

[35:41]

Where we currently are in the process is working through the language changes with departments.

**Key dates:**

- **Nov 4- Jan 4:** Public draft is available for public comment. Public meetings are being scheduled within the same period.
- **March:** County Executive transmits plan to County Council.

**b and c) History of the Policies and APDs and Current Recommended Changes - Kathy Creahan [46]**

Chapter 3 is primarily about land use policy; we're adding in information on the Local Food Initiative and the two main goals of the initiative and adding a placeholder for Farm, Fish, Flood policies. [Walks commissioners through the chapter and proposed changes].

Siri: You can search the entire Comp Plan for keywords, like "farm" and see what all of the departments are recommending regarding farms.

George Irwin: p. 26 top RXX– Is this protecting all easements on a property?

Kathy: This is new and is about protecting FPP easements and is calling for a long term strategy to protect FPP lands.

George: It doesn't say that.

Kathy: We'll make a note of that and clarify it.

p. 28: R649 and R650: Balance or conflict of ag land and habitat restoration projects is being worked on in the Farm Fish Flood Task Force. Then, policies will be recommended by FFF.

Bob Tidball: The shoreline management act covers and protects the floodplain farms, not just the GMA.

Bob Vos: p. 27: R647 – New development shall not interfere with existing ag operations. What about land adjacent to an APD?

Kathy: That would be within the APD. It does not say to protect those lands although it is sometimes considered. But these do address that: All resource lands...**R606**, p.20, refers to agriculture, forestry and mineral sites – and by the designation of appropriate, compatible uses on adjacent lands... **R607, too.**

[56:21]

Nancy: You asked about this regarding Ewing Stringfellow's challenge with City of North Bend?

Bob Vos: Snohomish County has a law called the "Right to Plow Law" that protects farmland, but King Co. does not.

Bob Tidball: Shoreline Management Act is a resource that may protect farms in the floodplain.

p.31, R658 expands the concept of working with non-profits as well as other jurisdictions to expand markets for local farm product sales and **we shall** do that.

R659 talks about farmer training and how we will support that.

p.33, RXX County would expand leasing of county owned lands based on a Local Food Initiative recommendations.

R662 Who we will work with on issues such as processing.

I really wanted you to see that we have a fairly significant body of policies supporting agriculture already.

Shelby Jors: Prime farmland that isn't currently in production. Is that delineated anywhere?

Kathy: We have identified farmland from an aerial photograph point of view and have identified lands that are farmable.

Darron Marzolf: regarding R663, "King County supports the processing of farm products, crops and livestock". Where can we find the type of support given? What is the county doing, is there a program?

George: This whole thing is a joke. It says "supports" and is more of a political statement than a service. These are guidelines except when things say "shall".

Ivan Miller: I would characterize it a little differently. The Comp Plan is a *statement of intent*; outlining the direction the county wants to move. I agree that there are parts that are non-binding, but it shows intent.

Kathy: An example, we have applied for a grant from the KCD to bring a mobile meat processor to King County. That would be a direct example of how we do that. Another is that we have a forum for farmers market managers that we hold 4 times/year. Our Agriculture Program staff, 4 people, are tasked with these activities and we do this work because we have this policy direction.

[1:10]

Kathy: New policy: Reclaimed water, working hard to getting reclaimed water in the Snohomish Valley; and the Council will be voting soon on the WID.

Bob Vos: This is really important and says "shall". Recommend it saying shall support the WID.

Leann Krainick: R669 suggests adding WSDA and USDA to county's partners, particularly the conservation programs.

Kathy: p. 37, LFI improving access to food for low income people, reducing food waste.

Patrice: Bottom of page 37 has a general statement about food production emitting the most greenhouse gases second only to cars and I believe that does not reflect the kind of production we have in King County.

Kathy: OK we'll look at that.

George: Agrees.

Bob Vos: The important thing is not the number of miles food travels, it's the number of miles that goes into the total number of production and sales.

John Taylor: As the DNRP coordinator for the Comp Plan, I am striking all of that language. It doesn't add anything, so rest easy, it will be deleted.

#### **d) Zoning Studies – Ivan Miller**

- Zantes – request to rezone from APD to City of Woodinville
  - Commission does not support this request
    - While the letter says it is not commercially farmed, it is currently farmed by several farmers
    - This property has an active farm stand where produce is sold to the public
    - Is it in Current Use Tax Incentive Program? Yes, Ted Sullivan checked and it is meeting commercial farming requirements for this incentive.
    - Commission states that this property is viable for agriculture and states the letter has several inaccuracies.
    - Numerous farms in King County are viable at this size by direct marketing
    - Recommend contacting 21 Acres for their comprehensive plan

Siri: Is this the kind of information that is needed? What is the likelihood that this request would be considered?

Ivan: The County's policies are very strong. And it's important we do due diligence and get feedback from citizen groups and commissioners to vet these statements. So, I think we have what we need in the minutes here.

- Remlinger –The proposal is to move the rural land into the Urban Growth Area just outside of the City of Carnation. This rural land is directly adjacent to agricultural zoned land. The county is in discussion with the Remlingers about several land use changes.
  - The county received a petition from 60 farmers saying this is a terrible idea.
  - I don't think there's a lot of support for this.
  - When community meetings happen in Nov and Dec, we may hear more.
  - Bradley Clark: We did receive a letter from the City of Carnation asking us to work on this issue, but not asking specifically for the annexation.
- Tall Chief – Proposal to add Tall Chief (80 acres) to the APD.
  - Commission supports

- Willing landowner? Yes.

## **Tall Chief- John Taylor, Bob Vos**

*see packet for materials*

*Nancy offers public comment to Erick Haakenson who arrived after the public comment period*

Erick Haakenson: I'm not quite sure what this topic or more to the point what this vote is about. Is it to support the specific decision of the committee or proposal? Is that what we're talking about?

Nancy: John, maybe you can answer that question.

John: Bob and I talked today and while I'm loath to come here with a pre-packaged solution for the commission, I drafted a letter (see meeting packet) with wording from Bob that basically says the ag commission participated in the process, thought it was a fair and good process, the outcome was fair and good and we support the process and that it will deliver a positive outcome. With that said, it is up to the commission members to decide if that is what they want to say or to send a letter to the council.

Bob Vos: I did talk with John and made some suggestions to the letter and thought it was important to address these issues in a timely manner. The letter contains my suggestions and I believe the proposal before the commission is whether or not to approve the letter.

[1:38:38]

Erick Haakenson: Thank you for clarifying. I was hoping that you would be able to accomplish something that I haven't been able accomplish for months, namely, to get a copy of the proposal. It's unthinkable to me that you could write a letter of support without seeing the proposal. And I'd be a little suspicious of being asked to write a letter of support without seeing the proposal. Commissioners, would you approve a proposal, you haven't seen? So, I would hope at the very least, you will have an opportunity to see that proposal.

The second point I would like to make is that there's been a lot of talk about the fact that we don't want to see farmers against farmers. We all know the proposal that was accepted was by Steve and Janet Keller, and I just want you to know that I consider them to be friends of mine. I've known them both for 25 years. At the end of the fight to keep Tall Chief from turning into a housing development, there were only four people left standing: Steve and Janet Keller and Erick and Wendy Haakenson. SO, we've been through a lot together and I admire them a great deal. Nevertheless, this isn't about farmer against farmer. It's about one particular problem: GMO Round-up ready corn and the glyphosate in Round-up. The Keller's own 700 acres and farm 1,200 and their main crop is GMO corn.

Three days ago the State of California added glyphosate to their list of cancer causing chemicals. That impacts not only human life, but salmon. There comes a time as there has come with asbestos, nicotine and a lot of other things, when the pendulum begins to swing, and all the king's horses and men can't change the fact we're dealing with a very toxic substance. I think we need to think about the health, welfare and safety of this community, of the fish on the river, and what farming in King County should

be like when we dispose of this piece of property that was paid for by the citizens of King County. And I think we all know how King County voted when it came to simply GMO products being identified – the vast majority were in favor. Now that we have these studies and know about it, we can't let this go forward.

Nancy: I appreciate your comments and I think, in all fairness, we should see the proposal.

John: I appreciate and respect where Erick and Dave are coming from. We have met and discussed this a couple of times.

The county bought Tall Chief Golf Course in 2013. We bought it because there was a proposal to subdivide it into 18 housing lots and that it would negatively impact neighboring farms. We bought it with the intention to put it back into farming.

We had two options. We could surplus the property or we could develop a request for proposals (RFP) and because we knew of people and organizations interested in farming the site, we developed an RFP to be very flexible with purchase or lease options and allow multiple uses because we wanted to see what types of proposals we would get in response.

We took the draft RFP and held a public meeting at Tall Chief about it and that meeting was very well attended with 15-20 people there. We asked for feedback. Many of the people who ended up submitting proposals attended that meeting.

When the RFP draft was finished, we circulated it for at least 30 days and solicited additional comments from the attendees and others because we wanted to make it as easy as possible for the interested parties to bid. One of the comments we then got was from Erick and was that people who are organic producers should get higher points when they submitted a proposal.

I'll be really clear about that. We did not accept that comment.

We can provide the commission our responses to the comments. The reason we took that stance is because the county does not want to get into the business of supporting one type of farming over another.

George: That's good.

John: There were expectations in the RFP:

- You have to get the land into production
- You need to find uses for the buildings

The detail of the scoring is in your packet. Outlined who was on the Tall Chief RFP review committee.

Received three solid proposals and tried really hard to select the strongest one, and I believe we did that.

In regard to Erick's request to see the proposals, we are not allowed to share information in purchase and sales agreements until the purchase and sale agreement gets transmitted to council. So, we can't share the Keller's proposal.

We are responding to a public disclosure request, but it's been tough because when you're in an RFP process, you just can't share documents. I know it's frustrating, but we legally cannot do it per our procurement department.

Larry Pickering: How did you select a sustainable business when they use GMO corn?

John: We judged it not on production methods but on economic sustainability five years and more down the road.

George: The California ruling on glyphosate is part of their farmworker safety program. The natural state is carcinogenic, but it breaks down in 7 days under UV light. I agree that over time, any plant will develop a tolerance to whatever weed control is being used.

Bruce Elliott: They may want to grow corn now, but that doesn't preclude growing something else in the future.

Siri: Are you able to share the scoring?

John: Once we've transmitted the purchase and sale agreement, we can share everything.

Bob Vos: The evaluation panel was diverse and we all developed our individual scores. We talked about them and we came to a consensus – a unanimous consensus – that the Keller proposal best satisfied the requirements of the RFP. The three proposals were very interesting and pretty different. In our discussions, there were both positive and negative aspects to each proposal.

Positively, the Kellers were the only ones who had the experience necessary to handle the building situation – some of the buildings are in serious disrepair. Some need serious work and some need to be torn down. The Kellers have the resources and experience to do that. In addition, they were the only proposal that could hit the ground running. They would immediately start using one of the storage sheds to start storing their machinery and actually offered to store machinery of their neighbors in case of flooding.

There are environmental benefits in reducing transportation because additional feed can be raised here and the land can be used to spread manure.

Regarding prices, one of the proposals was for a purchase at about half the price of the Keller's. And the third proposal was to lease the land for ten years at an annual no cost lease fee. We felt this showed that the business was not economically viable.

For those reasons, I would ask the commission to second the decision of the panel. Are there any questions?

Meredith Molli: Can we see a draft of this letter?

John: Yes, here is a draft.

Meredith: Whether or not we second this letter, the sale is happening, right? There isn't anything that can stop this from happening is there?

John: The Executive proposes and the Council has to authorize any purchase and sale. The purchase and sale agreement will be transmitted to the council soon. So, that is why we are bringing this to you. It could be that the council decides they don't want to do this. Our hope is that they will because we believe this was the best proposal.

We plan to use the funds from the sale of Tall Chief to buy additional land to support the other two proposals. We think this is a good outcome.

Josh Monaghan: I feel like this was a really solid process that also included interviews and site visits.

Kathy Creahan: We had an appraised value and the sale meets that. It would not be possible to sell the property for less than the appraised value.

Nancy: Can we add or amend the letter to read, "We have been informed of the thoughtfulness of the process, understand the objections, and reflect this discussion to an extent in the letter? We acknowledge the conflicts and would like to see the land being farmed as soon as possible."

George: Point of Order, I don't believe we have a quorum.

Nancy: I think we do of our current members.

Patrice: We do.

George: Is it a quorum of the current members?

Bob Vos makes a motion that: The Ag Commission approve this draft letter subject to some revisions that Nancy can work with the county staff to include on according to her previous comments.

Siri seconds.

- 7 current members
- 6 voting (chair only votes in a tie)
- Motion does not carry; 3-2
- George: I don't believe we have a quorum; so voted against. I don't believe we should take action on this item at this time.

*Motion to send letter in support of Tall Chief sale fails. Revisit next meeting; bring the commission bylaws to show the quorum requirements*

## Public Comment Part 2:

[2:10]

Ewing Stringfellow: I ask for your chair to come to the City Council meeting October 6<sup>th</sup> and speak; write a letter to the City of North Bend about trying to preserve a farm in the upper Snoqualmie – we are the last surviving farm in the area.

City councilman visited two weeks ago and he proposed a concrete bulkhead between the road and my feedlot. Tax revenue would come from developer to city and city build.

Second solution: relocate the barn.

Dave Casey: I'm concerned about the impact of filling the floodway and flood storage by this development. It seems like it is a displacement of storage.

Bob Vos and Larry Pickering are willing to attend the Oct. 6 meeting.

Kathy Creahan: You can request that we continue to engage with City of North Bend.

Nancy: Except we cannot vote because we do not have a perceived quorum.

### **Alternate for KCD Advisory Board**

Josh Monaghan and Nancy Hutto described the desired commitments.

*Action postponed to next meeting due to quorum in question.*

Siri: *Let's add learning about the KCD to the orientation information.*

### **Updates:**

**KCD:** Josh Monaghan; Happy about staff person Amy Holmes poised to join Commission. Drainage projects: 3 this year with County ADAP, new funding from flood control district for next year; Katie Penke, new drainage staff person.

\$650,000 in food systems grants and we are in the review process now. Advisory committee will make recommendations to the advisory council. Award notifications: Nov 7<sup>th</sup>

**FFF** - John Taylor: In partnership with KCD, we are tackling drainage. We doubled ADAP budget and hired Lou Beck for outreach and engineering support. Drainage ditch clearing: Last year we did 3,500 feet, this summer almost 12,000 linear feet. Want to see 20,000 ft. in the next couple of years. Based on KCD's survey, we know about 90,000 linear feet that need drainage. Partnerships with KCD are critical to our success.

The background of FFF is that DNRP is tasked with supporting farmers and with supporting salmon recovery and that is an internal conflict which FFF is trying to work through.

In June, with FFF, we entered into a Memorandum of Mutual Understanding. It contained work for the county to do over the summer:

1. Scope of work for strategic plan for the Snoqualmie APD,
2. Scope of work for a buffers task force
3. Scope of work for a regulatory task force

KCD, under Josh's leadership, is leading

4. Community outreach effort because the real point of contention in the Spring was that farmers were telling us:
  - a. We don't feel like we're being heard *and*
  - b. Agriculture does not have a unified position (yet)

We're on a path once farmers get their crops in, is to start convening meetings with landowners to see if there is a unified position on key issues in FFF that can be shared with the FFF task force when it gets back together in January. If these pieces fall into place, then we can start the tough work on negotiation of key factors for an agreement on how we do buffers, and how we do salmon restoration, and how we drain ditches. How do you knit something together that compensates farmers when we take ag land?

Just to be clear, we're gonna be taking ag land. We may not take as much as we would've, but if we're gonna do salmon restoration projects and we're gonna do them in the main stem of the Snoqualmie River, we're gonna have to take some ag land. That's just the reality and people need to understand that.

The last piece that we've heard especially from the commission, is that you [2:51] need crop and soils expertise in King County. We don't have anyone on staff who is an expert in crop and soil science. A long time ago, King County severed their relationship with King County Extension. There's good reasons why that happened. What we are doing in the short term, is WSU Extension collaborating with King County, is applying for a KCD grant to bring some of that expertise back into the county. Patrice worked on that grant with WSU. We're also starting to have very preliminary conversations with WSU Extension about re-establishing that relationship and what it might look like. We're going to evaluate that for the next biennial budget.

George: Dean Barnardo has announced that he's reviewing WSU's offices in every county to make sure they are meeting the local needs.

#### **Commissioners Selection Process: - Patrice**

The next commission is in 3 weeks, so I am planning to delay the orientation for new commissioners until November at which point the current commissioners have recommended we take you on a tour to show you some of the issues that will help you understand the issues around Farm, Fish, Flood, drainage, etc. I will plan to have a month's lead on the tour dates and times.

**Councilmember Lambert:**

Sept 22, 9:30a.m.: Drainage tour and pictures at ADAP/KCD drainage site in Cherry Valley.

Funding available: \$20 million coming available from arts funding. I want this money to be for barn restoration funds for my district and for money to go out to barn owners with county experts to support you in fixing your barn.

- Chris Moore 206-624-9449, WA State Dept of Archeology and Historic Preservation – Grant Program for Barn Restoration

I want to support barn dances without sprinkler systems in barns by changing comp plan and making that an allowable use.

Comp Plan Roads and Bridges Task Force (Ag Commissioner George Irwin is on the task force)- 35 miles of roads and 25 bridges will be closed without new funding. Their report is coming out in January 2016. Pay attention to this report.

**Commissioner Updates:**

Leann Krainick – couple of events from a

- Invitation only. See the Krainick Dairy Centrifuge and Bedding Master: Nov 15, 1-3pm, sponsored by KCD, King County DNRP. Commissioners, let Leann know if you're interested in attending.
- Giant Pumpkin Weigh off at Elysian Brewery, Georgetown, 9/27, 11am-3pm, free, there is also a beer garden, band, and pumpkin carving.

[3:10]

Adjourned 7:19 pm

---

**Next Meeting**

Thursday October 8, 2015

Issaquah Fish Hatchery, Watershed Science Center, Issaquah

Dave Casey's public comment re: Tall Chief

Tall Chief

Dear Agricultural Commission

I respectfully request that you delay your endorsement of the sale of the Tall Chief property for the following reasons:

1. The content and priorities of the RFP for the disposition of the property was prepared using input from the wider farming community.
2. The RFP contained a clear desire and direction on the part of the County and community that the selected proposal would have a strong public benefit to the wider farming community.
3. I have attended meetings with county staff and expressed that it was my opinion that the current proponent's benefit to the wider farming community would be much less than a different applicant (Seattle Tilth).
4. The RFP process appears to have been revised wherein the County is now looking for properties for all three of the applicants.
5. This begs the question of why (in my opinion) a weaker applicant was selected over a stronger applicant. As a result, the community's clear desire to have a public farming related benefit on the Tall Chief property has (in my opinion) been ignored.
6. I am afraid that as a result of abandoning the spirit of the original RFP and changing the process a breach of trust is occurring between the County and the wider farming community in the lower Snoqualmie valley.
7. Please read the RFP's of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> rated applications before you act.
8. A while back a significant breach of trust occurred related to the SR205 project wherein we were told by County staff that the downstream effects of the revisions to the Snoqualmie Falls would be negligible. We are still being impacted. It has taken many years to rebuild trust.
9. Please don't break it again. Thank you.

I would request that you allow ~~an~~ additional input from additional stakeholder at your next meeting prior to taking action

# King County Agriculture Commission DRAFT Minutes from Thursday, October 8, 2015 Watershed Science Center, Issaquah

---

Commissioners	P	A	Commissioners	P	A
Nancy Hutto, Chair		X	Bob Vos	X	
George Irwin	X		Siri Erickson-Brown		X
Eldon Murray	X		Larry Pickering		X

*P=Present; A=Absent*

Staff Present	
John Taylor	Brian Sleight
Joan Lee	Lou Beck
Kathy Creahan	Patrice Barrentine
Randy Sandin	
Guests Present	
Anne Becker	Pat McGlothlin
Leann Krainick	Erick Haakenson
Bruce Elliott	Kate Delavan
Leigh Newman-Bell	Katie Pencke, KCD
Meredith Molli	Tom Quigley
Amy Holmes	Erik Goheen
Darron Marzolf	Kathy Lambert, County Councilmember, District 3
Janet Keller	

## Meeting Action Summary

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>There was no quorum</b></li> <li>• <b>September Meeting Minutes were read and are pending approval at Nov meeting</b></li> <li>• <b>King County Comprehensive Plan Code Change Proposal: Agricultural Uses Presentation and Discussion</b></li> <li>• <b>Tall Chief Presentation and Discussion</b></li> <li>• <b>ADAP Presentation</b></li> <li>• <b>Next Meeting November 12<sup>th</sup></b></li> </ul> |
|--|

## Meeting Highlights with Action Items in Text Boxes

---

**Called to Order 4:05 pm**

### Agenda approved by acclamation

#### Ewing Stringfellow Update

George Irwin asked Patrice Barrentine if she had an update on Ewing Stringfellow's hearing. She explained the North Bend City Council had not placed it on their meeting docket, and therefore she had not attended. She further advised she had met with Mr. Stringfellow and Mike McCarty from the City on separate occasions to discuss the potential economic impacts on Mr. Stringfellow's operation from the proposed road in his area. John Taylor added that as the City and developer had not offered any additional information, Mr. Stringfellow had been advised to make a case to the City regarding the potential impacts to his operation from the road and what might be done to mitigate those impacts.

#### Approval of Minutes

*September meeting minutes tabled to next meeting (no quorum present)*

#### King County Farming Regulations: Study and Report – Kate Delavan, MPA, American Farmland Trust (AFT)

Kate Delavan introduced a presentation on regulatory constraints to farming in King County. Based on interviews of eleven farmers across the County, a survey was compiled for distribution to all King County farmers, to which 166 replied. The first question, on perceived regulatory constraints to farming, received responses addressing two main categories: specific regulations (primarily critical/drainage and septic), and the regulatory process (discontent with the cost and time of process). The survey also found a perceived disconnect in understanding between the agricultural community and County staff regarding the community's needs. Another question in the survey posed whether County regulations were constraining on-farm improvements; Ms. Delavan presented a graph that indicated a majority of survey respondents believed County regulations were preventing them from making a number of potential modifications to improve their farms and their productivity. In conclusion, Ms. Delavan's group presented several recommendations to the County: (1) continue pursuit of the agricultural One-Stop-Shop (OSS) program; (2) consider including an agricultural permit coordinator within the OSS to guide farmers through the permitting process; (3) convene a regulatory task force to help take any proposed regulatory changes regarding productivity to the next step in the legislative process; (4) create regulatory requirements specific to agricultural producers.

The question was raised whether there had been any distinction made between regulations for commercial vs. non-commercial agricultural needs. Ms. Delavan replied there had not been, and there had been very few responses addressing that differentiation. Bob Vos said that at one point there had indeed been a permit coordinator involved in the OSS process; Randy Sandin answered that the funding

for that had been withdrawn several years prior when it had been decided it was no longer organizationally feasible within the County for such an implementation.

## **King County Comprehensive Plan Code Change Proposal: Agricultural Uses – Randy Sandin and Kathy Creahan**

***Please see meeting packet for corresponding presentation and materials presented.***

Mr. Sandin stated that DNRP and DPER were working on two code-based projects for the upcoming comp plan.

The first project was a request from the County Council to review the current relevance of some code-based policies that had been adopted over the years. Mr. Sandin explained this more specifically pertained to two regulations adopted in the 1970s, one of which was the 1977 Agricultural Lands Policy (ALP). Both regulations, Mr. Sandin said, were a first attempt by the County at preserving agricultural lands and operations. The ALP was aimed at directing the County to designate certain areas as agricultural lands, and develop a program that would protect agricultural properties. This was a precursor to the 1985 comp plan amendments, he explained; Kathy Creahan added that it also predated the Farmland Preservation Program (FPP). He stated that his office's review of the ALP had led them to conclude that current regulations and policies fully replaced the 1977 ordinance. He said a recommendation would be made to de-codify, but not repeal, that ordinance, as it was believed the ordinance still contained historical and helpful information to provide context within the comp plan.

Mr. Sandin went on to discuss the second regulation DNRP had reviewed, the 1979 FPP ordinance. He said at this time no changes were expected to this, but a review and potential revision would be scheduled within two to three years to ensure it remained current. Mr. Sandin brought up a third regulation, a requirement adopted after the 1985 amendments, that the County review existing regulations to ensure consistency with newly-adopted policies. A report had been expected back within one year, but appeared to have never happened. In 1995 this ordinance was amended to require County review of regulations to ensure consistency with the 1994 comp plan, which Mr. Sandin stated had also yet to occur. He added that all newly-adopted code should already be compliant with the existing comp plan, and therefore a recommendation would be made to repeal that ordinance.

Mr. Sandin then addressed the second requested project from the County Council, to consider code amendments to comprehensive plan policies for agriculture-supported and -dependent uses. He stated the review had discovered some fairly significant flaws in the current County structure that may be creating impediments to easier permitting and processing. He said this went back to when the term "agriculture" was first defined by the County when a new zoning code was adopted in 1993. There were eight land use categories established, ranging from "residential" up to "regional." Agriculture was included under the "resource" category; however, this was limited to raising livestock, growing crops, and temporary farm worker housing. All other farm functions were distributed among the other seven land use categories. This complicated the permitting process. An example given was that if a farm that raised livestock wanted to slaughter those livestock, that would be prohibited due to that slaughter was considered "manufacturing," which per the code was not allowed in a facility that had been designated

as “agricultural.” The term “agriculture,” Mr. Sandin said, had been narrowly defined, to the exclusion of common agricultural processes such as production and equipment/farm maintenance. Therefore, Mr. Sandin said his group was proposing, as part of this current comp plan update, restructuring the existing code to place all agricultural functions back into one category/table, the “resource” category. As part of that, he continued, he wanted to define “agriculture” to be consistent with how farms operate within King County. Additional research by his group had found that King County is currently the only county in the Puget Sound region and eastern Washington state that had not defined agriculture or agricultural activity, and that should be fixed. Another goal is to allow agriculture-supported industries to locate closer to, or in some circumstances even within, their Agriculture Production Districts (APD). Their third goal, he continued, was to create an alternative review/approval process that was less process-driven, that incorporated considerations such as community impact. The structure was already in place, he said, with additional detail forthcoming and a goal of being ready for adoption next year.

A question was raised from the public whether processes in other counties had been considered when creating the list. Mr. Sandin answered that he believed the definitions and framework were largely consistent statewide.

Bob Vos asked if maintenance of agricultural drainage systems would be included as an agricultural activity under the proposed reclassifications. Mr. Sandin answered that would still be classified under farm “operations.”

Amy Holmes asked whether any opportunity for public input would be incorporated into the proposed re-definition of the term “farming” in King County. Mr. Sandin affirmed that this meeting, as well as others, such as the previous winter’s Farm Fish Flood forum, were all part of engaging the Agricultural Commission in that process. He elaborated that many of the issues being currently raised stemmed from flaws in how the term “agriculture” was defined in the County twenty years ago, but that undergoing a more comprehensive review process now could work out many of those flaws. Patrice Barrentine commented that she, Kesha Cline from DPER, and Ms. Creahan had been working on this issue since spring 2015, and that the comp plan review would become part of the public process and that soon a regulatory committee needed to be formed to be the primary reviewer of all forthcoming information for this comp plan update. She added that she believed the review thus far had been a positive process in terms of incorporating words and activities that would be beneficial to supporting agriculture more broadly, and that there would be ample opportunity for public involvement going forward.

Mr. Irwin raised a specific question about the proposed amendment regarding farm product housing, refrigeration and storage: whether a single farm would also be allowed to store or refrigerate product for multiple farms in the APD. Mr. Sandin replied that this review was about reclassifying existing standards under the “agricultural” category, not redefining them. He added that the review was looking at standardizing sizes for different facility types such as retail and warehousing, and elaborated this did not mean an APD would be subjected to facilities like large commercial slaughterhouses/warehouses, that such facilities could perhaps be located on lands adjoining the APD.

Mr. Vos inquired about two exemptions for “agricultural activities” specified in the Shoreline Management Act (SMA): whether by broadening King County’s definition of agricultural activities, farmers could then engage in additional activities previously prohibited by the SMA. Mr. Sandin answered that potential effects on existing code were a consideration in this redefinition process. Ms. Creahan added that she believed this proposed reclassification did not address the critical areas in the current regulations, that it addressed what was “allowed” as an agricultural use and was more of a structural change but provided a strong basis to support efforts to improve the regulations and recommended a reconvening of the regulatory commission.

Ms. Creahan reported that her division had also recently been working on a revision of the current stormwater manual. This was due to identifying many areas in the stormwater regulations that were inappropriate to agriculture in certain areas. She said her division recommended a number of exemptions or special considerations for farms in this revision. She said this was an issue she would also like a regulatory subcommittee to review the details of. She continued that her division’s position is the current stormwater regulations are based on a premise that stormwater actions should ideally work similarly to how they work in forested conditions. She said her division is making the case that in designated agricultural areas, the ideal situation should be an agricultural condition instead. She concluded that these changes were in the process of Council adoption but she was requesting agricultural input prior to moving forward with them.

### **Standing Committees – Re-Activate Regulatory Committee**

The Commission entertained a question soliciting those interested in participating on a regulatory subcommittee, reviewing proposed regulations for the comp plan. The following individuals expressed interest:

- Amy Holmes
- Bob Vos
- Meredith Molli
- Darron Marzolf
- Leigh Newman-Bell
- Anne Becker

### **Public Comment**

Erik Goheen addressed the Commission on the issue of the Zante property, referenced on page 9 of last month’s meeting minutes. Mr. Goheen complimented the assessment of the issue from the minutes and offered that it was the sentiment of the property he represented, 21 Acres, that the Zante land should be preserved for farming. He addressed the request for a comprehensive plan, a draft of which he advised was in process and would be brought before the Commission.

Tom Quigley, of Olympic Nursery and president of the Sammamish Valley Alliance, thanked the commissioners for their service. He raised the concern of roughly a half-dozen wineries/tasting rooms in the Woodinville area attempting to operate without meeting any permitting requirements, mostly on rural- and agricultural-zoned lands. He expressed a desire to discuss including fruit grown in eastern Washington state as “local” fruit, which he said would increase opportunities for wineries. He continued that those wishing to operate tasting rooms with no winery located on their property faced problems due to apparent ambivalence regarding King County’s ability to intervene on the matter, and this was a topic he believed would likely come before the Commission at a future date.

## **Tall Chief Property Sale: Bob Vos & John Taylor**

*see packet for materials*

Janet Keller, whose family drafted a proposal for purchase of the Tall Chief property, addressed the Commission. Ms. Keller explained her family included several generations of dairy farmers in the Snoqualmie River Valley, and lives adjacent to the Tall Chief property. Her family’s application and proposal to purchase the property were selected by King County, a collaboration process she indicated had been slow but positive. Her family’s long-term goals included value-added, and purchasing the Tall Chief land would provide them a critical location outside the floodplain and next to the dairy. She said their farm was currently milking just over 700 cows.

Bob Vos commented that it sometimes forgotten that one group of new farmers was often the children of existing farmers, and suggested that category of “new” farmers not be forgotten.

Ms. Keller continued that their new land base would be used for crops and manure, but that they were working with King County to have the option of putting animals there. She said their eventual hope was to relocate some of her young stock away from the floodplain.

Mr. Irwin advised that the Commission was unable to sign the proposal at this meeting due to a lack of quorum present, but that there was still an opportunity for discussion on this issue or defer it until the next meeting.

Meredith Molli commented that David Casey’s protest letter to the County on this issue included information she believed to be inaccurate. Referencing last month’s meeting minutes, Ms. Molli cited where Mr. Casey alleged King County had changed their point system regarding their intended meaning of “sustainability.” She said Mr. Casey quoted John Taylor as stating that by “sustainable,” what was actually meant was “economically sustainable,” which she said appeared to be the main basis of his protest.

Mr. Taylor stated that, contrary to another allegation in Mr. Casey’s letter, there had indeed been an appraisal performed April 2, 2015 on the Tall Chief property. He added that a sale could not have been completed without an appraisal, and appraisals were valid for one (1) year. Mr. Taylor said the appraisal had valued the property at \$720,000; Ms. Creahan confirmed the County had paid a total purchase price

of approximately \$4.5 million for the property. It had been appraised at the higher value, she continued, due to there already being an approved subdivision on the property. The \$720,000 value came from an assumed use of one residential unit on the property with an option of purchasing more for a total no higher than three residential units.

Mr. Taylor then reviewed for the Commission a PowerPoint presentation detailing the history of the property, and presented counter-statements to several allegations in Mr. Casey's letter. Mr. Taylor stated he believed it a disservice to those who had worked on this process to label it as non-transparent. He described several options and processes that had been considered and undertaken by the County in determining what action to take with the property, all of which he stated were available for review in the public record. Many public suggestions were considered and several incorporated into revising the property RFP, he continued, as well as the formation of a proposal review committee made of representatives from several King County agricultural entities and jurisdictions. He added that while he had unintentionally omitted "environmental" sustainability as criteria when speaking at the previous Commission meeting, it had not been removed from the RFP process, and that all three submitted proposals had been evaluated under the criteria of environmental as well as economic sustainability. He broke down the weighted point scale used to evaluate the proposals and indicated in the presentation the specific scores for each proposal. Ms. Creahan added that on-site interviews had also been conducted with the proposers and their facilities, and these had provided useful information in the selection process.

Mr. Vos affirmed he believed the selection process had been followed thoroughly. Erick Haakenson spoke up that while he appreciated the County's many public outreach opportunities on this proposal, he disagreed with Mr. Vos' and Mr. Taylor's assessments. He said the RFP explicitly states "the proposals will be reviewed by a Committee made up of County staff and representatives of the community," and that there had been no such representatives from his community. He described what he believed to be a disconnect between the perceptions of some Committee members and those of the farming community affected by the Tall Chief proposal in terms of the degree of potential impact of the Kellers' successful purchase on that community. He said that there were other factors that would likely have been noticed had there been representatives from the local farming community on the Committee, and that this would almost certainly have led to a different outcome in the final proposal scoring.

Mr. Haakenson addressed a second point that he disagreed that Mr. Taylor had simply misspoken at the prior month's meeting. He cited from the RFP a requirement for the successful applicant to show "a demonstration of a commitment to sustainable and environmentally appropriate farming practices." He continued that he believed this requirement in the process had not been taken into account, favoring a view towards economic sustainability, and the attitude he perceived at the prior month's meeting regarding Mr. Taylor's statement there that the County needed to be "agnostic" to farming practices. He stated that while he understood the motivation for that viewpoint, there was still a differentiation between types of farming practices that needed to be considered. The types of practices specified by

the RFP, he said, demonstrate a commitment to sustainable and environmentally appropriate farming practices. Mr. Haakenson went on to say he was not certain the community would agree that some practices, such as using synthetic fertilizers close to a river, were appropriate.

Mr. Haakenson's third point was that he believed very little fact-finding had been done on the proposals. This conclusion stemmed from seeing several names, including his own, on a list of farmers that had been indicated as consenting to farming on the Tall Chief land if the Kellers were selected for it. Mr. Haakenson said he had not actually consented to this.

Mr. Haakenson's final point was that he believed the proposal that most reflected a passage from page 12 of the RFP that the County had a strong interest in supporting and increasing productivity in Snoqualmie Valley agriculture as well as promoting educational opportunities on agriculture for the public and children of King County, had not been chosen. He said that a proposal from the Seattle Tilth Association, while taking longer to reach its posited goals than the Keller proposal, would have far more long-term benefits in terms of overall production totals and services offered to the local community.

Mr. Irwin replied that the Committee and Mr. Haakenson had probably been viewing the term "community" differently, in terms of the overall agricultural community vs., in Mr. Haakenson's perspective, the local community. Mr. Irwin added that while there were areas of the scoring criteria that might perhaps have been worded differently, the Commission was unable to entertain a motion addressing Mr. Haakenson's concerns at this time due to the lack of quorum present. Mr. Taylor added that the Kellers' immediate adjacency to the Tall Chief land had been a significant factor in their selection, and enumerated several community services that had been included in their proposal. He also added that several letters, including one from the Seattle Tilth Association, had been sent to the King County Council supporting the Kellers' selection, and that this cooperation might assist the County in working with Seattle Tilth in the future to locate another land parcel suitable to realizing their vision.

One final commenter stated they believed that, contrary to prior assurances otherwise, this selection process had indeed been a case of "farmer vs. farmer." He also believed this situation was very much repeating a situation that had come before the Commission some years prior, and iterated a concern that King County agriculture was "fragile" and that if its farmers broke up into opposing factions, it would be detrimental to all.

## **Agricultural Drainage Assistance Program (ADAP) Report Including Pilot projects related to ADAP and tiles with KCD**

Brian Sleight, manager of ADAP, briefly addressed the Commission on several staffing updates to the program. Lou Beck then provided an overview of ADAP's summer projects. Two early projects were a survey to Snoqualmie Valley area landowners about their drainage concerns, and a postcard mailing soliciting interest in an ADAP project with KCD with the potential for KCD cost-share. He enumerated several other projects including a small number that, while not achieving their full potential this year, were well-placed to do so next year. He added that as a result of their earlier survey, their group had visited Enumclaw and determined that many people in that area did not have a regulatory nexus to maintain their ditches. Larry Fischer from Department of Fish and Wildlife also visited the area and

would soon provide ADAP his assessment on the situation. Mr. Beck expressed a hope that some of these people could be moved towards a situation where permits would no longer be needed to maintain their ditches.

Katie Pencke from KCD then spoke to the Commission regarding a goal to create a statement of need to understand the scope of drainage issues currently faced in the County. She presented several graphs and charts representing the acreage in some areas affected by poor drainage, including areas that had been returned to production after this summer's dredging, and areas that were on the waiting list to be dredged. She attributed the changes in many of these amounts to ADAP's outreach to encourage more landowner registration of drainage projects. Mr. Beck reported that an estimated 130 total acres had been returned to production this year, with an additional 285 acres of improved lands. Ms. Pencke and Mr. Beck then detailed several large restoration projects undertaken by ADAP and KCD over the summer. Ms. Pencke went on to describe a large backlog of maintenance projects in the County where she and Mr. Beck intended to collaborate on ways to move more people through these restoration processes. She said there were approximately 30 projects on their waiting list and that that she believed there would be about \$100,000 to spend on these projects throughout the 2016 construction season. She added that despite the large existing project backlog, there were hopes to further expand the aforementioned Snoqualmie Valley survey to reach all agricultural landowners in King County and address more areas in need.

Bob Vos asked about King County's requirement to have plantings in streams that had been dredged regardless of whether fish were present or not. Mr. Beck answered that in his view the plantings were less about the fish and more about helping the sediment and water flow, especially in streams with a reed canary grass problem. Ms. Creahan added she did not foresee any changes in these requirements coming on the state level. Mr. Sleight said that if Mr. Fischer's assessment was upheld by his superior, a permit from the county or state would not be required to undergo the ADAP program.

Mr. Sleight gave a report on tiles. ADAP received a grant from the Flood Hazard District last year for two tile projects, reviewing the permitting process to determine any hurdles faced. He said ADAP hoped to have a completion and assessment from both projects in time for construction season next year.

### **Updates:**

Ms. Pencke and Amy Holmes reported that KCD had assigned a new staff member, Eric Nelson, to targeted outreach for Farm Fish Flood efforts in the Snoqualmie Valley. Requests for site visits to farms has almost doubled in the past year. In response to the increased demand, two new farm planners had been hired, and with the potential for one more. KCD will also have their board review a proposal to submit a letter of support for the Tall Chief property sale, they added.

Ms. Barrentine reported on the comp plan review, that comments from the last Commission meeting had been forwarded for incorporation. The public review draft would come available November 4<sup>th</sup> through January 4<sup>th</sup>, she added, with the County Executive transmitting it to the County Council in March 2016. Kathy Creahan said that any comments on the draft could also be forwarded directly to her for incorporation in advance of the review period.

Adjourned 7 pm

---

**Next Meeting**

Thursday November 12, 2015

Issaquah Fish Hatchery, Watershed Science Center, Issaquah



## WELCOME:

Congratulations on your appointment to a King County board or commission.

On this page you will find useful information for new board members. Currently appointed board members can also visit this page to find required training material or to view orientation material.

Before you look at any other documents new board members are required to do the following:

- ➔ Review the King County Board of Ethics Summary;
- ➔ Take the Open Public Meetings Act Training; and
- ➔ Take the Public Records Act Training

Click on the highlighted hyperlink to review the King County Public Records Act (PRA) PowerPoint slides:

### [King County Public Records Act \(PRA\) PowerPoint Display](#)

Click on the highlighted hyperlink below to view the Washington State Attorney General's Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA) training video. Scroll down about 3/4 of the page and you will find "Lesson 3: Open Public Meetings Act" video.

<http://www.atg.wa.gov/OpenGovernmentTraining.aspx>

After reviewing the required material, please print and complete the King County Certification Form (located on the right-side of this page). On this form you can check off which training(s) you have completed. Return the completed form to the address on the form. We also accept scanned copies of the signed form which can be emailed to: [Rick.Ybarra@kingcounty.gov](mailto:Rick.Ybarra@kingcounty.gov)

## List of Orientation Documents:

### Required Training and Certification forms:

- ➔ [A Summary of King County Code of Ethics](#) (PDF, 588KB)
  - [KC Training Certification Form](#) (123KB)

### King County Email Account Instructions:

- ➔ [How to Access Your King County Email Account](#) (669KB)
- ➔ [Email Use Guidelines](#) (46KB)
- ➔ [How to Find Other Board Member Email Addresses](#) (927KB)

## Orientation Material:

- ➔ [Board Member Job Description](#) (63KB)
- ➔ [Being An Effective Board Member](#) (17KB)

board or commission members with a King County email account for the purpose of conducting official board business ("*Independent*" boards and commissions are exempt from this requirement). Regular use of your King County email account for corresponding with board members or King County staff will ensure that we are capturing every record in compliance with record retention laws and the Public Records Act. After you have been issued a King County email account, review the step-by-step instructions on the right side of this screen for help signing in to your King County email account.

Please take some time to review the orientation material listed on the right side of this page. The staff liaison for your board or commission may also provide you with additional orientation material specific to your board or commission.

Please contact Rick Ybarra, Liaison for Boards and Commissions, at 206-263-9651 if you have any questions.

- ⇒ [Cooperation](#) (131KB)
- ⇒ [Parliamentary Procedure for Meetings](#) (100KB)
- ⇒ [Disability 101](#) (PDF, 38KB)



**King County**

## **KING COUNTY BOARD MEMBER JOB DESCRIPTION**

### **About King County Boards & Commissions:**

Boards, Commissions and Committees are made up of highly qualified, responsible, and motivated community members. Board members are generally volunteers serving in appointed positions. They contribute not only to the success of King County operations but to the quality of life for all by enabling the county to maintain and improve programs and services for citizens. With such influence comes great responsibility and accountability.

Most board members are appointed to represent the public at-large. In addition, we have seven (7) boards and commissions that are appointed by Council district. This means that each of the nine (9) King County Councilmembers nominate one individual to serve on the board or commission as their Council district representative. We expect that each resident appointed to a King County board or commission will bring an important perspective to the table because we know that differing points of view produce effective solutions.

### **Authority / Responsibility:**

Unless stated differently in the board's enabling legislation, King County boards and commissions review, discuss and make recommendations to the King County Council and King County Executive on a variety of issues that help shape the future of King County. The King County Council and King County Executive heavily consider board or commission recommendations when discussing programs and services, or pending legislation but the final decision is theirs. A full listing of King County boards and commissions including detailed descriptions of what each board does, can be found on the King County boards and commissions website:

<http://www.kingcounty.gov/exec/boards.aspx>.

King County currently has 49 active boards and commissions comprised of more than 450 volunteers. These dedicated volunteers give their time and expertise to help facilitate community decision-making, and serve as a primary conduit between residents, King County employees and King County elected officials.

### **Qualifications:**

Anyone can apply to serve on a King County board or commission as long as you are willing to put in the time and commitment necessary to serve on the board; are able to serve as an effective liaison between the board and the public at-large; feel you could bring a unique perspective to the board; you work well in a collaborative setting; and you are a resident of King County.

The only required qualification to serve on about 60% of King County boards and commissions is an interest in the subject matter. The other 40% of our boards do require professional experience dealing with the subject matter. Again, visit the King County boards and commissions website to learn what qualifications are required to serve on the board that peaks your interest.

### **Terms:**

Board members serve for 2, 3, 4 or 5 year terms depending on the board.

In accordance with Executive Policy LES 7-1 (AEP) residents appointed to King County boards and commissions are limited to serving no more than two full terms, unless waived by the King County Executive. Partial terms are not counted toward the two full term limit.

**Requirements:**

- A desire to be of service to your community;
- Interest in shaping the future of King County;
- Regular attendance at meetings;
- Innovative and creative thinker;
- Able to work in a collaborative setting;
- Open to new ways of doing business;
- Commitment to the work of the organization;
- Willingness to serve on at least one sub-committee (if needed) of the board and actively participate;

**Major Duties:**

- Use of assigned King County email account when conducting board business only. (*King County board members are issued a King County email accounts upon appointment for conducting board business only. If a board member does not own a computer we will work together to determine the best method for communicating with the board member*).
- Work with the board and staff to create an annual Work Plan;
- Assist with agenda development
- Promote board membership through community networking;
- Committed to King County's Equity & Social Justice Initiative. Click link for more info: <http://www.kingcounty.gov/exec/equity.aspx>
- Community outreach to promote board activity and gather public input on upcoming board business;
- Prepare for and participate in the discussions and the deliberations of the Board;
- Foster a positive working relationship with other Board members and King County staff;
- Participate in King County board member training sessions (Public Records Act, Equity & Social Justice, Ethics)
- Be aware of and abstain from any conflicts of interest

***Board and commission meetings are held in accessible locations. Reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities will be provided upon advance request.***

**This material is available in alternate formats for persons with disabilities.**

**Please contact 206-263-9651, TTY Relay: 711, or E-mail [Rick.Ybarra@kingcounty.gov](mailto:Rick.Ybarra@kingcounty.gov)**

**The King County Council and the King County Executive are committed to inclusiveness and outreach to all King County residents to ensure that King County boards and commissions are reflective of the community we serve.**

## PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE FOR MEETINGS

Having an agreed upon set of rules makes meetings run easier. Robert's Rules of Order will help your board or commission have better meetings, not make them more difficult. Following Robert's Rules ensures a suitable process that encourages fairness and participation.

Here are the basic elements of Robert's Rules, used by most organizations:

1. **Motion:** To introduce a new piece of business or propose a decision or action, a motion must be made by a group member ("I move that.....") A second motion must then also be made (raise your hand and say, "I second it.") After *limited* discussion the group then votes on the motion. A majority vote is required for the motion to pass (or quorum as specified in your bylaws.)
2. **Postpone Indefinitely:** This tactic is used to kill a motion. When passed, the motion cannot be reintroduced at that meeting. It may be brought up again at a later date. This is made as a motion ("I move to postpone indefinitely..."). A second is required. A majority vote is required to postpone the motion under consideration.
3. **Amend:** This is the process used to change a motion under consideration. Perhaps you like the idea proposed but not exactly as offered. Raise your hand and make the following motion: "I move to amend the motion on the floor." This also requires a second. After the motion to amend is seconded, a majority vote is needed to decide whether the amendment is accepted. Then a vote is taken on the amended motion. In some organizations, a "friendly amendment" is made. If the person who made the original motion agrees with the suggested changes, the amended motion may be voted on without a separate vote to approve the amendment.
4. **Commit:** This is used to place a motion in committee. It requires a second. A majority vote must rule to carry it. At the next meeting the committee is required to prepare a report on the motion committed. If an appropriate committee exists, the motion goes to that committee. If not, a new committee is established.
5. **Question:** To end a debate immediately, the question is called (say "I call the question") and needs a second. A vote is held immediately (no further discussion is allowed). A two-thirds vote is required for passage. If it is passed, the motion on the floor is voted on immediately.
6. **Table:** To table a discussion is to lay aside the business at hand in such a manner that it will be considered later in the meeting or at another time ("I make a motion to table this discussion until the next meeting. In the meantime, we will get more information so we can better discuss the issue.") A second is needed and a majority vote required to table the item being discussed.
7. **Adjourn:** A motion is made to end the meeting. A second motion is required. A majority vote is then required for the meeting to be adjourned (ended).

**Note:** If more than one motion is proposed, the most recent takes precedence over the ones preceding it. For example if #6, a motion to table the discussion, is proposed, it must be voted on before #3, a motion to amend, can be decided.

In most board or commission meetings, often only four motions are used:

- To introduce (motion.)
- To change a motion (amend.)
- To adopt (accept a report without discussion.)
- To adjourn (end the meeting.)

Remember, these processes are designed to ensure that everyone has a chance to participate and to share ideas in an orderly manner. Parliamentary procedure should not be used to prevent discussion of important issues.

### **Tips in Parliamentary Procedure**

The following summary will help you determine when to use the actions described in Robert's Rules.

- A main motion must be moved, seconded, and stated by the chair before it can be discussed.
- If you want to move, second, or speak to a motion, raise your hand, wait to be recognized by the chair, you may then address the chair.
- If you approve the motion as is, vote for it.
- If you disapprove the motion, vote against it.
- If you approve the idea of the motion but want to change it, amend it or submit a substitute for it.
- If you want advice or information to help you make your decision, move to refer the motion to an appropriate quorum, committee, or staff, with instructions to report back.
- If you feel they can handle it better than the assembly, move to refer the motion to a quorum, committee, or staff with power to act.
- If you feel that the pending question(s) should be delayed so more urgent business can be considered, move to lay the motion on the table.
- If you want time to think the motion over, move that consideration be deferred to a certain time.
- If you think that further discussion is unnecessary, move the previous question.
- If you think that the assembly should give further consideration to a motion referred to a quorum, committee, or staff, move the motion be recalled.
- If you think that the assembly should give further consideration to a matter already voted upon, move that it be reconsidered.
- If you do not agree with a decision rendered by the chair, appeal the decision to the assembly.
- If you think that a matter introduced is not germane to the matter at hand, a point of order may be raised.
- If you think that too much time is being consumed by speakers, you can move a time limit on such speeches.
- If a motion has several parts, and you wish to vote differently on these parts, move to divide the motion.

## PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURES AT A GLANCE

<b>To Do This</b>	<b>You Say This</b>	<b>May You Interrupt Speaker</b>	<b>Must You Be Seconded</b>	<b>Is Motion Debatable</b>	<b>What Vote is Required</b>
Adjourn meeting*	I move that we adjourn	No	Yes	No	Majority
Recess meeting	I move that we recess until...	No	Yes	No	Majority
Complain about noise, room, temperature, etc.*	Point of privilege	Yes	No	No	No vote
Suspend further consideration of something*	I move we table it	No	Yes	No	Majority
End debate	I move the previous question	No	Yes	No	2/3 vote
Postpone consideration of something	I move we postpone this matter until...	No	Yes	Yes	Majority
Have something studied further	I move we refer this matter to committee	No	Yes	Yes	Majority
Amend motion	I move this motion be amended by ...	No	Yes	Yes	Majority
Introduce business (a primary motion)	I move that...	No	Yes	Yes	Majority
Object to procedure or personal affront	Point of order	Yes	No	No	No vote, Chair decides
Request information	Point of information	Yes	No	No	No vote
Ask for actual count to verify voice vote	I call for a division of the house	No	No	No	No vote
Object consideration of undiplomatic vote*	I object to consideration of this question	Yes	No	No	2/3 vote
Take up a matter previously tabled	I move to take from the table...	No	Yes	No	Majority
Reconsider something already disposed of*	I move we reconsider our action relative to...	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority
Consider something already out of its schedule*	I move we suspend the rules and consider	No	Yes	No	2/3 vote
Vote on a ruling by the Chair	I appeal the Chair's decision	Yes	Yes	Yes	Majority

\* Not amendable

## PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE AT A GLANCE

		Debatable	Amendable	Can be reconsidered	Requires 2/3 Vote
Privileged motions	Fix time at which to adjourn	No	Yes	No	No
	Adjourn	No	No	Yes	No
	Question of privilege	No	Yes	Yes	No
	Call for order of day	No	No	Yes	No
Incidental Motions	Appeal	Yes	No	Yes	No
	Objection to consideration of a question	No	No	Yes	Yes
	Point of Information	No	No	No	No
	Point of order	No	No	No	No
	Read papers	No	No	Yes	No
	Suspend the rules	No	No	No	Yes
	Withdraw a motion	No	No	Yes	No
Subsidiary Motions	Lay on the table	No	No	Yes	No
	The previous question (close debate)	No	No	Yes	Yes
	Limit or extend debate	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Postpone to a definite time	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Refer to committee	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Amend the amendment	Yes	No	No	No
	Amendment	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Postpone indefinitely	No	No	Yes	No
Main Motion	Main or procedural motion	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

This table presents the motions in order of precedence. Each motion takes precedence over (i.e. can be considered ahead of) the motions listed below it. No motion can supersede (i.e. be considered before) any of the motions listed above it.

## IN THE MEETING

### **To Introduce A Motion:**

Raise your hand.

Wait until the chair recognizes you.

Address the Chair by the proper title.

- Now that you have the floor and can proceed with your motion say "I move that...", state your motion clearly.
- Another member may second your motion. A second merely implies that the seconder agrees that the motion should come before the assembly and not that he/she is in favor of the motion.
- If there is no second, the Chair says, "The motion is not before you at this time." The motion is not lost, as there has been no vote taken.
- If there is a second, the Chair states the question by saying "It has been moved and seconded that (state the motion)...., is there any discussion?"

### **Debate or Discussing the Motion:**

- The member who made the motion is entitled to speak first.
- Every member has the right to speak in debate.
- The Chair should alternate between those "for" the motion and those "against" the motion.
- The discussion should be related to the pending motion.
- Avoid using a person's name in debate.
- All questions should be directed to the Chair.
- Unless there is a special rule providing otherwise, a member is limited to speak once to a motion.
- Asking a question or a brief suggestion is not counted in debate.
- A person may speak a second time in debate with the assembly's permission.

### **Voting on a Motion:**

- Before a vote is taken, the Chair puts the question by saying "Those in favor of the motion that ... (repeat the motion)... say "Aye." Those opposed say "No." The Chair waits a few seconds, then says "The motion is carried," or "The motion is lost."
- Some motions require a 2/3 vote.
- If a member is in doubt about the vote, he may call out "division." A division is a demand for a standing vote.
- A majority vote is more than half of the votes cast by persons legally entitled to vote.
- A 2/3 vote means at least 2/3 of the votes cast by persons legally entitled to vote.
- A tie vote is a lost vote, since it is not a majority.

## AMENDMENTS ILLUSTRATED

Any main motion or resolution may be amended:

1. Adding at the end
2. Striking out a word or words
3. Inserting a word or words
4. Striking out and inserting a word or words
5. Substitutions

A member raises a hand, addresses the chair, receives recognition, and states the motion:

"I move that..."

**MAIN MOTION**

Another member seconds the motion.

The Chair repeats the motion and says,  
"Is there any discussion?"

*Must be germane to the main motion*

To improve the motion, a member raises a hand;  
receives recognition and says "I move  
to amend the motion by..."

**PRIMARY AMENDMENT**

Another member seconds the amendment.

The Chair repeats the amendment and says,  
"Is there any discussion on the amendment?"

*Must be germane to the  
primary amendment*

To improve the amendment, a member raises their hand  
receives recognition, and says, "I move to amend  
the amendment by..."

**SECONDARY AMENDMENT**  
(not amendable)

Another member seconds the amendment.

The Chair repeats the amendment to the amendment and says, "Is there any discussion on the amendment to the amendment?"

- When discussion ceases the Chair says, "Those in favor of the amendment to the amendment say "Aye." Those opposed say "No."
- If the vote was in the affirmative, the amendment is included in the primary amendment. The Chair then says, "Is there any discussion on the amended amendment?"
- If there is no discussion, a vote is taken on the amended amendment. If the vote is in the affirmative, the amendment is included in the main motion. The chair then says, "Is there any discussion on the amended motion?"
- At this place, the motion can again be amended.
- If there is no further discussion, a vote is taken on the amended motion.
- Even though the amendments carried in the affirmative, the main motion as amended can be defeated.



**King County**

## **Office of Civil Rights & Open Government**

Chinook Building, 401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 215  
Seattle, Washington 98104-1818 MS: CNK-ES-0215  
206-263-2446 TTY Relay: 711 206-296-4329 Fax  
civil-rights.OCR@kingcounty.gov www.kingcounty.gov/civilrights  
www.kingcounty.gov/exec/CivilRights/DA.aspx

---

# **DISABILITY 101 FOR KING COUNTY BOARD & COMMISSION STAFF LIAISONS AND MEMBERS**

---

**As a Staff Liaison or Board/Commission member, you are responsible for ensuring accessibility for any members of the public who serve on your King County Board or Commission who have disabilities. This fact sheet outlines the requirements of disability access laws that apply to King County Boards and Commissions.**

### **What laws govern disability access?**

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal law which mandates equal access and reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities in employment, government services, transportation, and public accommodations (such as businesses)). Title II of the ADA outlines the responsibilities of local governments to make their facilities, programs, activities and services accessible to members of the public who have disabilities.

Other nondiscrimination and disability access laws that apply include the Washington State Law Against Discrimination (RCW 49.60), Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and King County ordinances.

### **How is disability defined?**

A person with a disability is an individual who:

- 1) has a physical or mental condition that substantially limits one or more major life activities; or
- 2) has a record or history of such an condition; or
- 3) is perceived or regarded as having such a condition.

“Major life activities” means functions such as caring for oneself, performing manual tasks, walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, breathing, learning, and working.

We are concerned primarily with those individuals who fit the first prong of this definition – those who have a current disability and thus, may have an accommodation need that we should meet. This includes people who have:

- physical disabilities such as paralysis, blindness, deafness, arthritis, multiple sclerosis, HIV/AIDS, heart disease, cerebral palsy, cancer, etc.

- mental or cognitive disabilities such as depression, PTSD, brain injury, learning disability, etc.
- some short-term conditions that substantially limit an individual, such as a back injury, severely broken leg, etc. (the definition does not include common conditions such as the flu).

### **What is important to know about disabilities?**

Some characteristics of disability that are helpful to understand:

- People with disabilities in the U.S. number about 55 million, comprising about 20% of the total population.
- Most disabilities occur after childhood as a result of injury, disease, or disorders – only one out of every six disabilities is present at birth.
- Although many disabilities are apparent due to physical differences or use of aids such as a wheelchair or a white cane, some disabilities are “unseen” or “invisible” – the condition is not obvious to an observer.
- Some disabilities are variable from day to day. Other conditions are progressive, becoming more severe over time.
- The language used to refer to people with disabilities is important. Various terms and phrases (such as “handicapped” or “wheelchair-bound”) are inappropriate and should not be used. See OCR’s fact sheet titled “Disability Language and Etiquette”.

### **What are the requirements of Title II of the ADA?**

The ADA identifies steps that local governments must undertake to comply with the ADA. King County has designated a Disability Compliance Specialist to be responsible for public access compliance, has conducted a self-evaluation and transition plan to enhance access, and has developed a grievance procedure. Beyond these basic steps, the ADA requires:

- **Equal opportunity** – People with disabilities must be assured an equal opportunity to participate in the programs and activities offered by King County.
- **Program accessibility** – The standard for ADA compliance is one of overall program accessibility: Is the program, service or activity, when viewed in its entirety, readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities?
- **Reasonable modification (also called reasonable accommodation)** – Policies, practices and procedures must be modified when necessary to avoid discrimination against people with disabilities, unless to do so would fundamentally alter the nature of the service, program or activity, or would create an undue administrative or financial burden.
- **Equally effective communication** – The county is required to ensure that applicants, participants, and members of the general public with disabilities have communication access that is equally effective as that provided to people without disabilities.

## **How can Board or Commission Staff Liaisons and members ensure accessibility?**

Many people with disabilities want to participate in their government, and they should be encouraged to participate as members of county Boards and Commissions. Equal opportunity can be best assured by including people with disabilities in planning and decision-making. Some of them may need program access assistance.

### **Here's what the Staff Liaison and Board/Commission members can do:**

- **Facility access** – Make certain that board meeting locations are accessible. This means that accessible parking or bus routes are nearby, that the path from parking or bus stops to the facility is ramped, that the doors are sufficiently wide, and that accessible restroom facilities are available. It's a good idea to scout out a facility for access ahead of time.
- **Alternate formats** – For people who are blind or who have learning disabilities, written materials must be made available upon request in accessible formats, such as large print, Braille, computer disk, or providing a reader. See OCR's fact sheet titled "Alternate Formats and Resources".
- **Telephone communications** – Use of the statewide Telecommunications Relay Service or a TTY is an appropriate means of ensuring access for people who have speech or hearing disabilities. Familiarize yourself with the relay service and use "TTY Relay: 711" on your written materials.
- **Sign language interpreters** – King County Boards and Commissions are responsible for providing interpreter services upon request. Use of a notepad and pen for written communication may be sufficient for simple conversations; however, an interpreter may be necessary where the information is complex or the exchange is lengthy, as in a board meeting.
- **Meeting notices, minutes, and other printed materials** – You are responsible for providing effective notice that your county Board or Commission is accessible and that accommodations are available upon request. This includes the following required notices on all written materials:
  - State in 14-point type that the written material is available in alternate formats upon request (often this notice is placed in the footer).
  - Note that reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities are available upon request.
  - A TTY or Relay Service number (711) next to the telephone number.

It is appropriate and helpful to mention that your meeting location is accessible. You can state "this is an accessible facility" on your meeting notices or use the International Symbol of Access:



- **Service animals** – Growing numbers of people with disabilities are using service animals (or assistance animals) such as dog guides, hearing dogs, alert dogs, therapeutic companion animals, etc. See OCR’s fact sheet titled “Commonly Asked Questions About Service Animals.”

**If I have questions about how to meet the needs of people with disabilities, what resources are available?**

Your primary resources are the individual with a disability and the Disability Compliance Specialist at the King County Office of Civil Rights & Open Government. Most people with disabilities know what works best for them and will make specific requests. In choosing an auxiliary aid or service, give primary consideration to the request by the person, unless you can show that another equally effective means of providing access is available.

Roxanne Vierra is OCR’s Disability Compliance Specialist and the county’s ADA Coordinator for access to the public. She is available to provide you with technical assistance such as interpretation and practical application of disability access laws, accommodations options and resources, and help with evaluating facilities access. OCR’s intranet website has numerous fact sheets on a variety of disability topics, and Roxanne is available to conduct staff training. If you are unclear about whether or how to provide a requested accommodation, contact her at 263-2453 or [Roxanne.Vierra@kingcounty.gov](mailto:Roxanne.Vierra@kingcounty.gov).

Technical guidance is available on the internet and through local disability organizations. See OCR’s fact sheets online at [www.kingcounty.gov/exec/CivilRights/DA.aspx](http://www.kingcounty.gov/exec/CivilRights/DA.aspx).



# KING COUNTY BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

## Code of Cooperation

- Board members are expected to attend all regularly scheduled board or commission meetings.
- Board members are expected to place their responsibility to the community above their own personal interests or beliefs.
- Board members are expected to be punctual ensuring that meetings begin on time.
- Board members are expected to come to meetings prepared and actively participate in group discussions.
- Board members must be willing to compromise and work as a team in order to reach consensus.
- Board members will strive for a collaborative work environment.
- Board members will be respectful and professional with one another, King County staff and meeting guests.
- Board members are expected to use their King County email account for conducting board business only.
- Board members are expected to value diversity and listen to one another and their ideas.
- Board members will oppose discrimination and resist stereotyping in all of its forms, as indicated in the King County Code and Executive Policies on non-discrimination and anti-harassment.
- Board members will honor this Code of Cooperation, and hold themselves and each other accountable.

## Being an Effective Board Member

Boards, Commissions and Committees are made up of highly qualified, responsible, and motivated community members. Though appointed positions, you contribute not only to the success of King County operations, but to the quality of life for all by enabling the county to maintain and improve programs and services for citizens. With such influence comes great responsibility and accountability.

Members represent the public at-large. Appointments often are made to reflect a geographic interest, an area of expertise, or to represent a special interest group or professional association. Remember, each member brings an important perspective to the table and differing points of view produce effective solutions. Keep this in mind as you work with other members.

### **As an appointed member you will be expected to:**

- Attend regularly scheduled board, commission or committee meetings, as well as to attend all subcommittee meetings you have agreed to serve on.
- Be punctual so that committee meetings start and end on time.
- Come prepared to participate in conversations and make decisions
- Place your responsibility to the community above your personal interests or beliefs.
- Prepare for your new responsibility by:
  - Reviewing agendas and minutes from recent meetings to learn what current issues have been under consideration.
  - Familiarize yourself with the documents governing your particular body such as: city ordinances, state statutes, City Council resolutions, advisory body bylaws, relevant element(s) of Comprehensive Plans and other pertinent documents or reports.
- Have a clear understanding about the process, procedure, and conduct of your particular meeting.
- Be able and willing to constructively communicate with fellow members and actively participate in group discussions.
- Be willing to compromise and work as a team in order to reach consensus.
- Board members will oppose discrimination and resist stereotyping in all of its forms, as indicated in the King County Code, and policies on non-discrimination and anti-harassment.

## **Meeting Expectations**

Members have a responsibility for the content and productivity of the meetings they attend. They should come prepared to take ownership for their contribution to the end result of the meeting. Meetings do matter. There are many ways in which members can conduct a productive and meaningful meeting.

### **A productive meeting happens when:**

- All participants arrive on time and prepared to meaningfully participate.
- There are clear ground rules that all agree to honor.
- Agendas are written and shared.
- The physical environment is comfortable and accommodating.
- State and end times are agreed upon and honored by the group.
- All participants contribute
- The meeting process allows progress of movement and focus.
- Outcome is clear to all.
- Work to be accomplished is defined and assigned.

### **Decorum in meetings:**

- Start meetings on time and keep the agenda in mind in order to give each item the appropriate time.
- Announce at the start of a meeting if the order of agenda items is to be rearranged for convenience, for response to those attending only for certain items, or for better pacing of the agenda.
- Let the Chair or presiding officer run the meeting, seek recognition before speaking. Be fair, impartial and respectful of the public, staff and each other; give your full attention with others speak.
- Because people may be attending a meeting for the first time and may be unfamiliar with your procedures, either avoid or explain technical terms or verbal shorthand.
- Listen to audience concerns and do not engage in side conversation or otherwise be distracted during public testimony; public testimony is central to the strength of democracy, and is therefore strongly encouraged.

- Active listening does not mean engaging the public in debate; response is appropriately saved for after the public testimony is closed.
- Close the public testimony before you begin serious deliberation on an issue.
- Endeavor to end meetings at a reasonable hour; short breaks may be helpful during long meetings; extending the meeting beyond an appointed hour may be subjected to a vote when that hour nears.
- Sometimes questions can most effectively focus discussion and direct decision-making. For example:

For Staff:

- What is the history behind this item? What are the benefits and drawbacks?
- What other alternatives did you consider? What would it take for you to support this? What are your concerns?
- What specific, constructive alternatives can you recommend?

For Board members:

- What are we trying to accomplish?
- What are the long-range interests of the community?
- Often you must balance multiple views, neither favoring nor ignoring one individual or group over another; your obligation is to represent a broad-based view of the community's long-range interests.
- Remember that your group exists to take action.

**The presiding officer has obligations to the group that must be achieved at meetings and should:**

- Follow the agenda
- Remain impartial
- Entertain all motions, even if he/she opposes them.
- Avoid cutting off debate arbitrarily
- Keep the debate of the assembly germane
- Keep the group informed of the motion on the floor at all times
- Maintain control and administer the rules of order.

**General Membership Procedures:**

All Board, Commissions, and Committees shall take formal minutes of their meetings and shall appoint a member to take such minutes, or such minute responsibility may be delegated to a staff support person if there is staff support person assigned to the board, commission, or committee, on a permanent basis who is always in attendance at such meetings.

Except as otherwise state in state law, all meetings of boards, commissions, or committees are open public meeting \*(See Open Public Meetings Act of 1971).

All boards, commission and committees shall establish regular dates and times for meetings, and shall consult with staff about scheduling special meetings and announcing meeting cancelations.

**Rules of Order**

The proceedings of all boards and commissions shall be governed by the most current edition of Roberts Rules of Order.



<http://www.svpa.us/watershed-improvement-district/>

Farmers, residents and businesses have long recognized that there is always too much or too little water. The purpose of the watershed improvement district is to address water needs on a system-wide basis, protect water rights, increase access to irrigation, and address drainage issues. It would address irrigation needs by enabling a more efficient method to implement movement of water rights from those who have them to those who need them. This is especially important to the growing number of small farmers who are less likely to have adequate water rights. The district would address drainage by managing regulation and infrastructure on a system-wide level, rather than parcel by parcel.

#### WID CONCEPT AND FAQ

#### WID DISTRICT MAP

This is just one of our three project areas. Click the buttons below to learn more.

#### FLOOD IMPACT EVALUATION, MONITORING, AND MITIGATION

#### ONGOING MONITORING AND COLLABORATION

## Watershed Improvement District Special Election

The special election to form the Watershed Improvement District is upon us. Ballots will be mailed Oct 26, and will be due back on Nov 24. The SVPA is hosting a community forum to educate landowners on the process to form the WID, and to provide an opportunity to learn more about the Commissioner Candidates.

**WID Community Forum**  
**Monday, November 2**  
**Sno-Valley Senior Center**  
**4610 Stephens Avenue, downtown Carnation**  
**7:00 – 8:00 p.m.**

Candidates will be on hand to answer questions. Also in attendance will be water law and district expert Attorney Bill Clarke.

Read the candidates' statements by clicking the buttons below their name.

**Jim Abram** [READ STATEMENT](#)

**David Andrews** [READ STATEMENT](#)

**Mathew Benson** [READ STATEMENT](#)

**David Casey** [READ STATEMENT](#)

**Siri Erickson-Brown** [READ STATEMENT](#)

**Patrick McGlothlin** [READ STATEMENT](#)

**Gary Remlinger** [READ STATEMENT](#)

**Jason Roetcisoender** [READ STATEMENT](#)

<http://www.svpa.us/watershed-improvement-district/>

## **Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood Advisory Committee**

### **2016 Meeting Dates**

1. **WEDNESDAY, January 13, all day meeting, exact time and location TBD**
2. **WEDNESDAY, February 10, all day meeting, exact time and location TBD**
3. **!! March meeting – Please return to the poll and fill out the new options**
4. **TUESDAY, April 19, 4:00-7:00 PM, Location TBD**

**Fish, Farm, and Flood (FFF) Advisory Committee  
Memorandum of Mutual Understanding  
May 21, 2015**

The Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood (FFF) Advisory Committee has made enormous progress over the past eighteen months, building trust and understanding among all participants. Because of the early spring in the Snoqualmie Valley, and the demands that places on the landowner representatives on the Advisory Committee, the four landowners, the King County Agriculture Commission, and Sno-Valley Tilth have formally requested that the FFF Advisory Committee suspend meetings until November 2015. At this point in the process, the stakeholders believe it is important to document areas of mutual understanding among participants, establish a work-plan for summer/fall of 2015, and lay out a timeline that will yield solution at the scale of the Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District (APD) to the policy conflicts inherent in the FFF problems identified.

**Introduction – Problem Statement**

The Snoqualmie River Valley has incredibly rich agriculture soils, highly valuable salmon habitat and reaches of river with the potential for restoration of natural floodplain processes. Within the Valley, King County has statutory responsibilities to designate and protect farmland under the Growth Management Act (GMA) and implemented through the King County Comprehensive Plan. The GMA also requires the designation and protection of critical areas, such as streams and wetlands, implemented through the county’s Critical Areas Ordinance. The County must also facilitate the restoration of salmonid habitat under the Snohomish Basin (WRIA 7) Salmon Conservation Plan, the Endangered Species Act, and more broadly under the federal Clean Water Act, which in turn drives local water quality action. Federal, state and local law also require the county to limit the impacts of and risks to development within floodplains, and give the county and the King County Flood Control District the authority to protect the public and property from flood hazards on the Snoqualmie River. At times, these distinct statutory obligations and responsibilities are in conflict and require the County to undertake flood and salmon restoration projects that temporarily or permanently remove prime agricultural soils from production, and may reduce the productive potential of adjoining agricultural lands.

The Snoqualmie River Valley represents some of the richest farmland remaining in King County and is a critical long-term agricultural resource for King County. The value of northwest agricultural land is likely to increase as climate change decreases the agricultural productivity of some other areas of the world. Over 14,500 acres of the Snoqualmie River Valley is designated as an Agricultural Production District (APD) to protect diminishing farmland in the county for long-term commercial agriculture, thereby preventing conversion to other uses. Along with the other APDs in the County, the Snoqualmie APD was designated as Agriculture Land of Long-term Commercial Significance under the GMA.

The decline in salmon and salmon habitat has significantly affected cultural and community enjoyment of the species and has resulted in severe economic impacts to the commercial and recreational fisheries economy as well. As a result of the federal listing of Chinook salmon as a threatened species, King County is obligated to take actions to protect and restore Chinook habitat

in our watersheds.<sup>1</sup> The losses of habitat due to land conversion, the removal of buffers, and alterations to our rivers and streams have been key factors in the loss of salmonids throughout the county and in the Snoqualmie river system. It is therefore critical for the county to implement habitat restoration projects in portions of each of our rivers, including within the Snoqualmie APD, which contains some of the highest quality salmon habitat and area with restoration potential in King County. Also, widespread use of vegetated buffers along the river as well as tributary creeks and ditches help manage temperature and water quality, but may reduce arable land.

King County participates in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) which results in commitments to floodplain programs and regulations. By participating in the NFIP and adopting related programs and regulations, King County reduces risks to people and infrastructure in the floodplain, and participation has made it possible for County floodplain residents to incur some of the lowest flood insurance rates in the nation. The King County Flood Control District (FCD) was formed to provide funding to protect the life and safety of residents along King County's river corridors. Increasingly, the FCD is applying a multi-objective lens to FCD projects, with support for advancing hybrid habitat restoration/levee setback approaches to capital projects. While the high-quality agricultural soils of the Snoqualmie Valley are a direct result of long-term floodplain processes, setting back levees may negatively impact some prime agricultural lands. In some circumstances habitat restoration/ floodplain management projects will result in the irrevocable loss of prime agricultural soils.

The problem at the heart of the FFF stakeholder process is that there are inherent conflicts between multiple valid societal needs within an area currently developed primarily for agricultural production and these inherent values and conflicts are in turn reflected in conflicting county policies and programs.

**Mutually Agreed Upon Principles.** The members of the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm and Flood Advisory Committee mutually agree that agricultural viability and fishery recovery efforts are limited by coinciding societal needs that cannot be fully resolved through the FFF effort. Both agriculture and salmon recovery are limited by factors well beyond the scope of the APD or the FFF effort. In an effort to document the mutual understanding the FFF Advisory committee has gained, we fully support the following principles:

1. The Committee recognizes the importance of a viable agricultural community, ecosystem and salmon recovery, and flood safety. Planning, actions, and management in the Snoqualmie Agricultural Production District (APD) should promote without priority:
  - a. Agricultural viability
  - b. Ecological restoration

---

<sup>1</sup> The federal Clean Water Act further requires "fishable, swimmable" water quality which further expands the obligation for aquatic species protection and recovery. Tribal treaty rights also shape federal and state agency actions on behalf of salmon habitat.

c. Flood safety

2. King County has a legal obligation to protect farmland, support the restoration of salmonids, and protect residents and infrastructure from flood risks and impacts.
3. The King County Flood Control District has the authority to protect life and property from flood risks and funds capital project in the Snoqualmie valley as part of its strategy to do so.
4. The prime agricultural soils encompassed by the Snoqualmie Valley APD are an irreplaceable natural resource that is important to the community and economy of King County.
5. Salmonids are an irreplaceable natural resource of high value to the community, and have profound cultural significance to the Snoqualmie and Tulalip Tribes.
6. The APD is largely within the floodplain and floodway, an area of extensive flooding and in some locations, deep and fast erosive flows. Farmers need county support in taking actions to reduce flood risk to their homes and agricultural operations in a manner that doesn't transfer risk to other property owners.
7. To meet the County's legal obligation to protect and restore salmonid habitat and protect residents and infrastructure from flood risk, at times it may be necessary to undertake projects or programs that result in the loss of farmland.
8. Losses and gains of habitat, farmland and flood risks need to be tracked and reported.
9. Buffer plantings provide multiple benefits for salmonids, including food and habitat, as well as better water quality (such as cooler temperature and reduction of pollutants reaching the stream through direct runoff). Buffers reduce the impacts of farming on water bodies, but the necessary size and composition of buffers to balance agricultural needs and constraints, salmon recovery, and water quality improvement requires additional analysis and discussion.
10. There are a limited number of available acres to substitute for the loss of high-quality long-growing season agricultural land in the APD.
11. There is no substitute for prime salmon spawning/rearing areas, especially the alluvial areas below the Raging and Tolt River confluences.
12. Both advocates for salmon recovery projects (large capital and buffers), and advocates for Snoqualmie Valley agriculture need the support and collaboration of each other for these efforts to succeed over the long-term.
13. The productivity of agricultural lands can and should be increased through capital actions as well as through potential regulatory changes.
14. Land conversion and development in upland areas has had negative effects on agriculture as well as salmon habitat on the valley floor.

**Examples of remaining questions/issues where we are still working toward solutions.**

1. How do we best achieve ecosystem and salmon habitat restoration, agricultural viability and productivity, and flood safety? Definition of specific solutions, actions, policies, etc.
  - a. How do we improve agricultural drainage (including regulatory changes) without having adverse impacts on salmon habitat and water quality?
  - b. Excluding higher elevation land adjacent to the river from buffer plantings can protect sites for important agricultural infrastructure on some farms, but doing so reduces opportunities to address elevated water temperatures.
  - c. How do we maintain and improve certain water infrastructure (pumps, gates, revetments, constructed drainage features) to improve agricultural production while advancing salmon recovery and water quality improvement efforts?
  - d. How do we strike a balance between voluntary buffer plantings and increased agricultural production?
    - a. Riparian buffer plantings may improve water temperature and salmon habitat, but they may take valuable farmland out of production.
    - b. Is there a buffer size that constitutes a “best management practice” for farm operations?
    - c. How many total acres of buffers are salmon recovery interests seeking to plant in Snoqualmie APD? What are the potential impacts to the productivity of the APD from those plantings?
    - d. What are the impacts to farmland and food safety from increased wildlife use in future buffer plantings?
  - e. What are the four year and longer-term habitat restoration goals for the APD in the larger salmon recovery community?
  - f. Habitat restoration-driven regulatory reform discussions are also taking place in the region. What is the relationship of these efforts to the Regulatory Taskforce?
  - g. What are the implications of the KCFCD Hydrologic/Hydraulic studies for FFF recommendations and large habitat restoration project design?
  - h. What is the long-term vision for agriculture in the Snoqualmie Valley APD to better inform the FFF conversation and recommendations?

## **Fish, Farm, and Flood Taskforce Next Steps/Timeline**

In the interest of keeping the FFF process moving forward and ensuring that the gains made by the participants in this process are not lost, the Advisory Committee is recommending the following Summer and Fall/Winter Work Plans:

### **Summer Work Plan**

While the full FFF Advisory Committee supports the proposal to suspend meetings for the duration of the summer and fall, in order to ensure that the summer/fall hiatus is used productively the Advisory Committee is recommending the following summer work-plan for King County staff, in collaboration with available and interested FFF Advisory Committee and community members. The objective of the summer work plan is to lay an analytical foundation that the agricultural community can use to identify key interests and desired outcomes for the FFF process, and understanding that any work advanced over the summer will need full FFF Advisory Committee review, discussion and consensus to be successful. The full FFF Advisory Committee would not reconvene before Monday, January 4, 2016.

During the summer (June to October) of 2015 King County, working with KCD, available FFF Advisory Committee and community members, will undertake the following actions:

- 1. Develop a Landowner Engagement Plan (June-Sept 2015) to be implemented in Fall/Winter 2015.** A consistent message from the Agriculture Commission, Sno-Valley Tilth, and residents of the valley is that the FFF process needs a more comprehensive approach to community engagement and informal conversations regarding the FFF work. King County will collaborate with the King Conservation District (KCD) to convene a Snoqualmie Agricultural Alliance and develop a farmer-driven, comprehensive and effective engagement plan. With support from King County, the King Conservation District will work with the Agriculture Commission, Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance (SVPA), Sno-Valley Tilth, and the Kitchen Cabinet to create an ad hoc group hereafter called the Snoqualmie Agricultural Alliance (the Alliance), which can provide support to the four FFF agricultural representatives in the adoption of agricultural positions and agreements to support the FFF process. The KCD has generously offered its assistance; however the leadership structure of the Alliance is still to be determined in conversation with the agricultural community. Because KCD is a trusted representative of the agricultural community, it is assumed that they will take the lead on convening this group. The KCD will help identify the appropriate members of the Alliance, and will begin to convene the group over the summer for discussions/action in the fall after the harvest.

The Alliance would identify and help to conduct the types of agricultural outreach and engagement during Fall/Winter 2015 that would most benefit the FFF stakeholder process.

- 2. Initial Scope for Regulatory Task Force (June-September 2015).** County staff will use the regulatory survey recently completed by King County/UW Evans School, and recommendations from the FARMS Report and the Local Food Initiative, as a starting point

to prioritize regulatory challenges to farmers, identify county staff resources for a task force, and develop a task force framework and timeline. In the near term, the UW Evans School regulatory survey will be shared with committee members when it becomes available.

The draft task force framework and timeline will be available for review by FFF Advisory Committee members by October 2015, with the goal of refining the scope and composition of the Task Force by December 2015; and before a possible December 2015 subgroup meeting of interested FFF Advisory Committee members. The Regulatory Task Force will be focused on achieving permanent, meaningful change to regulations, where appropriate, and on developing to strategies and resources by which to move forward while complying with existing regulations.

- 3. Initial Scope for Snoqualmie APD Agricultural Strategic Plan (June-September 2015).** This summer King County will develop the outline (purpose and boundaries) for a Snoqualmie APD comprehensive strategic plan and scope out how it might be developed for consideration by the agricultural community in October-December 2015. By December 2015, the County, in consultation with the Alliance, KCD, and FFF landowners, will have identified the key components, methodology, and recommended timeline to develop a strategic plan for the Snoqualmie APD. In January the FFF Advisory Committee will consider the scope in its recommendations.
- 4. Initial Scope for Buffer Task Force (June-September 2015).** This summer King County will outline a scope of work and key issues to be addressed by a Buffers Taskforce. This scope of work and timeline will be reviewed by all members of the FFF Advisory Committee, and by December 2015, the County will have a draft scope of work and timeline for consideration in the FFF Advisory Committee recommendations in January 2016.
- 5. Agricultural Crop/Soil Scientist (June – September 2015).** King County and King Conservation District staff will meet to explore options for securing the needed crop and soils technical support as unanimously supported by the Advisory Committee at its March 2015 meeting. By December 2015, staff will have developed a scope of work and description of functions/services. This position will be included for consideration in the recommendations of the FFF Advisory Committee in January 2016.

### **Fall/Winter Work Plan**

Prior to reconvening the Advisory Committee in January, working with the newly formed Alliance, select FFF Advisory Committee and community members, King County will undertake the following actions:

- 1. Snoqualmie Agricultural Alliance Landowner Engagement (October 2015 – March 2016).** The goal of convening the Alliance and of the landowner engagement process is to arrive at a broadly supported articulation of the interests of the agricultural community in the Snoqualmie APD to guide the FFF landowner representatives when the FFF process

commences again in January-March 2016. It is understood that the Alliance may not arrive at consensus on identification of priority problems and solutions during this timeframe, however additional outreach and input from the broader agricultural community will help inform FFF landowners understand the various perspectives in the valley.

- 2. H/H Studies Completion (Now-April 2016).** County staff involved in FFF will track the work and findings of the H/H (hydraulics/hydrology) studies to identify implications for Advisory Committee consideration in advance of the reconvening of the full FFF committee in January 2016. They will communicate any study findings to the FFF Advisory Committee as soon as they are made available.
- 3. Complete Lower Valley Needs Assessment (Fall 2015) & Scope Expanded Program.** Farm buildings (e.g., barns, loafing sheds, milking parlors, etc.) in the floodplain are currently subject to flooding, which can cause significant damage to infrastructure, animals, and equipment. Elevating farm structures can be very expensive, and therefore not an option for many farmers. The county has a pilot program underway to cost share (up to 87%) the design and construction costs of elevating agricultural buildings; a needs assessment is underway to better quantify the need. County staff will complete the assessment that is currently underway to identify total number of farm houses in the floodplain and the relative priority for elevating. A scope will be created for a timeline and budget for an expanded long term elevation program for existing farmhouses and farm buildings
- 4. Scope the Drain Tile Valve Concept (June – December 2015).** While drain tiles can drain water from fields, allowing for cultivation earlier in the spring, they also move water towards the river more quickly than would otherwise occur. This can reduce available subsurface water in the fields later in the summer for agriculture as well as cool water recharge of adjacent waterways. The County will work in coordination with SVPA to scope an investigation of the installation of valves on drain tiles that would allow for greater control of the drainage of agricultural fields in a manner to support agriculture and strengthening ecological functions. Valves may help ensure proper filtering, adsorption, and biological processing of nutrients that might escape the root zone. This may help to address the water quality problems frequently associated with tiles. This is an evaluation of the drain tile valve concept.
- 5. Scope Habitat Protection /Restoration Plan Update (September – December 2015).** In collaboration with the Snohomish (WRIA 7) Forum and related fisheries and aquatic habitat stakeholders, King County staff will articulate a scope of work and schedule for identifying habitat restoration and protection actions. This will incorporate efforts by multiple entities working in the Snoqualmie and will reflect a 4-year time horizon, as part of updating the Snohomish Forum's 4-Year Work plan and developing a 10-year update to the Salmon Recovery Plan.

## **Summary FFF Timeline 2015/2016**

- **June to September 2015.**
  - Work with KCD to convene Alliance and plan fall landowner engagement
  - KC develops initial scopes for taskforces, the Snoqualmie APD Agricultural Strategic Plan, and explores options for securing Crop/Soil Specialist with KCD.
- **October – December 2015 (and likely continuing through March 2016).**
  - King County, the KCD, FFF Advisory Committee landowner members and the Snoqualmie Agriculture Alliance will develop and undertake a community engagement strategy to develop Snoqualmie Valley agricultural community priorities and solutions reflective of broad agricultural input.
  - In the interest of launching some task forces as early as reasonably possible, the County will circulate to the FFF Advisory Committee via e-mail draft Task Force scopes of work. Committee members can comment on and approve these documents via e-mail, thereby allowing the County staff to begin convening meetings as soon as the proposed members are available.
- **January -March 2016.**
  - FFF Advisory Committee will work to develop a final report and recommendations building on the work to-date through spring 2015 and informed by the work of the Snoqualmie Agriculture Alliance during fall 2015. In addition to recommended capital and policy actions, the recommendations will include description of an APD Scale Annual FFF Reporting Framework.

Recommendations may also include further scopes of work to develop policy solutions and actions within the next three years. Examples of potential areas of focus are:

- Buffers Task Force (Scope/Composition/Timeline)
  - Regulatory Task Force (Scope/Composition/Timeline)
  - Strategic Plan for Snoqualmie APD (Scope/Composition/Timeline)
  - Long-term Large Capital/Buffer Plan for Snoqualmie APD (Scope/Composition/ Timeline)
- The Advisory Committee will also develop draft policy language to be considered by the County Executive and Council for inclusion in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan update that resolves current FFF-related policy conflicts in the Comprehensive Plan. King County staff may prepare draft language for consideration in advance to expedite the committee's work given the tight timeline for proposed revisions to the Comprehensive Plan in early 2016.

- **June 2016.** Adoption of King County FFF Comprehensive Plan Policies.

## **FFF Advisory Committee Members**

Lawrence Carlson, farmer & Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance  
Siri Erickson-Brown, farmer & King County Agriculture Commission  
Jarvis Keller, farmer  
Bobbi Lindemulder, farmer  
Josh Monaghan, King Conservation District  
Scott Powell, Seattle City Light and Snohomish Forum  
David Radabaugh, Department of Ecology, Floodplain management  
Cindy Spiry, Snoqualmie Tribe  
Lara Thomas, City of Duvall  
Heather Trim, Futurewise  
Micah Wait, Wild Fish Conservancy  
Jason Walker, Snoqualmie Watershed Forum Chair & City of Duvall  
Daryl Williams, Tulalip Tribes  
King County Flood Control District

<https://www.change.org/p/save-snoqualmie-valley-wa-farmland-from-gmos-roundup-and-synthetic-fertilizers>

[Petitioning Chairman, King County Council Larry Phillips](#)

## **Rescind Preliminary Decision to Sell Snoqualmie Valley 'Tall Chief' Farmland to a Confinement Dairy Company Using GMOs, Roundup, and Synthetic Fertilizers.**

[Friends of Tall Chief WA](#)



[Friends of Tall Chief  
WA](#)

3,668

Supporters

**King County, Washington is about to pass an Ordinance (2015-0423) that would sell, at a loss, publicly owned prime farmland, the ‘Jewel of the Snoqualmie Valley’, called the Tall Chief property, to the largest land owner in the Valley, Keller Dairy, a confinement dairy farm that intends to grow Roundup-Ready GMO corn using glyphosate and synthetic fertilizers to provide feed for dairy cows.**

Known as the ‘Jewel of the Snoqualmie Valley’, King County’s 190 acre “Tall Chief” Property is a unique, extremely valuable tract of farm land with rich alluvial soils and prime upland acreage with sites for processing and storage facilities.

Last year, King County issued a [Request for Proposals \(RFP\)](#) to find a suitable owner or lessee for the property that it had recently purchased for \$4,500,000 to prevent construction of 16 mini-mansions which would have destroyed this farmland forever. The County’s stated policy centered on returning this previous golf course into a sustainable farming operation using sound agricultural soil and water conservation practices while strengthening the local food economy and production.

Despite [an excellent proposal](#) from the highly respected thirty-eight year old non-profit “Seattle Tilth”, the County’s Natural Resources and Parks Department decided to sell Tall Chief for a \$3,700,000 loss to one of the largest landowners in the Snoqualmie Valley.

We support the County’s policies and requirements that were set forth in its RFP and were shocked when those were apparently ignored. Seattle Tilth already runs a myriad of programs which mirror the RFP including land for small and start up farmers, incubator training program, wash and pack facilities, Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) marketing, food distribution hub, urban farming etc.

**[Click here to see our Top 10 Reasons To Redo The RFP](#)**

**We are not discounting the importance of milk, but [Seattle Tilth’s proposal](#) to add 75 acres of local, organic vegetable production in the County would mean a huge increase in high quality, local, responsibly grown food at the doorstep of nearly four million residents. This is in sharp contrast to the dairy proposal that could jeopardize thriving nearby downriver organic farms, while providing little net increase in agricultural production.**

Please support our petition to the King County Council asking it to stop this ill-advised sale and send back the proposal for a more thoughtful consideration with local participation and guidance from the County’s own stated policies.

**Link to Documents:**

**[King County RFP \(Request for Proposals\)](#)**

[Seattle Tilth Proposal](#)

[Proposal from Keller Dairy](#)

[Criteria and Scoring for Tall Chief](#)

Letter to

**Chairman, King County Council** Larry Phillips

We urge the King County Council not to sell the Tall Chief property to a single large conventional dairy that has proposed to construct private residences and grow chemically treated GMO, Roundup ready corn on the site.

Read more

## Updates

---

1. 2 days ago

**3,000 supporters**

2. 2 weeks ago

**Friends of Tall Chief started this petition**

## Supporters

[King Co should only award the bid to entrants whose proposal meets the RFP requirements. They are set to award to someone who met NONE of the requirements. Also, property was purchased with taxpayer \\$ to better the entire community, not to benefit one rich landowner. Karen Moulton, Fall City, WA](#)

[1 week ago](#)

[I don't want more Roundup harming the salmon, steelhead and trout in the Snoqualmie River. Tim Harris, Fall City, WA](#)

[1 week ago](#)

[Using our public land to farm using toxic chemicals such as glyphosate \(found in Roundup\) does not support the health and well-being of our community and the health of our environment! It is time to ban the use of this chemical, as 36 countries have already done!](#)

[Jessa Watkins, Carnation, WA](#)

[1 week ago](#)

## Organic Farmers respond to “Save Tall Chief” petition

NOVEMBER 10, 2015 NOVEMBER 11, 2015

We are a group of organic farmers from the Snoqualmie Valley and we write in support of the review committee’s decision to sell the Tall Chief property to the Keller family. We feel that the “Save Tall Chief” petition circulating online misrepresents this situation, and we are disheartened by the divisive public attack the petitioners are making against our neighbors and fellow farmers. Below are some of the specific points we think are most important to clarify:

RFP process – We feel King County’s RFP process for Tall Chief was not perfect, and could have been improved; however, this should come as no surprise considering the complexity of the issue both within and outside of the Snoqualmie Valley. Public processes often result in the least-worst option available and most certainly any decision coming out of the RFP process was certain to cause disagreement on some level.

Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) and what it means for the change in the value of the property – King County purchased the Tall Chief property to prevent it from being developed. As a buildable property it was worth \$4.5 million dollars, but the County has since purchased the development rights so it can no longer be developed. An outside appraisal, after the development rights were purchased, valued the property between \$500-800,000. The sale of this property is being incorrectly portrayed as a giveaway or ‘loss’ for county taxpayers. The other proposals in the RFP would have paid even less to the County than the Kellers are offering, or nothing at all in the case of Seattle Tilth. (within the RFP Seattle Tilth proposes no payment ‘in lieu of public benefit.’)

GMO/Roundup issue – While this is not intended to be a defense of GMO seed or Roundup (Glyphosate) we would like to point out that King County has no reason to object to a farmer’s use of Roundup when deciding who should receive this property. King County itself uses Roundup on roadsides and highly sensitive environments along stream and riverbanks – including the Snoqualmie River. To expect the County to base the Tall Chief decision on a farmer’s use of Roundup does not makes sense.

It distresses us to see this sort of personal attack from members of our own community. For those who, like us, believe that Roundup and GMO Roundup-Ready crops are a harmful and unsustainable form of agriculture, we humbly suggest that we take a different approach toward farmers who use these products. When we encounter someone whose perspective or beliefs differ from ours, friendly, respectful relationships go much further toward building trust and keeping people open to change than do attacks in a public forum. The Kellers are long-standing members of our community, and already farm hundreds of acres in the Snoqualmie Valley. We

feel it's only appropriate to treat them with the same level of courtesy any of us would expect in return.

Finally, we want to re-iterate the message sent by the board of Sno-Valley Tilth:

*“Ultimately we believe all farmers love their land, and possess vast knowledge and important skill sets. The independent farmers who raise the food of our nation all deserve our respect. That being said, the mission of SnoValley Tilth is to support organic and sustainable food and fiber production....This “support” includes being a resource, and hopefully an inspiration, for farmers who do not currently employ these practices.”*

Signed,

Michaele Blakely, Growing Things Farm

Matt & Deanna Tregoning, Sol to Seed Farm

Siri Erickson-Brown & Jason Salvo, Local Roots Farm

Andrew Stout, Full Circle Farm

Meredith Molli & Pat McGlothlin, Goose and Gander Farm

Cathryn Baerwald, Summer Run Farm

Scott & Amy Turner, Blue Dog Farm

Kim & Ryan Lichttenegger, Steel Wheel Farm

Kate Halstead, Soil Sisters Farm

Susan & JJ Schmoll, Game Haven Farm

Sarah Cassidy, Hearth Farm

# King County Agriculture Commission DRAFT Minutes from Thursday, October 8, 2015 Watershed Science Center, Issaquah

---

Commissioners	P	A	Commissioners	P	A
Leigh Newman-Bell	X		Bob Vos	X	
Amy Holmes	X		Anne Becker		X
Meredith Molli		X			X

*P=Present; A=Absent*

Staff Present	
Kathy Creahan	Patrice Barrentine
Randy Sandin	
Committee Members	
Darron Marzolf - absent	

## Meeting Highlights with Action Items in Text Boxes

---

### Called to Order 1:30 pm

Randy opened the meeting by starting with a code primer using **21A.08.090 Resource Land Uses**

- Table A. Resource Land Uses and
- Table B. Shoreline Uses

#### Code change objectives

1. Redefine agriculture and include processing, storage, etc.
2. Get use tables in alignment
3. Simplify the process for minor land use decisions

Example: Develop alternative review process

### **21A.08.090 Resource Land Uses Proposed changes document**

From commissioners:

Amy: Considerations in horse boarding inclusion/exclusion in commercial ag

- Stormwater
- Concentrating environmental impacts
- Maintaining BMPs
- Addressing in Step 2 of the code change process

Bob: Farm parking areas don't seem to be included; access roads are, but we need gravel pads, too.

Bob: At some point, we need to discuss impervious surfaces.

Amy: Yes, and that dovetails in to clearing and grading.

To show commercial ag production

- a) Current use ag tax registration
- b) Schedule F
- c) Meet the standards of current use by showing receipts or other records (ex. farmers market sales reports).

Gray area is boarding, not breeding, raising or selling livestock for commercial sales.

To be inclusive of commercial boarding, we agree to:

**The use of land for the raising of crops or livestock and the processing of agricultural products for commercial purpose.**

"Services"

Agricultural activities

- a. Is soil, take out irrigation; **add "composting"**
- b. Processing? Separating, methane digester, fertilizer; **add "composting"** and processing
- c. D
- d. Largely water,
- e. Improved areas? Ex: Parking area; improved or changed from its original condition. **Add "parking" as example**

21A.06 add "on-farm" to support services – 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph

Ag Activities: **delete "for off-site consumption"**

Look at agritourism more: temp use permit is required for any event occurring more than twice.

Allowed up to 60 days per year allowed for temp use permit.

Randy: We can address this in the table for what is allowed or not. Allowed for small events, alternative permitting process for large events.

Bob: building and machinery doesn't sound inclusive – drainage systems, irrigation, equipment, etc. Add facilities and infrastructure?

**Use this:**

**The land, buildings, equipment and infrastructure used in the raising of crops or livestock and the production of agricultural products for commercial sales.**

***Add a g. for Agritourism – specifically education and on-farm experiences***

Adjourned 3:45pm

---

### **Next Meeting**

**Wednesday November 18th, 2015 afternoon; hold 1-5pm**

Location: TBD