

KING COUNTY AGRICULTURE COMMISSION

MEETING NOTICE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 2017

4:00 – 7:00 P.M. AT THE

SEATTLE'S PIKE PLACE MARKET, CLASSROOM

PARKING INFO: <http://pikeplacemarket.org/directions-parking>

PROPOSED MEETING AGENDA

(AGENDA ITEM TIMES ARE TENTATIVE)

4:00	Call to Order <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introductions• Approval of Agenda• Approval of Minutes (November 10th and 28th) p.3-8	Leann Krainick, Chair Pro Tem
4:10	Pike Place Market <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome• Tour of Pike Place Farm Program Areas	Ben Franz-Knight, Executive Director, Pike Place Market Leigh Newman-Bell, Zack Cook, Alisha Kissell
5:10	Pike Place Market Farm Programming in a Nutshell <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presentation• Q&A	Leigh Newman-Bell, Zack Cook, Alisha Kissell
5:30	Seattle Farmers Markets <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Stats and Policy Work with Health Department p.9-10• Q&A	Chris Curtis, Seattle Neighborhood Farmers Markets, Zack Cook, PPM
5:50	King Conservation District Regional Food Grant Program p.11 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Application and Review System• Strategic Initiatives	Mary Embleton, KCD Food Grant Program Manager
6:00	FFF Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Report edits/additions to Draft FFF Document p. 12-25• Q&A• Action (Motion/Vote)	Larry, Meredith, Siri, Bob
6:25	Ag Commission Strategic Planning for 2017 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Commissioner outreach for open positions	Patrice Barrentine and Commissioners
6:40	Public Comment	
6:45	Updates (approx. 5 min each) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• King Conservation District• Farm Bureau• KC Land Advisory Committee• Ag Program• Local Food Initiative• Commission Details	KCD Staff Bruce Elliott Leann Krainick Richard Martin Mike Lufkin Patrice Barrentine
7:00	Adjourn	

Next Meeting:

February 9th – Lake Wilderness Lodge, Maple Valley

2016 Meeting Topics Calendar

Complete	Topic	Who	When	Outcomes	
				Letter advising County Executive	Notes
✓	What's Going on with Ag in Other Counties?	Snohomish	Jan		
✓	Appoint a commissioner and an Alternate for KCD Advisory Board		Jan		
✓	New Farm King County Website	Mike Lufkin, Patrice Barrentine	Feb		
✓	Commissioner Service Recognition and Reception		Apr		
✓	Farm Fish Flood Policy for Consideration		Apr		
✓	Tour – Vashon		May		
✓	Farm Fish Flood (FFF) Agreement Presentation – Janne Kaje		Aug		
✓	Marijuana Zoning		Sept	✓	
✓	Tour – Sammamish		Oct		
✓	Ag Definition Code Changes		Oct	✓	
✓	FFF Vote on committee recommendations		Nov	✓	
	What's Going on with Ag in Other Counties?	Skagit	Fall		
	What's Going on with Ag in Other Counties?	Pierce	Fall		
	Joint Meeting with Rural Forestry Commission		2016		
	Commission Policies and Procedures: Review and Modify				
Tours to cover: Purpose of Commission, FPP, ADAP, Buffers, Salmon Recovery, Drip Irrigation, Drought, WID, Reclaimed Water, Keller Ditch, Tall Chief, Ag Regulatory Changes					



**King County Agriculture Commission
DRAFT Meeting Minutes
Thursday, November 10th, 2016
King Conservation District, Renton**

Commissioners	P	A	Commissioners	P	A	Commissioners	P	A
LeAnn Krainick, Chair Pro-Tem	X		Siri Erickson-Brown	X		Leigh Newman-Bell	X	
Amy Holmes, Vice Chair Pro-Tem	X		Shelby Jors	X		Larry Pickering	X	
Roger Calhoon		X	Meredith Molli	X		Bob Vos	X	
Bruce Elliott		X	Eldon Murray	X				

P=Present; A=Absent

County Staff Present			
Patrice Barrentine, DNRP	Michael Lufkin, DNRP	Megan Moore, DNRP	John Taylor, DNRP
Joan Lee, DNRP	Richard Martin, DNRP	April Sanders, KCC	

Guests Present		
Sylvia Berndt, Enumclaw FFA	Bea Covington, KCD	Josh Monaghan, KCD
Kendra Bertrand, Enumclaw FFA	Jarvis Keller, Sno Valley Tilth	Courtney Naumann, KCD
Liz Clark, KCD	Bobbi Lindemulder	Libby Reed, SVT

Meeting Action Summary

- **Approval of October 2016 Meeting Minutes**
- **Welcome to Enumclaw FFA**
- **Recommendation for King County Farmland**
- **Comprehensive Plan Hearing & Remlinger 4:1 Proposal Update**
- **Farm Fish Flood (FFF) Draft Agreement Discussion**
- **Next Meeting: December 8th, 2016 at Pike Place Market, Seattle**

Meeting Called to Order at 4:08 pm

Approval of Meeting Agenda

LeAnn Krainick suggested switching the FFF agenda item to occur after the scheduled break, with the KC Farmland and Comp Plan items instead to precede the break. Bob Vos motioned to approve the amended agenda as suggested. Meredith Molli seconded the motion, which passed by full acclamation.

Approval of Prior Meeting Minutes

Bob Vos motioned to approve the October 13th, 2016 meeting minutes. Leigh Newman-Bell seconded the motion, which passed by full acclamation.

Public Comment

Two high school students from Enumclaw FFA spoke about their proposed goal of the city of Enumclaw becoming a participating entity with the King Conservation District (KCD). They added they would like to make a formal presentation on this project to the Commission in December 2016 and/or January 2017.

Recommendation for King County Farmland – Land Committee

Richard Martin of DNRP summarized a proposal on criteria to determine new and existing lands' potential place in the County's portfolio, and the County's role in leasing these lands to potential farmers. The two criteria agreed upon by the Land Committee were: 1) provide a launching pad for beginning farmers; and 2) ensure all suitable County lands are farmed to maximum potential. A third possibility, not specifically recommended by the Committee, was to create a broad partnership of County, non-profit, and other entities to network farmers with potential lands. He noted the Committee and County do not generally favor County fee ownership of land, except as reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the Commission.

Mr. Martin added that a long-term goal of the proposed partnership is to ensure farmers are successful by networking them with land pieces an appropriate size to be economically viable. This sparked a discussion about possible subdivision of larger parcels to reach a certain size, and a perception/concern among Commissioners that terms in the County's Farmland Preservation Program (FPP) favoring consolidation of parcels conflict with the subdivision idea. Patrice Barrentine of DNRP recommended DNRP's FPP program staff speak to the Commission in December to clarify this issue, particularly in regards to the recently-consolidated Sinnema property. Amy Holmes stated she believed the ultimate driver of this discussion was for farmland to remain farmland regardless of parcel size.

Ms. Barrentine said the Land Committee supports the idea of the County playing a role of "matchmaker" or "broker" to facilitate transition of land to new farmers, and is asking the Commission to support this recommendation. LeAnn Krainick added that the County Executive's land conservation initiative increases urgency to implement this process: that in some cases the most time-economic path to save farmland may be for the County to purchase a piece of land then make a determination on a course of action for it at a later time. She also noted that acquiring conservation funding from entities like the Nature Conservancy or Forterra would also require the County to play an intermediary role.

Bob Vos recommended clarifying the meaning of "ownership" in the proposed language, to specifically refer to keeping existing County farmland ownership. There was additional discussion on leasing property at market rates and the County's need to fulfill its "equity and social justice" requirements in this process.

Meredith Molli motioned to support the Land Committee's recommendation with Mr. Vos's suggestion incorporated. Siri Erickson-Brown seconded the motion, which passed by full acclamation.

Comprehensive Plan Hearing/Remlinger 4:1 Proposal Update – John Taylor

John Taylor of DNRP reported the King County Council (KCC) would convene a hearing to adopt the KC Comp (Comprehensive) Plan on December 5th, with a public hearing to precede on November 28th.

He spoke in more detail about a piece of the plan, the Remlingers' 4:1 proposal to develop property directly adjacent to the city of Carnation and the Snoqualmie Valley APD. Under the proposal, out of 25 total acres, five would be developed, and the other 20 added to the County's portfolio as "open space." This was not preferred by the County, Mr. Taylor said, as 4:1 land must remain open space forever, and never be used as farmland. The County also did not wish for a fee purchase of the land. He said their goal is to conserve the land, and their preference is to own the development rights, and the Remlingers lease it as farmland.

April Sanders of KC Councilmember Kathy Lambert's office advised the "worst case scenario" on the 4:1 would be, should new information come to the KCC's attention, a vote before they recess on December 12th. She affirmed that while the city of Carnation had passed an ordinance in favor of the 4:1, the Remlingers appeared to be considering a transfer of development rights (TDR) instead.

BREAK

FFF Draft Agreement – Commissioners Only (Closed Discussion)

LeAnn Krainick asked the Commission as a whole if they generally supported the spirit and intent of the proposed Farm Fish Flood (FFF) draft agreement as presented in the report document before them. Larry Pickering and Bob Vos advised they would vote against the current draft, as there were several issues they did not believe had been adequately addressed in it. Meredith Molli also voiced reservations.

Siri Erickson-Brown, who served as Commission designee in FFF, said she fully supported the action item agreements that emerged from the FFF process, and encouraged fellow Commissioners to do likewise. She believed the agriculture caucus achieved the best results possible with the means provided, but there was a missed discussion on how the County would manage the agricultural land base in the Snoqualmie Valley, and balance its needs with fish recovery. She reiterated a concern that implementation of the FFF process had removed regulatory language protecting land in the SV APD from outside developers or restoration projects. There had been caucus discussion about a “cap” on the total land removed from agricultural use for projects, but she did not believe the current FFF implementation timeline placed enough urgency on this concern. She strongly urged the Commission to make this issue a top priority going forward.

Several questions sparking lengthy discussion were raised concerning the uncertain nature and purpose of the next phase of FFF, “FFF 2.0,” and specific issues that individual Commissioners wished to see addressed in the agreement. Amy Holmes and Ms. Krainick presented a draft letter for Commission review, with a purpose of stating to the County the Commission’s general support for the spirit of the agreement, but also noting their specific concerns. Ms. Holmes stressed this letter was not intended as blanket approval of the agreement, but an urgent opportunity for the Commission’s voice to be relevant in the FFF 2.0 process.

Bob Vos recommended four concerns to include in the letter: 1) concrete definition of “wins” (progress) for agriculture to match those of the fish community; 2) a definitive list of farm-friendly caucus members for FFF 2.0; 3) a to-be-determined security mechanism to assure “bundled” priorities for the three caucuses move forward together; and 4) fair and balanced representation and implementation for “pilot programs” like drainage and alluvial fans. Commissioners voiced general consensus to include these concerns in the letter. John Taylor advised that further negotiation on some of these concerns could forestall completing work for FFF 2.0, but noted the Commission needs to be comfortable with the document. He also advised any requested changes to the agreement would be best circulated for discussion as specifically worded language in a document. This discussion, he said, could either occur through email or a meeting.

Prolonged discussion followed on what the specific security mechanism in #3 above should be. Due to time constraints, Mr. Vos suggested holding a special meeting between tonight and next scheduled Commission meeting to continue this discussion. Patrice Barrentine proposed a three-hour meeting where the present document was reviewed line by line, with a focus on a mechanism to enforce bundling. Several staff from non-county entities were suggested for inclusion in the meeting to assist. The Commissioners present agreed to convene this meeting on November 28th from 9:00 am to 12:00 pm in the Snoqualmie Valley.

Updates – Commission Details

- **KCD, Farm Bureau, Agriculture Program:** These updates were tabled due to lack of time.
- **Commission Details:** Patrice Barrentine reported Anne Becker had resigned from the Commission, effective immediately.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:20 pm

Next Meeting

Thursday, December 8th, 2016 at 4:00 pm
Pike Place Market, Seattle

**King County Agriculture Commission
Special Meeting Minutes (DRAFT)
Monday, November 28th, 2016
Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance, Carnation**

Commissioners	P	A	Commissioners	P	A	Commissioners	P	A
Leann Krainick, Chair Pro-Tem	X		Siri Erickson-Brown	X		Leigh Newman-Bell	X	
Amy Holmes, Vice Chair Pro-Tem	X		Shelby Jors	X		Larry Pickering	X	
Roger Calhoon		X	Meredith Molli	X		Bob Vos	X	
Bruce Elliott	X		Eldon Murray		X			

P=Present; A=Absent

County Staff Present		
Patrice Barrentine, DNRP	Joan Lee, DNRP	April Sanders, KCC

Guests Present		
Cindy Alia, CAPR	Lee Grumman, City of Carnation	Matt Tregoning
Hannah Cavendish-Palmer, SVT	Cynthia Krass, SVPA	Dennis West, farmer
Matthew Distler, Oxbow Farm	Josh Monaghan, KCD	

Meeting Action Summary

- **Farm Fish Flood (FFF) Draft Agreement Discussion**
- **Updates: King Conservation District, Snoqualmie Watershed Improvement District**
- **Next Meeting: December 8th, 2016 at Pike Place Market, Seattle**

Meeting Called to Order at 9:00 am

Approval of Meeting Agenda

The agenda was modified and approved by unanimous acclamation.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Farm Fish Flood (FFF) Draft Agreement – Commission, SVT/SVPA/KCD/County Staff

The Commission continued discussion on this topic from the prior regular meeting on November 10th, 2016. Lengthy dialogue involved detailed review of a draft letter by Siri Erickson-Brown, stating general Commission support for the Agreement but also voicing key reservations to its current draft. Most suggestions addressed specific language revisions to the letter.

Amy Holmes stressed this letter should focus on clarifying specific Commission concerns, not making requests. She added that a listed point in the draft letter requesting urgent King County Council (KCC) attention to agriculture code updates in the current Comp Plan cycle may be redundant, as it was decided at

October's Commission meeting that she and Patrice Barrentine would draft a separate Commission letter on that topic. After further discussion, consensus favored leaving this point to be addressed by the forthcoming letter drafted by Ms. Holmes and Ms. Barrentine, as this would emphasize the remaining points in the current letter.

BREAK

FFF Draft Agreement, Continued – Commission, SVT/SVPA/KCD/County Staff

The Commission continued review and revision of the Agreement draft support letter. Siri Erickson-Brown voiced a concern there was insufficient time to finalize and vote on this letter in a full Commission meeting. LeAnn Krainick suggested Patrice Barrentine work up a new draft for approval, to which Ms. Barrentine agreed and proposed that one or two Commissioners be designated to issue final approval on the letter. Bob Vos made a motion to approve the letter as written, contingent on the addition of "bridge" language to be crafted by Ms. Erickson-Brown and Ms. Barrentine, with the final letter to be signed by Ms. Krainick. Larry Pickering seconded the motion, and the Commission approved it unanimously.

April Sanders of KCC member Kathy Lambert's office re-raised a suggestion from earlier in the meeting about a possible proposed amendment to this year's King County Comprehensive Plan, to clarify language in the draft Plan's Appendix A addressing the intended geographical scope of the Snoqualmie Valley FFF process. She said Councilmember Lambert's office would be willing to draft and sponsor the proposed amendment, but Ms. Sanders did not believe it would receive votes at KCC without official support from the Commission. This support would need to come by the next Monday to ensure a 2016 vote. Ms. Barrentine advised this support would need to occur through action at today's meeting, and could not be done through phone or email. Mr. Vos made a motion, seconded by Mr. Pickering, that a revision to the draft of Appendix A be finalized by Amy Holmes on behalf of the Commission. The motion carried unanimously.

The discussion shifted to review of the language in the FFF Advisory Committee Final Report, beginning with Ms. Erickson-Brown and Mr. Vos's recommended revisions. Commissioners offered many further suggestions, all noted by Ms. Barrentine, for new or revised language.

Joan Lee of DNRP advised that the County would relay to FFF participants the Commission's strong support for the Advisory Committee's work and the Commission's concerns about bias in the draft of the Final Report. She said there would be an email to FFF participants, giving the opportunity to weigh in on the Commission's proposed revisions to the Report. She proposed this review could be completed by the New Year. She requested the Commission consider signing an agreement approving the Committee Action Recommendations, to help progress in the ongoing FFF process.

Several issues with the Report were raised that Commissioners believed require further work: proposed composition of the FFF 2.0 Committee and task forces, a mechanism to enforce "bundled" progress of each FFF caucus's priorities, and ensuring follow-through of proposed pilot projects. Mr. Vos suggested forming a subcommittee to assist County staff to find a solution to those issues prior to next Commission meeting. Meredith Molli, Ms. Erickson-Brown, Mr. Vos, and Mr. Pickering volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

Updates – King Conservation District, Snoqualmie Watershed Improvement District

- **King Conservation District (KCD):** Josh Monaghan reported a possible future settlement of a KCD-involved legal case could provide funds for agriculture strategic planning at a County level; more information is forthcoming. He also noted KCD is working with Joan Lee and DNRP on a grant project to clearly define the concept of "farmability." The rough draft of this work, he said, is ready to send to local farmers for review.
- **Snoqualmie Watershed Improvement District:** Cynthia Krass reported the District's new water bank is up and running, and seeking Snoqualmie Valley farmers in search of water rights for 2017. She advised interested parties to contact her for further information.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:45 pm

Next Meeting

Thursday, December 8th, 2016 at 4:00 pm
Pike Place Market, Seattle

Neighborhood Farmers Markets - 2015 Report

		West Seattle	Columbia City	Lake City	Magnolia	Capitol Hill	Phinney	All 7 Markets
Year Opened	1993	1999	1998	2002	2003	2005	2007	-
Market Location	University Way between NE 50th & NE 52nd, 98105	California Ave SW & SW Alaska, 98116	S Edmunds between 36th & 37th, 98118	NE 125th & 28th Ave NE, 98125	33rd Ave W & W. McGraw, 98199	Corner of B'way and E. Pine at SCC, 98122	Phinney Neighborhood Assoc. 67th & Phinney N, 98103	-
Number of Weeks Open	52	52	24	17	20	51	18	234
Day of Week	Saturday	Sunday	Wednesday	Thursday	Saturday	Sunday	Friday	-
Hours Open Each Day	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	-
Time of Day	9am - 2pm	10am - 2pm	3 - 7pm	3 - 7pm	10am - 2pm	11am - 3pm	3 - 7pm	-
Shopper Count	177,874	122,757	55,964	27,491	36,189	85,806	23,609	529,690
Avg Shopper Count Per Market Day	3,421	2,361	2,332	1,617	1,905	1,683	1,312	-

Economic Impact

Vendor Sales	\$ 4,084,060	\$ 1,826,441	\$ 847,918	\$ 357,264	\$ 455,524	\$ 1,535,566	\$ 311,425	\$9,418,198
Average Vendor Sales per Day	\$1,187	\$898	\$787	\$803	\$794	\$823	\$677	-
Number of Vendor Stalls for the 2015 season	3,441	2,035	1,078	445	574	1,867	460	9,900
Average Number of Vendors per Day	66	39	45	26	29	37	26	-

Total number of vendors who sold in 2015: 177 (105 farmers, 8 fishers, 2 foragers, 42 processors, 20 prepared food vendors)

Number of full-time employees represented by all market Vendors: 521

Number of seasonal or part-time employees represented by all market Vendors: 1,033

Total Acres of Farmland Owned or Leased: 9,307 Total Acres in Production for FMs: 3,535 (Row Crops: 1200 Pasture: 3551 Orchard: 919)

SNAP Dollars (EBT/ Food Stamps) spent at the markets	\$43,408	\$16,687	\$19,954	\$7,830	\$1,110	\$34,591	\$2,862	\$126,442
Fresh Bucks (Produce Bonus Program for SNAP shoppers)	\$26,832	\$11,874	\$14,320	\$6,078	\$598	\$25,894	\$2,336	\$87,932
Food Bank donations (pounds)	11,800	400	9,151	998	1,376	15,401	1,569	40,695
WIC Farmers Market Nutrition Program Checks*	\$1,008	\$2,404	\$11,244	\$9,080	\$60	\$1,052	\$1,016	\$25,864
Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program Checks*	\$8,752	\$4,736	\$33,232	\$6,640	\$524	\$4,504	\$3,792	\$62,180
Helping Harvest Vouchers*	\$3,585	\$3,674	\$1,504	\$512	\$40	\$698	\$74	\$10,087

Food Access Total ⁹**\$393,488**

2015	University District	West Seattle	Columbia City	Lake City	Magnolia	Broadway	Phinney	All 7 Markets
Community Building & Shopper Education								
Volunteers Helping with each Market	1	special event vols included in total for all seven markets	1	2	3	special event vols included in total for all seven markets	6	66*
Volunteer Hours	100		15	49	54		4	699*
<i>**Total volunteer hours include on-site market volunteers and Board of Directors, fundraiser, office volunteers, etc.</i>								
Booth spaces provided to Community Non-Profits	53	46	62	17	2	90	23	293

***Terms:**

WIC/Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program Checks: Redeemable by WIC clients/low-income Seniors at Farmers Markets for fresh produce.

Helping Harvest Vouchers: Vouchers for food bank clients to purchase food at the Farmers Market.

Food donated to food banks: At the end of each market day, vendors donate food to local neighborhood food banks.

Community Non-Profit Partnerships

The Farmers Markets provide a forum for the community to meet, interact and learn. In 2015 the NFM provided tabling space for local groups, listed below:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| AlertSeattle | NEST |
| Beacon Ave Food Bank | North Helpline |
| BeatWalk | Odessa Brown WIC clinic |
| Bike Curious | Office of Emergency Management |
| Bike Works | ORCA School Garden |
| Capitol Hill CHAMPIONS | PCC TASTE Mobile |
| Seattle City Light Green Up | PNA Tool Library |
| Clean Greens | Public Health WIC table |
| Columbia City Medical Clinic, Neighborcare | Rainier Valley Food Bank |
| Community Day School | Reading Partners |
| Master Composters/Seattle Tilth | Safe Futures Youth Center |
| Design in Public | Salmon Safe/Stewardship Partners |
| Education First | SCCC |
| FIUTS | SDOT |
| Fred Hutch Vaccine Trials Unit | SE Seattle Youth and Fam Svcs |
| Gateway Project in Columbia City | Seattle Restaurant Week |
| Girl Scouts | Seattle Subway |
| GPHomestay/Seattle Lutheran HS | Seattle U |
| Greenwood Library | Sound Transit |
| Greyhound Pets | St Mary's Food Bank |
| Guide Dogs | St Matthew School |
| Health Care for All - WA | Sustainable Capitol Hill |
| HUGO HOUSE poetry booth | Transportation Choices Coalition |
| Jewish Family Services | University District Food Bank |
| KC Metro | U-District Square |
| King Conservation District | UHC Community/WA Medicaid |
| Lake City Medical Clinic (Neighborcare) | U-Loo |
| Library | Group Health WIC Clinic |
| Lifelong - Chicken Soup Brigade | West Seattle Library |
| Lyons Club | WSECU |
| Master Gardeners | YMCA |
| Metro - ORCA | |
| Nature Conservancy | |
| Navos | |
| Neighbor Care Health at 45th St. | |

KCD Regional Food System Grant Program Targeted Outreach for 2017

We're interested in hearing from you!

In carrying out the Regional Food System Grant Program, KCD aims to increase both local farm productivity and strengthen local food market opportunities through investing in projects that meaningfully contribute to economic viability in the local food system.

In developing the Regional Food System Program in 2015, KCD staff actively engaged with regional planning efforts of the King County Kitchen Cabinet, and sought out and received input from over 50 food system practitioners on priority needs for a robust and comprehensive regional food economy.

Both helped develop a community-based, competitive grant process and identify Early Action projects that addressed priority issues raised throughout the community.

- Actions identified in regional planning goals and by numerous stakeholders
- Critical early steps toward meeting regional food system economic goals
- Clearly defined as a specific project or activity, and
- Could be accomplished by KCD staff or through contracted work.

Early Action projects specifically addressed infrastructure gaps, local institutional food purchasing (LIFT), increasing food access through expanded SNAP/EBT benefits at farmers markets, model farm cooperative, one-stop-shop for farm services support, and food systems metrics project.

In anticipation of our 2017 grant cycle, KCD staff are again seeking input from a broad diversity of local food system participants to identify issues that help us evaluate our program, better understand stakeholder participation in the regional food system, and inform our future direction. Out of this process, we will look for strategic initiatives that address multiple stakeholder needs, and leverage stakeholder input for greater impact.

Mary Embleton

Manager-Regional Food System Grant Program

1107 SW Grady Way, Suite 130 Renton, WA 98057

(425) 282-1958 Fax: (425) 282-1898 | Mary.Embleton@kingcd.org | www.kingcd.org

<image001.jpg>

Local Food, Healthy Forests, Clean Water

11/29/16
R-650a - FFF

cmj

Sponsor: Lambert

Proposed No.: 2016-0155

1 **AMENDMENT TO ATTACHMENT A TO PROPOSED ORDINANCE 2016-0155,**
2 **VERSION 2**

3 **Chapter 3, Rural Areas and Natural Resource Lands:**

4 On page 3-52, beginning on line 2185, strike lines 2185 through 2199, and insert

5 "R-650a **The Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District is the first**
6 **Agricultural Production District to undergo a watershed planning effort**
7 **called for in R-650. King County shall implement the recommendations of**
8 **the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm and Flood Advisory Committee. The**
9 **recommendations of the task forces and other actions identified in the final**
10 **Advisory Committee Report and Recommendations will form the basis for a**
11 **watershed planning approach to balance fish, farm and flood interests**
12 **across the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District and an**
13 **agreement on protecting a defined number of acres of agricultural land. The**
14 **Advisory Committee, or a successor committee, will monitor progress of the**
15 **task forces and will reconvene to evaluate the watershed planning approach**
16 **to balancing interests prior to the next Comprehensive Plan Update. The**
17 **policy issues and recommendations outlined in the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm,**
18 **Flood Advisory Committee Report and Recommendations are largely**
19 **specific to the Snoqualmie Valley and are not intended to be applied broadly**
20 **in other Agricultural Production Districts. Future Fish, Farm, Flood efforts**
21 **focused in other Agricultural Production Districts will need to go through**
22 **their own processes to identify barriers to success for all stakeholders in**
23 **these geographic areas. R-649 continues to apply to the Snoqualmie Valley**
24 **Agricultural Production District until the watershed planning effort outlined**
25 **in the Fish, Farm and Flood recommendations is complete. A policy**
26 **reflecting the outcome of this effort shall be included in the next four-year**
27 **cycle Comprehensive Plan Update."**

28

29 **EFFECT: Refines policy R-650a (related to ongoing Farm Fish Flood work) to make**
30 **it clear that the Snoqualmie Valley FFF work will not apply to other APDs. The**
31 **amendment would change the policy from the substitute version as follows**
32 **(strikethrough formatting is included for illustrative purposes only):**

33 R-650a The Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District is the first Agricultural
34 Production District to undergo a watershed planning effort called for in R-650.
35 King County shall implement the recommendations of the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm
36 and Flood Advisory Committee. The recommendations of the task forces and
37 other actions identified in the final Advisory Committee Report and
38 Recommendations will form the basis for a watershed planning approach to
39 balance fish, farm and flood interests across the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural
40 Production District and an agreement on protecting a defined ~~((amount))~~ **number**
41 **of acres** of agricultural land. The Advisory Committee, or a successor committee,
42 will monitor progress of the task forces and will reconvene to evaluate the
43 watershed planning approach to balancing interests prior to the next
44 Comprehensive Plan Update. **The policy issues and recommendations**
45 **outlined in the Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood Advisory Committee Report**
46 **and Recommendations are largely specific to the Snoqualmie Valley and are**
47 **not intended to be applied broadly in other Agricultural Production Districts.**
48 **Future Fish, Farm, Flood efforts focused in other Agricultural Production**
49 **Districts will need to go through their own processes to identify barriers to**
50 **success for all stakeholders in these geographic areas.** R-649 continues to
51 apply to the Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District until the watershed
52 planning effort outlined in the Fish, Farm and Flood recommendations is
53 complete. A policy reflecting the outcome of this effort shall be included in the next
54 four-year cycle Comprehensive Plan Update.

Snoqualmie FFF Committee
Draft Minutes
1/10/2017, 1:30-5:30
SnoValley Tilth's office, Carnation

Commissioners	P	A	Commissioners	P	A
Larry Pickering	X		Bob Vos	X	
Meredith Molli	X		Siri Erickson-Brown		X

P=Present; A=Absent

Staff Present	
John Taylor	Patrice Barrentine
Joan Lee	April Sanders, CM Lambert's Office
Committee Members	
Hannah Cavendish-Palmer	Melissa Borsting

Summary

- The committee reached agreement on all edits* and will be presenting the info the full commission for a vote Thursday 1/12/2017
- Many of the edits will be submitted by the county as grammatical or balanced language improvements including
 1. changing the name of the buffer task force to match the regulatory task force and reduce language bias
 2. changing the name of the drainage project to “accelerating agricultural drainage progress” and reduce language bias
- **2 major topics will be taken back to the FFF Task Force for inclusion:**
 1. Commission’s version explaining **bundling** including:
 - a “mechanism” for evaluation (timeline)
 - a “trigger” (a letter by the concerned caucus to DNRP Director with copies to Executive and Council), and
 - a “restart” (resuming the normal process once progress in all areas is balanced).
 2. Make-up of 2.0 committee including:
 - **Ag organizations to be invited***
 - Equal number of fish/farm caucus representation on the committee, task forces and pilot projects (unless mutually agree upon)
 - Total number of committee members (15) including up to five farm/fish/ex officio members

*Bob Vos and John Taylor will be meeting with DNRP Director, Christie True to discuss inclusion of CAPR to the ag organizations list hopefully before this Thursday.

Snoqualmie Fish, Farm, Flood Advisory Committee DRAFT FINAL REPORT



August 2016



Ag Commission's Revision

1.12.2017

Balanced Implementation and Critical Sequencing Over Three-year Timeframe

As described in Committee Findings (above), a core guiding principle of the Committee's recommendations is the need to achieve tangible gains for all three F's (fish, farm, flood) over time. Bundling, i.e. future concurrent progress in the three areas has been a topic of intense discussion and has been agreed to by the FFF committee as necessary to maintain trust and fairness. Work will be required by all interests to ensure concurrency, and ideally the concurrent progress will occur naturally, given the trust and mutual awareness that is in place. However, certainty of effective bundling requires mechanisms for evaluation (ensuring that concurrency is occurring), a "trigger" (a letter by the concerned caucus to DNRP Director with copies to Executive and Council as described in next paragraph), and a "restart" (resuming the normal process once progress in all areas is balanced).

The evaluation of progress in each area will be the responsibility of the corresponding caucus. Each caucus should first discuss any concerns with the entire committee, but if that is not satisfactory, the caucus as a last resort may trigger County DNRP involvement by notifying the Director of the Department of Natural Resources and Parks of the missed milestone, with copies to the County Executive and Council. The Director will be responsible for working with the committee to achieve fair concurrent progress. Restart of the normal process will be agreed to by the Director, the concerned caucus and the whole advisory committee.

The milestones for these bundled recommendations were captured in the timeline exercise described below. The timeline will serve as the initial dashboard to be used by the Fish, Farm and Flood Implementation Advisory Committee in its semi-annual evaluation of progress.

Recommended next steps and progress reporting

Next generation FFF Committee

Through working together for two and a half years, the Committee has built trust between individuals and entities, despite differences in interests and perspectives. The Committee recommended that the County establish a next-generation FFF committee to serve a 3 year term and to provide support and accountability for the implementation phase of these recommendations. The next generation FFF committee should select the chair of the committee. The Committee fully recognized that the list of proposed actions, task forces and studies is ambitious.

Going forward, fish, farm and flood representatives must remain engaged to provide review, advice and support in the form of personnel for the next-generation committee, three task forces, and pilot program teams. In order to promote upfront certainty of accountability, fair representation and bundled progress for all interests, the following committee organization is planned.

The next-generation committee should consist of equal representatives from fish and farm for ten members, plus up to five ex officio members, for a total of fifteen members. These organizations will be invited to participate in the 2.0 committee, task forces, or pilot projects. Each caucus, task force and pilot project will have an equal number of representatives unless mutually agreed upon by the 2.0 committee. Each organization will choose a representative and an alternate for their seat(s). Since some of these organizations have multiple missions, they commit each representative to a specific caucus.

The farm caucus will invite the following organizations:

- Agriculture Commission (appoint one commissioner and farmer(s)/landowner(s) to round out the caucus if other orgs can't fill seats)
- King Conservation District
- Snoqualmie Watershed Improvement District
- Farm Bureau
- CAPR
- Sno-Valley Tilt
- Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance
- Farmland (PCC or American Farmland Trust, Office of Farmland Preservation, Conservation Futures Tax)

Comment [BP1]: COMMISSION and John have committed to having Bob will be meeting with DNRP Director to discuss asap.

- WA State Department of Agriculture

These members have significant expertise and representation in the diverse components of agricultural needs and methods, community involvement, land use, property rights, and legislation/regulation. All these components are needed within the farm caucus to develop effective solutions and to obtain acceptance of the results.

The fish caucus will invite the following organizations:

- Futurewise*
- Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust
- Puget Sound Partnership
- Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum*
- Snoqualmie Tribe*
- Snoqualmie Watershed Forum*
- Sound Salmon Solutions
- Stewardship Partners
- The Nature Conservancy
- Tulalip Tribes*
- Washington State Department of Ecology*
- Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Wild Fish Conservancy*

* denotes member of current Committee

King County will initiate semi-annual reporting, beginning in 2017, for progress by the County and fish/farm/flood representatives. Approximately monthly meetings are expected, with possible special additional meetings. The formation of ad-hoc short-term subcommittees may also be expected.

Proposed ex officio membership, but not limited to:

- Individual farmers (see note above)

- King County Departments/Divisions
- King County Flood Control District*
- Washington State Department of Agriculture
- Washington State Department of Ecology*
- Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife

* denotes member of current Committee

As discussed above, the new committee will use the initial implementation timeline as a dashboard for evaluating overall progress. The committee will pay particular attention to the rate and balance of progress on those recommendations that were explicitly “bundled” as part of the final agreement. If the group finds that key milestones are not being met, the County will look to the committee to make specific recommendations for corrective measures to regain the intended balance.

King County should initiate semi-annual reporting to the new committee beginning in 2017 to provide updates on implementation progress. More frequent meetings may be advisable from time to time. The formation of ad-hoc groups for short-term committee work may also be advisable.

Funding for implementation

Implementing details of the planned progress will require the commitment of staff and financial resources from the County, the Flood Control District, representative organizations and external funding sources. The King County WLR Division has taken early actions in preparation for the 2017-2018 biennium, such as requesting funding for a new regulatory specialist for the agriculture team, securing grants for modeling and projects, and drainage assistance in collaboration with the King Conservation District.

Funding may be helped by the visible consensus already achieved within the broad Committee which included diverse interests, and in particular both farmers and tribes. The next steps must keep in mind that the Snoqualmie Valley is not the only place where tensions exist between agriculture and habitat restoration, and further progress in these areas will have impacts which are at least county wide. The next-generation committee and County must work with private and public organizations, including state and federal government, in seeking necessary support and funding. Funding should be secured for non-government organizations that may need stipends to participate.

New avenues for funding may emerge from the fact that the recommendations in this report were reached by consensus within a Committee that includes diverse interests - and in particular includes both farmers and tribes. The

Snoqualmie Valley is by no means the only place where tensions between habitat restoration and agriculture exist, and the Committee is proud of the hard-won progress that is captured in these recommendations.

The Committee recommends that the County, with support and participation from Committee members, craft multi-objective project packages for funding by State and Federal programs, or directly by the State Legislature. In particular, the Floodplains by Design program, administered by the Department of Ecology in collaboration with the Puget Sound Partnership and The Nature Conservancy, is a promising avenue for funding ambitious multi-objective efforts in floodplain areas.

Committee members and their respective organizations will also commit to leveraging their own resources wherever possible, and to support the County as it takes the lead in implementing these recommendations and advocating for funding to do so.

Committee members also pledge to support the County as it initiates outreach to elected officials, the general public, partner organizations and landowners about committee findings and ongoing implementation. What we have achieved here is unique and important. It is our shared responsibility to sustain the trust that has been generated at the Committee table through dialogue and deepen that trust through action.

ORIGINAL

FFF DRAFT AGREEMENT REPORT

Balanced Implementation and Critical Sequencing Over Three-year Timeframe

As described in Committee Findings (above), a core guiding principle of the Committee's recommendations is the need to achieve tangible gains for all three F's (fish, farm, flood) over time. While each F needs to have tangible gains in the near term (3 year timeline), many of the ultimate goals will take far longer than three years to accomplish, making a timely balance of effort and progress challenging. The emphasis on a three year timeframe helps show progress of implementation and provides an opportunity for a robust review of progress at the end of that period.

However, the types of actions that are most important to each F will develop differently over time. For example, implementing a large capital project to restore salmon habitat (recommendations #17-18) takes many years of planning and design, but ultimately results in significant ecological improvement at the time of construction and the years that follow. In some cases, such as when farmed land is within the project footprint, farm land may be permanently removed from production as a result.

In contrast, actions that are most important to farming, such as exploring options for decreasing flood peaks (recommendation #1), working toward a more comprehensive drainage services program (recommendation #21) and trying to resolve regulatory issues associated with drainage (recommendation #22 and Regulatory Task Force) are incremental steps toward the ultimate outcomes of greater flood safety and the regulatory flexibility associated with a more predictable and less costly system of drainage maintenance. Thus, achieving "balanced" progress over time is not as simple as it sounds.

At its final meeting in spring 2016, the Committee worked on drafting an initial timeline for some of the recommendations to illustrate how actions might be sequenced during the first three years. While not all recommended actions were included on the timeline (due to meeting time constraints), the following guidance emerged from the exercise:

- Several recommendations have an explicit linkage to the three Task Force efforts. Thus, all three Task Forces should be convened in early 2017, if not sooner. King County has secured or is anticipating resources in the near future to support all three Task Force efforts on at least some aspects of their scopes of work.

- Those action recommendations for which partial or full funding is in hand, or for which funding is highly likely to be secured in the near future, should be implemented without delay. These include, for example, the development of a beaver management plan, completion of alluvial fan pilot projects, drain tile replacement pilot projects, completing testing of the Ecosystem Management Decision Support modeling tool, and initiating pre-design and fundraising for the next large restoration projects.
- As a practical matter, the next large capital project in the APD (pursuant to recommendation #17 which calls for progress on 2-3 projects) is not likely to break ground before 2019. Planning and design, as well as efforts to secure funding, must begin right away to meet a target construction date of 2019.
- Demonstrating progress on recommendations important to the agricultural community (e.g., drainage program expansion) will be critical within the first three years of the agreement so that tangible investments and benefits will have accrued to all F's upon completion of the next large restoration project in the APD.
- Recommendations pertaining to drainage improvements and associated changes to the regulatory framework vary in complexity. Some early steps should be taken without delay, such as conducting needed inventories of needs and existing facilities. Those actions that require collaboration with state and/or federal regulatory agencies (e.g., floodgate maintenance or replacement) may take several years to resolve (recommendation 21.b).
- While the specific outcomes of regulatory discussions with local, state and federal outcomes cannot be predetermined, an open and robust attempt to address regulatory issues must be made within the three year period, with the participation and support of all F's.
- Some staff resource intensive actions, such as accelerating farm home elevations to ten homes per year (recommendation #2) will require significant new budget authority and thus may need to ramp up to the desired pace over several years.

Moreover, some actions are dependent on the completion of others and thus require explicit sequencing. For example, recommendations #10-14 have to do with the assessment of the impacts of past projects on flooding, improving community outreach and involving a third-party reviewer when implementing large capital projects and associated studies. Thus, initiating studies and developing guidance for project management should occur as soon as practicable in order to inform the next generation of capital projects for both habitat restoration and flood risk reduction. Similarly, broadening the scope and increasing the pace of drainage maintenance actions (recommendations

#21-23) highlight the immediate need to ensure the participation of a fish biologist in all drainage maintenance projects to assist with impact avoidance, minimization and monitoring (#21.a).
minimization and monitoring (#21.a).

Recommended next steps and progress reporting

Next generation FFF Committee

Through working together for two and a half years, the Committee has built a solid foundation of trust between individuals and entities, despite differences in initial interests and perspectives. The Committee recommends that the County establish a next-generation FFF committee to provide support and accountability for the implementation phase of these recommendations. The Committee fully recognizes that the list of proposed actions, task forces and studies is ambitious and that many details are yet to be developed. It is therefore vital that a committee of fish, farm and flood representatives remain engaged to provide review, advice and adaptive management support going forward.

The new “FFF Implementation Review Committee” should strive to include as many of the same organizations (and preferably individuals) as the current Committee. In addition, the Committee recommends the addition of other organizations that will bring important additional perspectives to the table. Importantly, the addition of more agriculture and farmland preservation focused organizations will relieve some of the pressure of participation from individual landowner volunteers, though landowner participation is also highly encouraged.

Proposed membership, but not limited to:

- American Farmland Trust
- Futurewise*
- King Conservation District*
- King County Agriculture Commission*
- King County Departments/Divisions
- King County Flood Control District*
- Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust

- Puget Sound Partnership
- Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Forum*
- Snoqualmie Tribe*
- Snoqualmie valley city*
- Snoqualmie Valley Preservation Alliance*
- Snoqualmie Watershed Forum*
- Snoqualmie Watershed Improvement District
- Sno-Valley Tilth
- Sound Salmon Solutions
- Stewardship Partners
- The Nature Conservancy
- Tulalip Tribes*
- Washington Department of Ecology*
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Wild Fish Conservancy*

* denotes member of current Committee

King County should initiate semi-annual reporting to the new committee beginning in 2017 to provide updates on implementation progress. More frequent meetings may be advisable from time to time. The formation of ad-hoc groups for short-term committee work may also be advisable.

Funding for implementation

Implementing the Committee's recommendations will require the commitment of staff and financial resources from the County, the Flood Control District, partner organizations and external funding sources. The Committee appreciates the early

actions taken by King County WLR Division in preparation for the 2017-18 biennium, such as requesting funding for a new regulatory specialist for the agriculture team, and securing a grant from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency that will assist with the development of the EMDS model application. In the current biennium, the County increased funding for implementing drainage projects, in collaboration with the King Conservation District.

New avenues for funding may emerge from the fact that the recommendations in this report were reached by consensus within a Committee that includes diverse interests - and in particular includes both farmers and tribes. The Snoqualmie Valley is by no means the only place where tensions between habitat restoration and agriculture exist, and the Committee is proud of the hard-won progress that is captured in these recommendations.

The Committee recommends that the County, with support and participation from Committee members, craft multi-objective project packages for funding by State and Federal programs, or directly by the State Legislature. In particular, the Floodplains by Design program, administered by the Department of Ecology in collaboration with the Puget Sound Partnership and The Nature Conservancy, is a promising avenue for funding ambitious multi- objective efforts in floodplain areas.

Committee members and their respective organizations will also commit to leveraging their own resources wherever possible, and to support the County as it takes the lead in implementing these recommendations and advocating for funding to do so.

Committee members also pledge to support the County as it initiates outreach to elected officials, the general public, partner organizations and landowners about committee findings and ongoing implementation. What we have achieved here is unique and important. It is our shared responsibility to sustain the trust that has been generated at the Committee table through dialogue and deepen that trust through action. 34