

SNOHOMISH SUSTAINABLE LANDS STRATEGY (SLS) FINAL MEETING SUMMARY



Thursday May 14, 2020 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Videoconference

PARTICIPANTS (Executive Committee members in bold):

Aaron Kopp – Snohomish County SWM
Bennett LaFond – Snohomish Conservation District (SCD)
Brett Shattuck – Tulalip Tribes
Brian Bookey - National Foods, SLS EC Co-chair (Ag)
C. K. Eidem – Ducks Unlimited
Carol MacIroy - Carol MacIroy Consulting
Colin Wahl – Tulalip Tribes
Dan Bartelheimer – Snohomish Valley Farms
Dan Calvert – Puget Sound Partnership
Dani Driscoll - Snohomish County SWM
David Killingstad - Snohomish County PDS
Erik Stockdale - Snohomish County SWM
Jessica Hamill - Snohomish County SWM
Harry Richardson
Heather Cole – The Nature Conservancy
Henry Lippek – Stillaguamish Flood Control District
Ikuno Masterson - Snohomish County PDS
Jay Krientz - Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Jill Farrant – SnoValley Tilth
Joe Christianson – Marine View Farms
Kirk Lakey – Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Kristin Marshall – Snohomish Conservation District (SCD)
Kurt Nelson – Tulalip Tribes
Larissa Lee - NOAA
Linda Lyshall – Snohomish Conservation District
Linda Neunzig – Snohomish County
Lindsey Desmul – Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Lisa Nelson - WA Department of Ecology
Michele Anton - Snohomish County SWM
Nick Bratton - Forterra
Robin Fay – PCC Farmland Trust
Spencer Easton - Environmental Science Associates (ESA)
Terry Richardson
Terry Williams – Tulalip Tribes

FACILITATOR

David Roberts – Kulshan Services

Welcome, introductions and agenda review

David welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced Bennett LaFond and Kristin Marshall from SCD. Bennett will be working with Ag resilience and Kristin with riparian and salmon habitat restoration.

Approval of meeting summary

Meeting notes from April 9, 2020 were approved.

Community Comment

None

Primary presentations or discussion topics

Snohomish FbD Grant Package of Projects

Spencer Easton from ESA presented an overview of the Snohomish FbD grant package. He shared the list of projects the Snohomish IT plans to include in the 2021-2023 Floodplains by Design grant application which is due in July. This overview was presented at the January and March meetings, but more details were added, such as new specific actions on page 3, updated SLS attributes on page 17, and updated budget on page 18.

After initial review, Ecology asked a lot of questions about modeling. Questions included one about the feasibility process to sequence the sites to determine criteria and another about how to balance inundation changes on an alternative site. Snohomish IT needs a letter of support from the executive committee for final application. After the presentation, questions were answered.

Questions and comments:

Brian – I'm surprised by the lack of detail. Haven't we gone through the SLS attributes?

Spencer - We presented this package twice before. CK has been involved at IT meetings.

David R. – This is a pre-proposal for review and comments.

Jessica – Vagueness and uncertainty is built into this package. We had to make assumptions. Funding is tentative and may be delayed.

Brian – What are the property acquisitions? There are questions about farmland.

Jessica – We are still working out the details.

Robin – 2300 acres of farmland will be conserved for Ag and not for other use. It's hard to predict what specific landowners will do and what transactions will be completed. Farmland is prioritized on the county-wide map. The current grant includes outreach to farmland owners in the reach and basin.

Brian – Will easements be preserved as farmland? No development on the land? What about the habitat side?

Robin – The current grant expands the set of tools to conserve farmland. The easements will be committed to farmland conservation.

Jessica – The current grant and new grant have funding for farmland conservation, such as farmland and habitat acquisitions. Strategies will be developed for criteria

in the next 6 months through the development of a land acquisition strategy. We will use PCC Farmland Trust to identify farmlands in conversion.

Brian – Unlike the Stillaguamish FbD proposal, there are no specific acquisitions at this time?

Jessica, Robin – Yes, that is correct.

Dan B. – Old Snohomish Road is underwater at a section less than 100 feet long. Could it be raised 2 feet?

Jessica – This county road should be reviewed to see whether it will fit in the package.

Brian – How do we view the IT? Are they an independent group or part of this SLS group?

Robin – We are part of SLS.

Brian – Why do we endorse projects?

Spencer – Ecology asks for letters of support. A letter from the SLS executive committee is essential for projects to move forward.

Brian – Isn't this the proposal for SLS?

Jessica – We all view the IT process as born out of the SLS mission statement. Slides that Spencer showed us are SLS maps. This proposal is a product of SLS. It is not inconsistent with the SLS, it just needs more detail. We want to come to the next meeting with a more concrete proposal. We need to find a way to collaborate and address concerns, but we are not in a place to stop. The majority feels that this is an SLS product.

C.K. - I agree with Jessica.

Brian – I was concerned with the manner of the presentation. I don't want the IT to be independent of SLS.

David R. – We can spend some time on the attributes list or come back at a later time with more detailed information. Contact Spencer for specifics.

Robin – We will keep farmland acquisitions in Ag by using the Snohomish IT process and getting landowner feedback. Outreach can be provided at site specific level to achieve both goals on the ground. Easements do not preclude restoration, though there may be some allowances. We are dealing only with willing landowners.

Kurt – I thought there would be more details on this proposal, such as a caucus or meeting, kind of what we did on the Stillaguamish FbD proposal.

Terry – I would like more detailed information and a caucus meeting.

Spencer - Mid next week we may be able to present and discuss this project more.

David – Both Stillaguamish and Snohomish IT's come to partner meetings for letters of support.

Jessica – July 31st is the due date for the Floodplains by Design application to Ecology. We have an early July partners meeting and need support and feedback before this.

Spencer – We need caucus meetings in the next 2 or 3 weeks.

David – Caucus meetings or other?

Linda and Brian – Ag caucus is okay.

Carol – Stillaguamish IT and Snohomish IT planned proposal presentations for certain SLS meetings. There will be another opportunity during the contracting phase for refinements. We have limited time for caucus and other meetings.

Heather – Proposals and requests coming into Ecology will be very competitive. You need good collaboration at this scale to score as high as possible.

Lisa – It is very competitive at this round. There is uncertainty about funding with Covid-19.

David will help set up caucus meetings for a more detailed look into the Snohomish IT package. The next SLS meetings are June 11th and July 9th. Carol would like to bring a revised package back in June and a final package in July. The Stilly IT is going over the attributes list to make sure they are answering questions. Carol will work with David R. to determine the level of detailed information needed for the Stillaguamish presentation.

Joint Planning Team introduction to the SLS Work Plan

Linda Lyshall and Dani Driscoll talked about the draft work plan and how it is focused on coordinated action. The primary goal is to take action on policy and projects and collaborate on structure to move forward in a coordinated manner. The draft work plan is just an introduction for today and there will be more discussion at the next meeting. It is still a work in progress and they would like input and feedback. Send comments and identify what actions in a 2 to 5 year time frame you would like to work on and for the collective group. Identify self for comments and respond within the next two weeks. Dani sent an email 5/15/20 with instructions on how to add comments to the interactive document at this link [Draft SLS Work Plan Framework](#).

Comments:

Terry – For the Stillaguamish and Snohomish, Tulalip needs an update to move this forward.

David R. – This is attempt to streamline the process and reduce overhead.

SLS Input to Comprehensive Plan

Nick Bratton presented a PowerPoint and talked about how the SLS can engage with the County Comprehensive Planning (CCP) process. This is a technical SLS process that includes advocacy. We need a strategy for communication. We also need to identify priorities and think of topics to weigh in on. There is a timeline and a need for volunteers.

Comments:

Terry – I greatly appreciate the presentation. Tulalip is working on a separate water delivery plan with Ecology and wants to include SLS in discussions about streamflow for habitat and cultural water. It's a CCP water supply approach.

Ikuno – Nick framed approaches very well. I hope SLS becomes as an advocate for the CCP and I'm glad to talk about the policy issues.

David K. – We are open to coming back and can package the CCP in smaller pieces for areas that SLS is looking at. The SLS should look at the updated countywide planning policy. What are the issues that would be applicable to weigh in on for cities and the unincorporated county?

Ikuno – SLS should get engaged because it is about land use.

Nick – Contact me if you would like to volunteer or for input. IT input welcome as well.

Carol – Would you form a workgroup now?

Nick – The window for public input is still to come, but it is not too early to start looking at the CCP. A workgroup would figure out the timeline and an effective way. We can create a group in the next month and coordinate with PDS as well. I'll come back at the next SLS meeting with more information from PDS.

David K. – I will run this by the joint planning group.

Ikuno – Maybe Nick and I can outline something for the SLS.

Updates

Carol presented a PowerPoint showing May updates in the Stillaguamish FbD package,

Meeting adjourned at 12:00PM

Upcoming meetings and proposed topics:

June 11, 2020

- IT grant proposal reviews

July 9, 2020

- IT final grant packages