

Notes SLS Steering Committee

December 10, 2020, 10:00AM – 12:00PM

Present: David Roberts (Facilitator), Brian Bookey, C.K. Eidem, Linda Lyshall, Erik Stockdale, Daryl Williams, Linda Neunzig, Robin Fay, Andy Werkhoven

Not present: Rodney Pond, Terry Williams



1. Team building – What are we most looking forward to in 2021?

Return to normalcy and less disruption, vaccine! Starting Cub Scout pack again! Social gatherings and eating with friends and having in person with staff and friends. Not needing to have emergency communications set up anymore from emergency to recovery. Looking forward to projects coming to fruition. Keep on farming! Lots and lots looking forward – ease of seeing people and getting together. When normal life feels more straightforward. Toddler is fun with looks forward to summer fun outside. Better life for school-age kids. Tough to run a utility by Zoom – quick one-on-one communication is missing. Getting back to social component and interaction for our kids who have suffered and may suffer impacts down the road. Building up to good things in 2021. Ditto on several others. Don't miss commuting! Lots of catching up to do. Higher milk prices – it's been a scramble to get in the black and appreciate the subsidies. Economically sustainable economy.

2. Organizational Structure and Roles Document (David Roberts and Linda Lyshall)

David and Linda provided some background regarding the development of a document which has been renamed the *SLS Organizational Structure and Roles*. The document outlines how SLS is organized and expectations for various committees and working groups.

We had an in-depth discussion to clarify the authority, expectations, and intent that would guide an approval process by the Steering Committee (SC). The role of the SC is to bring balance to the process. We agreed that any decisions by the SC to support or endorse projects would be by consensus. The SC stamp of approval has value as a culmination of efforts by the working groups and holds a lot of value for obtaining or retaining grant funding.

We discussed a few specific areas of the document and where changes were suggested, David added edits.

- Under the Steering Committee, we confirmed that new members may volunteer when there are new openings. Ultimately the SC decides which future members will be part of the SC. We acknowledged that the SC is a place where we can identify, resolve, mitigate, and mediate conflict. We also supported the statement that encourages multiple-benefit outcomes for all SLS interests.
- Under Partners, we added “air grievances and solve or avoid conflicts” as a primary activity. We agreed to the statement regarding SLS Partners being the foundation of SLS and that public engagement is one of its key roles.
- Under the Outreach Group, we agreed that they should assist the ITs with community engagement needs where they have the capacity to do so. We also agreed that communications should be coordinated. Because entities may have their own communications staff, coordination is necessary and desirable.

David asked that people send him any more changes/suggestions ahead of the January Partners meeting.

Everyone felt this was a good process and are grateful for the work. The group thanked Linda, Robin, Kristin Marshall, and David's efforts.

3. Policy framework for Comp Plan review (Nick Bratton and Rebecca Schwartzman)

Nick and Rebecca (Forterra) provided an overview and recommendations from the Comp Plan Work Group comprised of Robin Fay, Jessica Hamill, Nick, Rebecca, and Amalia Walton (Kulshan Services) and David Roberts. Their goal has been to review the County's land use policies and to provide recommendations that support the objectives of the SLS. This is the first stage in a process which will later include the update to the County's Comprehensive Plan. The group came to the SC to determine if the right issues were raised and if anything additional should be added to the CPPs.

The group looked for alignment in the current and proposed policies, and what speaks to FFF interests. The focused on three elements: Development Patterns, Natural Environment, and Climate Change. The group is seeking input to share with the County in January.

The group affirmed a number of the existing policies and proposed changes being considered. They also provided some minor edits to other policies. In addition, they recommended the County consider three additional policies:

1. **Reducing development pressure:** Limit development in current and projected flood prone areas to reduce risk and provide opportunities for farmland protection and fish habitat restoration. Retain resource lands for agricultural, forest, habitat, and open space uses. Lastly, prioritize growth within cites and UGAs to reduce development pressure and flood risk in rural areas.
2. **Climate and social equity:** Incorporate analysis of environmental conditions due to climate change in relation to where communities of color live, work, and have access to outdoor amenities. Establish and implement measures that ensure equitable access to these necessities and develop metrics that maintain equitable access for the long-term.
3. **Addressing the protection of cultural values:** Identify areas, ecosystems, and environmental elements of cultural value with a location, to whom the site is significant, and define how each identified site or environmental aspect will be protected from development, climate change, or other alteration, with counsel from tribal governments and involvement of accountable parties.

We discussed the recommendations from the work group and considered some additional ideas. Nick pointed out that some ideas made sense for this policy level conversation, while others would be better considered at the General Planning Policies level (GPP/Comp Plan):

- How do we include the concept of balancing between farmland and habitat?
- How do we improve zoning? The 5-acre zoning creates a lot of pressure to break property up and encourages development which is contributing to the fragmentation of agriculture. Preserve the farmland with PDR's and TDR's.
- Is flooded farmland a use? If it was deemed a use, could a balance be struck between habitat and farm interest?
- Food security should be added as a focus.
- Address how land converted to habitat is no longer considered ag land.

- Look at King County's approach to conversion of developed lands back into agriculture to offset land dedicated to fisheries enhancement.

Comments on Recommendation number 2: What does "Equitable access to necessities" mean? Rebecca responded that this corresponds to recreational outdoor amenities. There are already a natural environment and climate change statements. This newer statement is tying this into social equity. How do recreation and amenities tie-in to climate?

Daryl pointed out that tribes have been reluctant to encourage recreation in the rural areas. They are trying to protect these areas for cultural practices. Tribal members are finding it nearly impossible to find secluded locations. Daryl felt that tribes would have difficulty supporting expansion of outdoor recreation. Rebecca will look at this.

A revised framework document with ideas discussed will be provided to the SC in the next couple of weeks. Please review and send feedback.

- **Rebecca and Nick will craft a 4th bullet policy statement about balancing of interests.**
- **Rebecca will look into ways to address the concern about encouraging access to necessities.**

David will send out to the Partners and the County in once the SC has reviewed the new draft.

The group thanked Nick, Rebecca and the work group for their efforts. The document will be circulated to the SLS Partners for information in January and forwarded to County Planning staff for consideration.

4. Legislative Advocacy – Who, when, what tools? (David Roberts)

David presented a template developed by the SLS Communications Group which would help SLS members present and advocate for funding priorities to lawmakers including state and federal funds. He asked if this kind of tool would be helpful. If so, can we agree with what priorities should be on the list? More specifics are needed.

We reviewed the advocacy document and discussed gathering input regarding desired funding requests for the legislative session in January and February 2021. All agreed a tool like this would be useful, though there was some concern about how much information should be included. Most felt it would be best focused on State funding programs and policies. David and Linda L will distribute this document for input and review once additional information has been added. This first attempt will require a bit of coordination. It may not be possible to include everything, so we should treat it as a focus document.

Linda Lyshall is seeking meetings with legislators prior to session and during Legislative Days. The CD is planning a live virtual tour. SLS partners can participate in the planned tours. Priorities developed by SLS would be useful to have at that time.

Linda Neunzig pointed out that one of the County's priorities is for the Snohomish Food and Farming Center, a \$6 million request for state funding. They are also seeking a Federal value-added producer grant.

CK would like to share our priority list with the public policy folks from Ducks Unlimited in Sacramento.

David will resend the advocacy document to each of the SC members. Please provide suggestions for him to add into this document. He suggested a quick meeting beginning in January where they review a more filled out document.

Follow-up:

Daryl would like more info about Food and Farming Center to share with tribal members. Linda Neunzig will coordinate.

Brian asked for links to the items included on the priority list. David will add these to the document.

Robin asked how will this tool will be used. Is there a coordinated outreach process? We should be aware of each other's contacts. He also suggested we keep the document short and focused. Are there a few things we can have a collective impact on?

Linda Lyshall suggested focusing in on key geographic regions and how funding has or will support projects in those areas. The CD is targeting specific projects to show how multiple funding sources leverage each other. Linda will share appointments with legislators as they arise and invite anyone who is interested.

The County hires Gordon Honeywell to lobby on behalf of county. Erik looked at the FbD new application outlining economic benefit of next grant round. \$8.5 million ask. This was helpful to put in the dollar amount and the local job impact. Cue this up. Jessica Hamill is reaching out to PSP and TNC.

David will pull together the priority information from everyone and have a new draft ready for review in January. The group can decide what to push for while each person can advocate for their own interest.

5. What should SLS focus on in the coming year?

We discussed progress this year and the next steps for work of the SC and for SLS as a whole. David shared that we have completed a lot. We now have money which is allowing many things to move forward. He shared the graphic below which has been the focus of his work and indicated we have made good progress on a number of items including: the SLS structure, roles and responsibilities, decision process, attributes list, ground rules and communications plan.



The areas most needing attention include clarifying mission and the net-benefit statement. David also recommended we start discussing goals so that the monitoring group will have something to

shoot for. Linda L shared that the FBD Strategy group is doing a theory of change. It relates to much of our work and multi-benefit monitoring. She will share this to inform our mission and goals discussion.

David noted that we don't meet until February. The conversations will begin then on mission and goals. Also, more conversations about collaboration and dispute resolution process, if needed. Everyone agreed this works for them.

Dates for future meetings (The SC will be meeting every other month starting again in February 2021. All meetings will be 10:00-12:00 unless otherwise notified.)

- | | |
|---------------|--------------|
| ▪ February 11 | ▪ August 12 |
| ▪ April 8 | ▪ October 14 |
| ▪ June 10 | ▪ December 9 |

Possible Agenda items for January Partner meeting

- Organization Structure and Roles Document
- Workplan review
- Advocacy for SLS
- Funding Team concept
- Development of a flood management plan
(CK noted that the Snohomish IT voiced a desire for an independent flood document something like the ag resilience plan. This concept should be to discussed with Partners. Erik said there is a framework for flood management basin planning. It's been a while since the Skykomish plan was created. Funding program from WDOE dried up. **Erik and CK will discuss and define what they want to accomplish with this.**)

Adjourn 12:10pm