

# Dungeness River Management Team Meeting

January 14, 2009

## Dungeness River Audubon Center

Notes prepared by Melissa Coughlin

### Team Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Cathy Lear, Clallam County (alt)  
Scott Chitwood, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe  
Shawn Hines, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe (alt)  
Cynthia Nelson, WA Department of Ecology  
Virginia Clark, Dungeness/Quilcene Planning  
Lorenz Sollman, USDFW - Dung. Nat. Wildlife Refuge  
Pete Schroeder, Riverside Property Owners RM 3.25-4.25  
Al Moore, Riverside Property Owners RM 0-3.25  
Mike Jeldness, Water Users Association

Walt Blendermann, Sports Fisheries  
Don Hatler, Conservation Dist. /Sports Fisheries (alt)  
Michael Blanton, WDFW Watershed Steward  
John Cambalik, Puget Sound Partnership  
Allison Lutz, North Olympic Land Trust  
Joe Holtrop, Clallam Conservation District  
Judy Larson, Protect Peninsula's Future  
Robert Brown, Dungeness Beach Association

### Others in Attendance:

Weldon Clark, Dungeness River Audubon Center  
Byron Rot, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe  
Ann Soule, Clallam County  
Robin Berry, Graysmarsh  
James Karr, Resident  
Mark Hannah, TAG  
Elizabeth van Sickel, Property owner, resident

Steve Rankin, Streamkeepers  
Cheryl Baumann, North Olympic Lead Entity (NOPL)  
Andrew Cambalik, Concerned Citizen  
Bob Boekelheide, Dungeness River Audubon Center  
Powell Jones, Dungeness River Audubon Center  
Melissa Coughlin, Independent contractor/note-taker

2:10 P.M.

## I. Introductions /Review Agenda / Approval of December 10, 2008 DRMT Meeting Notes

- Mike Jeldness chaired meeting in Steve Tharinger's absence.
- Draft agenda sequence was 'changed to accommodate late arrivals of Ann Soule and Cynthia Nelson.
- Changes to December's meeting notes included spelling correction of Michele d'Hemecourt and inclusion of Eric Carlsen to the attendance list. Further clarifications (last bullet page 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet page 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet page 6) proposed by Judy Larson. Motion to accept modified notes made by Virginia Clark, seconded by Robert Brown and unanimously passed.

### Public Comment:

- Robert Brown asked who to contact about the restroom closure at Dungeness Landing Park. He was told to contact Clallam County Parks Department.
- Robert Brown requested dissemination of list of vice-chair rotation. Shawn Hines to accommodate via e-mail.
- Cheryl Baumann stated that the WDFW Watershed Steward program is not included in the governor's budget; this should be a huge concern. Michael Blanton is the steward for the Dungeness watershed (as well as other areas). Cheryl handed out information to send letters of support for the WDFW Watershed Steward Program.
- Dr. Karr announced that Gary Loomis is speaking tonight at 7:00 P.M. at the Sequim High School. Expert on what we ought to be doing about the disappearing fish population in the Pacific Northwest (handout). See [www.fishfirst.com](http://www.fishfirst.com) or [www.joincca.org](http://www.joincca.org) for more information.
- Judy Larson wanted to express appreciation for the efforts of the Streamkeepers, Steve and C.J. Rankin in particular for stormwater monitoring in the Dungeness Valley area (Clallam County grant from EPA). Judy was also pleased with the recent City of Sequim Council vote which did not change the municipal code to allow a minimum lot size in Sequim. Sequim is not up-to-date with critical area ordinances. They are completing the recharge studies, and Judy wondered if there is a linkage of funding to the grant on recharge? Concerned about funding of possibly overlapping studies. Judy also informed team about the land use (green build) program at Lincoln Center in Port Angeles tomorrow from 8:30 A.M. – 3:00 P.M. Joe Holtrop noted that meeting was geared toward government planners. A similar workshop will be held in February for the public. John Cambalik further remarked that it was part of the latest round of low-impact technical development assistance programs (Sequim was one of the recipients and will be given assistance from now until June). Program encourages adoption of LID (Low Impact Development) changes.
- Robert Brown asked for a presentation on the Dungeness Flood Management Plan on next month's agenda.
- Mike Jeldness thanked Shawn Hines for her remarkable job of keeping the DRMT informed.

## II. Jimmycomelately Lessons Learned Report – Byron Rot, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe

- Byron talked about the restoration final report that he, Dave Shreffler (Shreffler Environment), Sam Gibboney (ISE Consultants), Randy Johnson (Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe), and Lyn Muench (formerly of Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe) produced on the Jimmycomelately project.
- Byron gave some of the reasons for writing the report on one of the largest restoration projects in the Puget Sound Area: to give guidance to future restoration projects, (although the JCL project was unique due to creek-tidal (fresh water to salt water) connections); to encourage large scale restoration projects elsewhere; to advance restoration science; and to close the book on JCL restoration.
- Byron wanted to briefly explain the various chapters/topics of the report. The *Partnership and Coordination* portion explained how the project got organized; *Restoration Planning* was provided by the technical team, and explained how they came together; Randy Johnson provided the *Graphics* portion, creating the important visual message; *Property Acquisition* was explained in the report, which incorporated a lot of thinking outside the box; Lyn Muench explored the *Historical Aspects* of what happened; *Outreach and Education* explained the marketing and getting funding for the project; *Cultural Resources* was a short section warning “look before you dig”; *Toxics* was a topic by Dave, Lyn and Byron that included creosoted piling removal, log yard and engineering hazardous wastes and the rules and regulations involved; Sam Gibboney explained in the *Olympic Discovery Trail* section what went into placing a public trail within a restoration project; Byron contributed to the section on *Engineering Design*; Sam on *Sequence and Permitting*; Sam and Byron contributed to *Construction & Management 101* which discussed working with contractors and engineers; Dave discussed the reality of monitoring as an unfunded mandate of the project in the *Monitoring and Adaptive Management* section; Dave also contributed to the *Parting Thoughts* report ending.
- A successful restoration strategy includes: Start early; concept idea from a natural analog; landowner outreach (listen to the landowners to discern what motivates them and work with that); assemblage of a broad-based technical team and partners; development of a process-based restoration concept; confirmation with landowners; get funded; design process.
- An unsuccessful restoration strategy is likely to contain: concept derived from the outcome fixing a problem; landowners who are not invested in the project; an assembly of only a few of the partners to avoid trouble; a technical team of office mates; an engineering solution to problem; monitoring that is tied to fixing the problem.
- Bryon cited mitigation project with the Department of Transportation as an example of a successful project.
- Bryon also shared a few important personal lessons from the Jimmycomelately project: landowner and community support was critical from the beginning of the project; recognizing a need to respect other views during the entire process; design for process and from natural analogs; found the most difficult part of restoration is removing embedded idea and infrastructure; in a dynamic system, it doesn’t matter where the paintings are hung.
- Example of project working well: Clallam County was building a bridge while summer chum spawned. Intense meeting with WDFW, contractors, concern over putting the bridge up (big equipment running) during spawning. Big part of the meeting was getting people to stop talking at each other and turn around and look at the fish. Compromised with a viscucene fence – learned to respect everyone’s viewpoints to move forward.
- What next? Bryon ran through a list of upcoming projects: Morse Creek: restore to 1939 course – will channel up river from Highway 101; Dungeness River – Army Corps dike setback; Salmon Creek and Dungeness River Estuaries restoration; Reconnection of Salmon and Snow Creeks; Pysht River estuary restoration; Jimmycomelately monitoring, database building, and channel maintenance. All have been influenced by the JCL restoration project.
- Byron presented overview slides of various restoration projects.
- Virginia Clark asked about alternatives to downloading the large report from the Tribe’s website ([http://www.jamestowntribe.org/jstweb\\_2007/programs/nrs/nrs\\_jimmy.htm](http://www.jamestowntribe.org/jstweb_2007/programs/nrs/nrs_jimmy.htm)). Byron said there are CDs available for interested people who didn’t/couldn’t download report.
- Robert Brown asked if monitoring plans included Sequim Bay. Byron said eel grass and shellfish was being monitored, the DOE intended to monitor Bay. Scott Chitwood remarked that when the log yard was still there, bundles of logs were tied to pilings and a family of 8-12 harbor seals lived there, after material was removed no family of seals remained living there. From Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe office windows you can monitor any harbor seal activity on a regular basis.
- Bob Boekelheide remarked on the Tribe’s recent development activities (Long House, gas station); asked if a hotel was going to be put up behind the new Long House, and how would that development affect things. Byron explained that the Long House included LID (the Tribe’s first attempt). He wasn’t sure about hotel plans (hasn’t been designed yet), but Scott Chitwood said that there will be expansion of the resort and stormwater and water quality issues will be handled the same as with the Long House, going beyond

requirements to exhibit the Tribe's commitment to low-impact development. Joe Holtrop suggested a Lessons Learned Report on that LID project could be useful.

- Discussing any downsides of the JCL project, Byron mentioned the channel was built in wet soil and there was no historic gravel to mine from. Gravel may have to be supplemented (for some time) as the amount of gravel (which salmon need for DO purposes) decreases. Joe Holtrop asked if camas was found, and it had been. Byron said that previously they were thinking of converting the RV site to prairie and planted ¼ acre with 3,000 camas bulbs; but they eventually decided against that (too wet). Now planning to plant Garry oak and shrubs.
- Robin Berry asked what the highest point of creek is saltwater. Byron answered around Highway 101 Bridge and Olympic Discovery Trail Bridge, he wasn't certain of exact elevation. Robin wanted to know the cfs on JCL, and Byron answered high flow (two-year flood) was about 180 cfs, year before last had 3 floods over 180 cfs. 50-75 cfs is the average in a normal year.
- Ann Soule asked about hazardous waste producing activity that was found. Byron said it was mainly the breakdown products from creosote buried in berms (berms had been built up to stop tidal floods). Found it when they dug up berms, creosote breaks down over time, hauled out waste to somewhere in Oregon.
- Joe Holtrop asked how Dean Creek is holding up. Byron noted there haven't been many high flows in Dean. Not utilized by many salmon.

### III. Aquifer Recharge Project Update – Ann Soule, Clallam County

- Aquifer Recharge Project Update / Carlsborg Aquifer Recharge Pilot Tests / Spring – Summer 2007-2008
- Tests conducted two years in a row at three ditch sites (one of them was not officially part of the study). Purpose: To test viability of using abandoned irrigation ditches to intentionally recharge the shallow aquifer with Dungeness River water during high-flow season.
- Preparatory Steps: Irrigation pipe conveyance; MOU with irrigators (2007 & 2008); Shake-down/testing of new installations; Competition from all users; Ditchwalker very helpful; Short term water right (2007 & 2008); SEPA checklist, 14-day comment period; Concurrence letters from habitat interest groups; Landowner permissions; Water right application, 30-day protest period + 30-day appeal period; *Conditions imposed by Ecology: Conditions of Short-Term Water Use Authorization: Minimum flow: 575 cfs at Schoolhouse gage; Effective date: May 1 – July 15, 2008; Maximum diversion: 5 cfs, 2000 acre-feet; Other: Depends on cooperation of facility owners (Cline-Clallam irrigators); Daily monitoring; Other basic conditions; Engineering & Ditch Prep – 2007 only* (didn't do over for 2008): design of pilot test operations; excavation / scarring of ditch base; Design of monitoring: groundwater well network; hand measurements; transducers (continuous measurements); downgradient streams; River side channels; New sites/equipment: 14 piezometers installed; 10 staff gages installed.
- Operation: Valves (depend on irrigators for adjustments) – took until May 15-16 for appropriate cfs; Flume and meter maintenance (design & installation are critical - level, distance from valve, elevation, water-tight approach, etc.)
- Monitoring: April – October, once per week for most sites.
- One of Ann's slides included AR and Monitoring Sites (2008); showed placements of flumes, precipitation gages, wells with and without transducers, stream gages, and recharge sites.
- Monitoring – 2008:
  - AR flows at 3 sites: Jakeway: meter, flume, wetted distance (daily); Olympic Discovery Trail: 2 flumes, wetted distance (daily); Green Acres Mobile Home Park pond\*: hand-held flow meter at pond inlet and outlet (weekly) (\*Note that GAMHP pond is not a grant-managed recharge site; it is part of the Clallam Ditch Company conveyance to irrigators downstream).
  - Well Network: transducer wells (14): continuously recording at 15 min. – 4 hr. intervals; hand-measured wells (10): measured weekly by Peninsula College interns
  - Streams/tribs – all weekly: Matriotti: RM 0.4, 0.7, 2.0, 3.2; Lotzgesell: RM 0.0, 1.5, 2.3 (2007 only); Owl (Bear): RM 0.05 est. (aka Mat 3.8t); Hurd: RM 0.6; Cassalery: RM 1.7; West Cassalery trib: RM 0.2, 0.9
  - Side Channels – all weekly:
    - West bank: 23 and 23E: Gagnon (two branches); 36W: RRBP west channel upstream of trestle; 36NW: RRBP west channel downstream of trestle
    - East bank: 22: Anderson; 29: Stevens/Bates (Savage)
- Infiltration – Jakeway

Site 1 - Jakeway	2007	2008
Max rate	1.5 cfs	1.2 cfs
Number of pulses	5	2
Duration	4.5 days	3 weeks
Total Volume	4.67 acre-foot	32.3 acre-foot
Wetted Distance	1,500	1,000 ft

Infiltration Rate	Not calculated	20 -40 ft/day
-------------------	----------------	---------------

- Infiltration – Olympic Discovery Trail

Site 2 - ODT	2007	2008
Max rate	1.0 cfs	0.5 cfs
Number of pulses	3	2
Duration	2 weeks	8 weeks
Total Volume	14.1 acre-foot	45.6 acre-foot
Wetted Distance	1,600	1,600 ft
Infiltration Rate	Not calculated	5 -20 ft/day

- Infiltration – GAMHB Pond (est)

Site 3 - Jakeway	2007	2008
Max rate	0 .75 cfs	0.75 cfs
Number of pulses	Constant	constant
Duration	5 months	4 months
Total Volume	Not calculated	183 acre-foot
Wetted Distance	1,000 sq ft	1,000 sq ft
Infiltration Rate	Not calculated	1 ft/day

- Never filled a ditch in 2007 or 2008 – barely got numbers in 2007.
- Monitoring Results: Affect of AR on shallow aquifer: well data vs. AR, precipitation, river flow. Affect of AR on small streams: flow data vs. AR, precipitation. Affect of AR on side channels: flow data vs. AR, River flow.
- Ann showed graphs representing displacement and infiltration and precipitation, volume of recharge. Volume of AR timing of this and other graph possibly shows recharge. On the ODT site there are 4 close wells; “displacement” patterns show change (rise or fall) from initial point; some fluctuations may be the influence of nearby wells. One starts rising before river and before recharge, though could be river influence in other cases.
- Ann showed graph of Erwin well near river – 2008, there is a 6-week lag before river rises. Deep monitoring well on PUD property north of Industrial Park. Don’t see sharp rise (but there is a small one) even in a deep system something is happening that corresponds to shallow system.
- Not a lot of conclusions can be made – influence from river or recharge? Notable Considerations: Leakage from lower River = 0.2-13 cfs in mid and upper reaches, correlated with streamflow (and reach) (Simonds & Sinclair).
- Total volume recharged: Jakeway: 32.3 ac-ft: ODT: 45.6 ac-ft. Total (approx.): 78 ac-ft = **936 ac-in**; = **468 acres** 2 inches deep; = **312 acres** 3 inches deep. (\*Note this volume doesn’t include Green Acres pond: 200 ac-ft. which started sooner and ended later).
- Cost Summary:
  - MOU, SEPA, Water Right, Project Management \$14,000
  - Monitoring \$6,900
  - Consultants & Engineering \$26,000
  - Construction (valves, ditches) \$29,800
  - Supplies, Fees, etc. \$1,800
  - 2007 Total Cash Costs \$78,500
  - 2008 Test Operations \$15,000
  - 2008 Monitoring & Data Analysis est. \$25,000
  - New gages & piezometers \$42,000
  - Contributed (college field work, SK data entry, County lab) for 2007 & 2008 est. \$10,000
- Lessons Learned: Start testing during April-May to avoid competition; In-pipe flow meter not recommended; Flumes easily eroded; Field irrigation may affect well and streamflow hydrographs at this scale, but unlikely to be connecting to the water table; Nearby well pumping could be influencing some well hydrographs; Side channel flow measurements may not be comparable (use piezometers); More TBD...
- Recommended Next Steps: Consider additional data analysis: Green Acres MHP pond and surrounding wells; nitrate dilution data; groundwater temperature data (what kind of water is affecting wells); air temperature data correlations with infiltration rate; well hydrographs near River and Matriotti Creek (look for connections between perched area and regional aquifer; look for well-stream connections and well pumping evidence). Ideas from others, especially habitat biologists and surface water hydrologists?; Consult with irrigators about concerns regarding ongoing cooperation; Determine minimum data collection necessary for evaluation vs. characterization (do we have too much data): what is needed and what is necessary.
- Shawn Hines asked if any of the data were put into the model for the artificial recharge feasibility study. Ann answered not in a quantitative way, can’t take a little bit of information and apply to model. Shawn remarked the feasibility study suggested that certain AR projects are ready to go, but from what Ann presented – it seemed like there were some unanswered questions that would need to be resolved be for implementing a project. Ann said the irrigation ditch AR in Carlsborg *is* ready to go, what isn’t known is the cost/benefit. Think it’s worth

putting effort into it. Feasibility Report isn't in final stages yet to present, review and updates are pending. Will present at future DRMT meeting.

- Pete Schroeder asked about temperature fluctuations and were they the same in shallow and deeper wells. Ann answered that temperature went up and down by multiple degrees, not small amounts and there is something to be learned there. Pete wondered if it indicated continuity of some sort, or river connection.
- Judy Larson asked about connectivity with relation to locations selected in Carlsborg area. Can another test site be selected where river influence is minimal? Ann answered that ditch recharge sites were known to be abandoned, criteria limited site selection. Judy asked if Green Acres location was down-slope from Parkwood location and wondered what they were doing with their water system and asked the source of pond (how it's charged). Ann answered that Parkwood is not upgradient; ditch water fills pond – inlet and outlet is part of irrigation system. Joe Holtrop said the Green Acres Pond was piped last summer (Sept. 2008), the irrigation conveyances around the pond are piped, as well. On the order of .2 to .3 cfs go in, .1 to .2 cfs at outlet point
- Contact Ann Soule at Clallam County if you have more questions on this topic.

#### IV. Status of Ecology Watershed Implementation Project Proposals – *Cynthia Nelson, Washington*

##### *Department of Ecology*

- Watershed Implementation Grant applications status update: prioritized have been forwarded to Department of Ecology. Ranking should be completed by February or March. The goal is to take the applications for the high priority projects to the legislature. Money has been cut everywhere. Funding even the highest priority project will be difficult.
- Ann Soule (for Clallam County) applied for an operating grant for the County to put together the pieces needed to implement the Instream Flow Rule when it goes into effect. Worked with the DOE and Exchange to draft application. If received, will look for examples in other areas where this type of work is being done. Process needs to be in place in a timely manner to handle the projected impact of the Rule. Cynthia added that options for buying water were included in the application. The Director of DOE has received a letter from the County Commissioners which reinforced that the grant is necessary help the County help the DOE with Rule matters.
- Operating budget: Watershed Planning Grants have to be funded. Commitment to fund projects that are in process is highest priority, includes maintaining stream gages and funding for additional gages. Need method for accessing and determining how much stream gage data is desired.
- Robert Brown asked if the budget cuts would impact the completion of the Instream Flow Rule. Cynthia didn't think the rule-making would be impacted, and the Exchange had funds to put it into place, but not to run and supply it with water. Won't know the budget outcome until legislature meets on it, not before May/June timeframe.
- Robert Brown suggested a presentation by the Water Trust representatives. Cynthia reminded team Amanda Cronin from the Washington Water Trust was here last month presenting, her group is wrapping up now – could use time on next DRMT agenda for going through the Rule and policies and Exchange can be part of that presentation.
- Cynthia mentioned the Water Banking statute in Yakima, and authority from legislature to engage in practice elsewhere is needed. There is a bill to make it clear [House Bill 1494 in legislature now on water banking]. Ideally the OK will be given to move forward. Scott Chitwood asked if this was where the department liaisons' work with Senator Hargrove and others would be useful. Cynthia said yes, but people other than lobbyists and DOE are needed to plead the case. Robin Berry asked if the Water Bank was needed or could you just go through the Department of Ecology for water; is it a question of DOE managing? Cynthia answered that we need a mitigation service of some sort to deal with water needs and it remains a question who will manage and maintain such a mitigation program. Trying to take a piece of the Water Trust statue so people will be able to obtain/buy water from Exchange, but we don't know if we have the authority to do this. Not sure what it will look like in the Legislature.
- Rule Update: Third public workshop is scheduled for Tuesday, February 3<sup>rd</sup> **[this has since been changed to Feb. 18]** at the John Wayne Marina from 4:00 P.M – 7:00 P.M. There will be a poster session, people will be staffed to answer questions, and at 5:00 P.M. there will be presentations. Watershed Planning recommendations and the Memorandum of Understanding will be discussed, and Sarah Ferguson will present on the Rule concept. Question and Answer period until 7:00 P.M. In the meantime one or two more articles will be placed in the Sequim Gazette.
- Pete Schroeder asked for more information on the Deschutes Basin Water Banking (how long has it been functioning, how well has it been functioning, is it running as hoped). Cynthia answered that hydrogeology and the layout of the basin make for significant differences in Oregon. The Deschutes water operation has a website, has been operating and functioning the way it was intended and generally well-regarded during the number of years it has been operational.

- Robert Brown recommended that the details for the public workshops should be basic, such as what a water right is, and how things will change as Rule is adopted. Cynthia agreed, and a goal is to bring people in who never think about it. Want to explain before and after Rule scenarios. Cynthia suggested sending any suggestions or comments to her.
- Al Moore asked if new Rule just affects our instream flow, or elsewhere. Cynthia replied that the area covered is the Dungeness River from Bell Creek to west side of Bagley Creek – this includes all streams and groundwater.
- Don Hatler had a question: in discussing the small watershed with the very small tributaries coming in, if I want to drill on one watershed where there is no mitigation setup, what would I do? Cynthia answered that right now we're dealing with mitigation in the Dungeness watershed exclusively. Breaking out, Dungeness will still be the highest priority. Local individual creeks have local issues. Biologists talk about what would the water mitigation look like, and have discussed that it might be acceptable to negotiate water for habitat enhancement. Have to work that out with biologists. Some sort of compensation, mitigation will have to take place. Don thought it would be a very tricky problem if negotiations were to stay in the same watershed.
- Quilcene-Sno Rule: Cynthia reminded the Team that WRIA 17 started rule drafting process earlier than Dungeness and that they were unsuccessful in moving forward when the public review process began. They had to start the process over. Had to work closely with the public and government to resolve issues.
- Currently we are around the same rule-making stages as Quilcene –Sno, but they will file first. They have already completed drafting the rule language. Time is needed between filing to consider staff limitations and breathing room. Originally Dungeness was to file draft in March, but Ecology has decided WRIA 17 should file first, pushing back East WRIA 18 file date to around mid-May.
- Reminder that after the draft is final it is possible to make small, minor changes, however anything more would require a complete start-over.
- Scott Chitwood inquired about the portion of Sequim Bay that is in WRIA 17 Cynthia thought it would probably go through a process after WRIA 17 and after East WRIA 18.
- Michael Blanton attended the WRIA 17 planning unit meeting last night and said that Quilcene-Sno plans may get bogged down; there is still significant disagreement between parties. He is hopeful it won't be necessary that East WRIA 18 would have to wait because of this. Scott Chitwood said the same disagreeing parties attended a WRIA 17 public workshop in early December; the problem seems to be that they associate water rights with property rights and their attitude is unlikely to change. Can these problems hold up the rule filing date of the timetable just discussed? Cynthia thought some issues could be addressed through the comments process portion.
- Cathy Lear stated that EMMT is waiting for restoration work to progress before further Rule work continues. Cynthia said the Elwha-Morse Management Team is waiting until instream flow recommendations are stabilized, but that doesn't mean they are holding up Rule-making.
- Robert Brown commented that it seemed as though, although there is a timeline for rule adoption, there doesn't seem to be a schedule for rule implementation. That is, all the steps required by the rule (water bank, MOA between County and Ecology) may not necessarily be in place at the time of rule adoption. Cynthia explained the contract was funded for the Water Trust work, but agreed framework and water itself is not funded. County will need a number of things in order to implement rule: water rights for irrigators; Washington Water Trust will develop a Water Users Manual (to be self-explanatory and easy to understand) to be handed out at County; MOA needs to be signed, etc. Robert Brown was concerned that there was no schedule for implementing once the rule is complete.

## **V. Other Business – All**

### **Puget Sound Partnership – John Cambalik**

- John selected and printed out a few pertinent sections of the Action Agenda which he distributed to Team.
- Specifically pointed out sections of interest, stating that implementation plans are being developed for all Action Areas across the board.
- Submitted budget request to governor which included a Puget Sound packet of request including both financial and policies.
- PSP has created a non-profit completely separate from the Puget Sound Partnership. Have hired a lobbyist and Director. Don Hatler asked how the non-profit is to be funded. John wasn't certain, but the charter is to seek funding from non-traditional sources. Michael Blanton asked the name of the non-profit, John answered, "Foundation for Puget Sound".
- Don Hatler asked about a rumor that PSP may consider a special taxing district. John wouldn't call it a "taxing district", there have been discussions along the fee-oriented, and not property tax oriented line. Fees could possibly come from on-site septics, impervious surfaces service impact fee, etc. This session there will be a proposal written into legislature.

- Pete Schroeder asked if LID philosophy was rolled into PSP. John said that yes, especially in the water quality sections.
- Pete Schroeder made a motion for the DRMT to write and submit a letter of support for the DFW Watershed Steward Program/ specifically in support of Michael Blanton, motion was seconded by Cathy Lear and passed unanimously.
- HAPPY BIRTHDAY was wished to Michael Jeldness. Traditional song was sung.

## **VI. Meeting Adjourned at 5:00 P.M.**

### **Handouts:**

- From Dr. James Karr: Handout announcing presentation by Gary Loomis
- From Cheryl Baumann: handout on WDFW Watershed Salmon Recovery - role of the watershed stewardship program. Handout of contacts for letter writing to voice concern over budget cutting of the Watershed Steward Program.
- From John Cambalik: handouts from the action agenda: "Priority C: Reduce the sources of water pollution"; "Question 4: Where do we start?"; "A.3 Protect and conserve freshwater resources to increase and sustain water availability for instream and human uses"; "E.3 Continually improve the scientific basis for management actions in the Puget Sound through a comprehensive and prioritized regional science program"; and a large printout of "Hood Canal Action Area" and "Strait of Juan de Fuca Action Area" charts which included benefits, threats and priority strategies columns.