



February 9th, 2010
APPROVED Meeting Notes
Dungeness River Management Team
Dungeness River Audubon Center, Sequim, WA
2:00 – 4:30 P.M.
Notes prepared by: Melissa Coughlin

Team Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Scott Chitwood, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
Cathy Lear, Clallam County (alt)
Bob Caldwell, Water Users Association
Robert Brown, Dungeness Beach Association
Shawn Hines, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe (alt)

Joe Holtrop, Clallam County Conservation District
Colleen Teevin, NOLT
Judy Larson, Protect the Peninsula's Future
Tom Martin, Clallam County PUD #1
Paul Haines, City of Sequim

Others in Attendance:

Elizabeth Van Sickle, Property owner
Phil Martin, Retired physicist, county resident
Steve Rankin, Streamkeepers
Melissa Coughlin, DRMT Note-taker

Bob Boekelheide, Dungeness River Audubon Center
Ken Hobson, Resident
Paul Burgess, Sequim Resident
Matt Heins, Dungeness Farms

2:00 P.M.

I. Introductions /Review Agenda / Review and Approval of January 12th DRMT Draft Meeting Notes

- Chair Scott Chitwood called the meeting to order, introductions all around.
- No changes were made to the agenda, although it was noted that Cynthia Nelson absence would mean the DOE updates would not be covered in today's meeting. Scott did say, however, that the County, DOE and Water Users remain in discussion on how to proceed during the rule-making suspension.
- In reviewing the notes from January meeting: Robert Brown said it was not defined that a 12-month rule-making suspension would be in effect. Scott said they were definitely leaning that way, based on a meeting in October - so he has assumed it. A new version of the instream flow/water management rule (mainly editing and formatting changes) is due out soon. Judy Larson referred to an article in the PDN that summarized the effort for agreement on how to proceed toward rule-making, but the article listed more than the DOE, County and Water Users as the interested parties.
- Shawn Hines noted that she had made a few modifications based on some DRMT member comments to the January 12th meeting notes, as well as highlighting in the notes issues for follow-up. Judy Larson made a motion to accept the notes; Bob Caldwell seconded the motion, which passed. Robert Brown asked about the future agenda items, specifically the NASA tools follow-up; he was informed that Shawn had sent out a draft 2011 DRMT agenda/calendar/workplan by e-mail prior to the meeting. Tentatively the NASA project update is scheduled for the April DRMT meeting.

Public Comment:

- Judy Larson noted that a presentation on the status of eelgrass in Dungeness Bay is scheduled, but she wanted it to include information on Sequim Bay, as well. Shawn said she would make that request to the presenter, Ron Thom. **[Done. Ron will include information on eelgrass in both Sequim and Dungeness Bay.]**
- Judy Larson spoke about an article in section C of the February 8th Peninsula Daily News that focused on Sustainable Communities. Perry Spring, a member of Cascadia Green Building Council, had presented "Micro-hydro power from Stormwater". She suggested contacting Perry to present to the DRMT on water usage and the micro-hydro power usage of stormwater. **[Done. Cathy contacted Perry, and Perry will get in touch with Shawn to schedule time on a DRMT meeting.]** Tom Martin had just heard Perry speak on sustainable buildings, energy and water and said those presentations were best made to watershed groups.

II. Follow up: Revisions to DRMT Goals and DRMT Operating Procedures – DRMT Goals

- Goals were discussed and a change to Goal 7 resulted: "Develop and" were removed and changed to "Encourage development of a community stewardship ethic".
- Possible redundancy of goal 4 and 8 were discussed but no change was made.

- There was also a discussion about the amendments section, and request for clarification about the terms “MOU” and “Resolutions”. “MOU” is referenced in AMENDMENTS section, and “Resolutions” is referenced in the BACKGROUND section. Shawn will clarify and e-mail to group. Date of document modification will also be updated. **[Done. Shawn clarified in 2/16 email to Team. Related edits to the document were made accordingly, and attached in the e-mail.]**

Operating Procedures

Much discussion took place regarding suggested changes, including:

- Map should be included in the document to encompass what is described in the text. The Clean Water District area map can be used.
- Under “Meeting Structure”: The issue of dissent was discussed. The DRMT is not a decision making body, it has no authority to enforce; rather it is a place of collaboration and for sharing information. It is a community/citizen body for someone else’s decision-making process. The DRMT works on a consensus basis for decision-making. When there is a difference of opinion, the group’s members need to be respectful of individual views, but need to move forward during the meetings. There was a concern over the way it was phrased; the group doesn’t have any say on behavior outside the meeting. It was decided that dissenting opinions can be written and attached to the notes of the meeting. When topics for meetings are discussed was reviewed. #5- #7 it stated that at the end of meeting discuss next meeting topics, changed to future meetings instead of “next”. The group agreed to omit 7 completely from this section.
- The group discussed if the exact location of the meeting needed to be documented, sometimes the meeting has to change location, so it was left as is. Executive Committee members usually discuss topics and bring to DRMT for discussion. Executive Committee may schedule special meetings when required.
- The need for regularly scheduled meetings was questioned. An advantage to regularly scheduled meetings is that the public knows when the DRMT meet and can show up if they have an issue. Although it is not always possible to attend, alternates can cover for a represented group. Robert Brown suggested a subcommittee to investigate other meeting times (off hours, only when needed).
- Under Ground Rules 1 – c: Changed to written dissent noted in meeting minutes and/ or dissent into writing and attached to notes (instead of in appendix).
- Under Amendments: Attaching the MOU was recommended, Shawn to clarify in e-mail. Approval of DRMT instead of “all represented groups indicate approval”.
- Added provisions for leaving the DRMT under Ground Rules, add a bullet under #6, “provide written notice to their organization and the DRMT if representative is going to resign”. On #3, second sentence was stricken. #4 changed wording, “members commit to negotiating in good faith, and to working within the consensus-building process.
- Under Public Comment provided to the local media was suggested instead of posted in the Sequim Gazette.
- Shawn will make changes and circulate via e-mail for approval from members not in attendance at meeting. **[Done. Shawn sent email on 2/16].**

III. DRMT Effectiveness – DRMT

- Scott Chitwood commented that the article on Watershed Councils along with the branding work Byron has in the works (which began with focus group/workshop on branding facilitated by Chuck Pettis) led to him wondering how we affect the behavior and thought of people who don’t share our concerns about the environmental community at large. Any thoughts?
- A list of suggestions by DRMT members followed during a brain-storming session:
- Elizabeth van Sickle thought the Discovery Bay video that was presented at one DRMT meeting was quite interesting and wondered if there was any effort to widely distribute that. Scott Chitwood said the film maker, Shelly Soloman, (Environmental Design & Consulting), had offered to present her other films. Elizabeth said the last film was not too long, and it held viewer’s attention. Scott said “Olympia Oyster” is another of Shelly’s films that she could present to the DRMT. Others are working on environmental/ restoration project films as well, such as Albert Stein.
- Judy Larson asked if the DRMT could be more involved with the Irrigation Festival, time an event or some way to inform the public at festival time. Displays that were developed for Rule-making could be used at events. Also asked if there were more Dungeness-region based videos.

- Robert Brown has come across people living on the river who have been surprised by County or Tribe personnel who drop by. Robert said the property owners feel like they're being told what to do on their own property. There needs to be better education on what property owners can do and what the Tribe or government agency may be looking for. Robert said a year ago the Tribe wanted access to the river by way of someone's private property; Robert said that, according to the property owner, out of the blue the people see Tribal staff on their property looking for river access. There needs to be better relations and preparation work prior to visits. Scott Chitwood said that he knew of no situation (noxious weeds, river reach for engineered log jams) where Tribe representatives have not first contacted owners of riparian zone and river beds prior to entering private property. Robert Brown said that he has heard that perception from a number of landowners. He thought there should be better communication with contact. Cathy Lear said people fill in the blanks when they don't know what is going on and assume the worst circumstances. It makes the situation more difficult to talk about issues when people are frightened or defensive.
- Scott brought up that Dungeness branding efforts address landowner and public perceptions. The group Byron is working with is looking for ways to present restoration and land management to appeal to landowners. This parallels what Watershed Councils found in the article and what Chuck Pettis will present in March **[NOTE: Branding topic has been postponed to April DRMT meeting]**. What can be done on a volunteer basis that regulations aren't effectively doing?
- Robert Brown suggested using the DRMT as a clearing house for any activities on the river. Contact DRMT for more information on river activities. Get to know people involved prior to actions.
- Bob Caldwell brought up the power of the press. An effective way to get out a message is to write it yourself and include good photographs. The paper is a good way to get information out to the public. Most local events have many opportunities to get involved, such as setting up and manning an educational booth. There are good opportunities to interact with the public. Bob recalled the on-site talk given by Hannah Merrill on the dike setback sponsored by NOLT. People attending asked good questions; and the presenter knew the answers. Showed a willingness to meet and provide information and public interaction prior to all the decisions being made. Scott asked what Bob thought was an effective group size was for an on-site talk; Bob thought 20 people would be effective.
- Bob Boekelheide said the River Center is available for outreach. He also mentioned the River Festival has many opportunities to educate the public. 2,800 – 3,000 people now attend with 800 students showing up for the education day on Friday of the RiverFest. There are only two public accesses to the lower Dungeness River, one at Railroad Bridge Park and one on Ward Road. 120,000 people crossed at the bridge last year. He suggested setting up on the bridge and talking to people.
- Judy Larson suggested using displays from the Rule-making activities at the park during the good weather.
- Robert Brown emphasized informing people of events and presentations. He would have gone to Hannah's presentation if he had known about it.
- Scott Chitwood brought up the problem that there is no single phone number or agency for attention or concern when you need to contact someone about an activity on the river. The solution may be to have a "Water Master"/"River Steward" position or group of people to people to properly channel issues or concerns. Scott further said the Tribe gets called but it has no authority, it doesn't administer codes or ordinances against improper behavior at or towards the river.
- Cathy Lear suggested Rich Sill at the County in the Department of Community Development (under the Sherriff's Office) as the point person to call.
- Judy Larson thought essential information on the DRMT with a brief background and then "if you ever have a question about something on the river" – and give referral number could be in the local paper(s) or on a website.
- Tom Martin remembered a person that had a neighbor he felt was abusing the river came to a DRMT meeting and it resulted in the DRMT writing a letter. An effective use of the DRMT could be a place where people are directed to an appropriate contact. Concerns on water quality and water quantity could be directed. A "contact me" tab on the website could also direct people. Shawn Hines noted there is a contact person listed on the website. It's Susan Stark, of the Tribe (who maintains the website). Susan forwards any pertinent questions/concerns from public that she receives to Scott or Shawn. Shawn said the few issues she had been forwarded have been simple to address with an email or phone call.
- Elizabeth suggested cable channel 3 as well as Todd Orloff's show on local KONP radio.

- Judy suggested a basic article with more information on DRMT meeting and website information, phone number and e-mail. Any comments could be brought up at the next DRMT meeting directly.
- Paul Haines said a code enforcement officer at the City looks into code violations and brings back information. Can call Public Works: 683-4908, or 911. There is also a dispatch number for non-life-threatening calls.
- Could have a representative from DRMT to address issues with correct information, so that there is not mis-information out there. Once a week at a specific time on public radio can give correct, consistent information.

IV. Other Business / Announcements

Shoreline Master Program Update – Cathy Lear

- Timeline for SMP update activities keep changing.
- In January focus group meetings throughout the County were held. (1) To get a sense of how best to effectively structure the Community Forums (likely in April). (2) To get a sense of people who would come forward to ask if participants think conditions in the area are improving or going in the wrong direction (with regard to private property protection, providing public access, protection of shoreline – and what factors are used in judging). Participants were asked what would inspire them to participate in the County’s effort to update the SMP. Responses included: communications on the projects along the way, transparency was important.
- Currently the County is involved in drafting the inventory and characterizations of Clallam County shorelines with physical and biological descriptions.
- A web portal is being setup with all the technical information. DRMT will be forwarded a link when the portal is ready. Maps are there for review and feedback.
- Robert Brown asked how they are handling changing shorelines in this state of flux. Documents a point in time, but channels and spits change and islands form. Cathy answered that the environments are dynamic, where there is data they discuss channel migration zones, they are relying on Puget Sound Nearshore Restoration Project data for the marine shoreline.
- Cathy specifically requested that before the inventory and characteristic maps and reports come out, the DRMT members need to look at sections and make sure that it is described and noted properly.
- Judy Larson said that she heard of a “natural resource damage assessment program” at the HAZWOPER training class. She suggested getting data on the most environmentally sensitive areas from Dave Byers.
- Scott Chitwood mentioned the letter to the editor in the paper which asked, “Can the County just not do it (SMP update)”. Cathy Lear thought that if the County chose not to update the SMP they would risk losing any State funds and would probably end up spending a lot of money in court as the Shoreline Management Act makes the update a State law. Commissioner Chapman has said that as County Commissioner he took an oath to uphold the laws of Washington State. The consequences would be heavy. Paul Haines said the City is bound by the same laws. Heavy penalties would result from non-compliance.
- Judy Larson understood that Jefferson County had finished their update, and DOE said Jefferson County had to adjust the final plan. Is their FAQ similar to focus groups questions? The Streamkeepers had circulated Jefferson County’s FAQ on-line. She said she would be interested in any discrepancies. Cathy said they are putting together an FAQ, but not covering specific questions about implementing plans, it may include bigger/broader questions.
- Robert Brown asked if the Shoreline Master Program update will drive Code updates (affects building). Cathy said the SMP update is about how we, the people who live here, use the shoreline.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

Handouts:

- Dungeness River Management Team Operating Procedures January 2011/ modified February 9, 2011
- Dungeness River Management Team Goals / modified February 9, 2011
- Article: “Watershed Councils: It Takes a Community to Restore a Watershed”, by Marie Oliver from Pacific Northwest Research Station Science Findings, issue 129/ January 2011.