

Pete Schroeder, Riverside Property Owners (RM 4.25-5.25)  
Don Hatler, Sports Fisheries (alt)  
Michael Blanton, WA DF&W

**Team Members/Alternates in Attendance:**

Cathy Lear, Clallam County (alt)  
Scott Chitwood, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe  
Shawn Hines, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe (alt)  
Bob Caldwell, Water Users Association  
Virginia Clark, Dungeness/Quilcene Planning  
Robert Brown, Dungeness Beach Association  
Don Hatler, Sports Fisheries  
John Cambalik, Puget Sound Partnership

Joe Holtrop, Clallam Conservation District  
Tom Martin, PUD  
Lorenz Sollmann, USFW  
Frank Needham, City of Sequim  
Alison Lutz, North Olympic Land Trust  
Greg Good, North Olympic Land Trust (alt)  
Judy Larson, Protect Peninsula's Future  
Pete Schroeder, Riverside Property Owners (RM 3.25-4.25)

**Others in Attendance:**

Cheryl Baumann, NOBLE  
Byron Rot, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe  
Robin Berry, Graysmarsh  
Diane Hood, Resident

Miltin Griffing, Property owner  
Elizabeth van Sickle, Property owner/Resident  
Bob Boekelheide, Dungeness River Audubon Center  
Melissa Coughlin, Independent Contractor/note-taker

**2:10 P.M.**

**I. Introductions /Review Agenda / Approval of June 10th, 2009 DRMT Meeting Notes**

- Robert Brown served as chairperson in Steve Tharinger's absence.
- Introductions all around.
- Agenda was reviewed, Virginia Clark moved to accept, Judy Larson seconded the motion which passed unanimously.
- One change was noted for June draft notes: Frank Needham corrected that it should read, "1.6 million gallons/day" not, "6 million gallons/day" on page 5, second bullet from bottom. Virginia Clark moved to accept June 10 DRMT meeting notes. Frank Needham seconded the motion which was then unanimously passed.

**Public Comment:**

- Cheryl Baumann from North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity announced that Michele d'Hemecourt and Eric Carlsen (also from NOBLE) are conducting an inventory of all the different monitoring, sampling, and surveying going on throughout the North Olympic Peninsula. There isn't one place to find all the different types of monitoring going on, Cheryl has that survey for anyone interested, or can e-mail the information to interested people. NOBLE will be using that information in adaptive management to salmon recovery in the area.
- Milt Griffing asked about the status of planning near the mouth of the river (removing dike), he wanted to know if that will be discussed today. He was referring to the area south and upstream of the Schoolhouse Bridge. He wanted an updated map of the plan. Cathy Lear will give an update of the project in the area in her presentation later in the meeting.
- Bob Caldwell reported (as a representative of Friends of the Fields) activity to put together an easement on the Finn Hall property. FOF received about \$860,000 from the Recreation/Conservation Office from Washington State and had raised about \$200,000 in private funds, and the whole activity was contingent on receiving a grant from the Federal Farmlands Protection Program. FOF have recently received word that they did not get the Federal Farmlands grant. The fallback plan is to try again next year. State RCO grant goes on to the next qualified applicant. Joe Holtrop said that you have to get the state dollars before you are eligible for the federal money and asked if they had to give the state money back. Bob Caldwell said, yes. The application timelines are tight. Bob said there were \$33 million in applications in the state for Federal grant money and were only given about \$8 million. Pete Schroeder asked Bob if it was the same grant for which he had previously applied (successfully), Bob said yes. The Brown farm got the most recent state money.

## II. 2009 SRFB Project Proposal Presentations for NOPLE

Meeting attendees were given full program proposal applications, so these notes only include a brief summary of each project along with any discussion that took place during the project presentation at this meeting.

- Cheryl Baumann gave a brief introduction: There are three projects in the Sequim-Dungeness area that have applied to the North Olympic Peninsula for Salmon Recovery Funding. This is the final stage of presentation. (There is a fourth project that will be presented today, the Jimmycomelately Riparian Protection project, that is in an early stage and will not be included in the ranking for NOPLE East WRIA 18.)

### **Program Proposal: Sequim Prairie-Dungeness Irrigation Conservation – Joe Holthrop, Clallam Conservation District**

- *Project Sponsor:* Clallam Conservation District
- *Goal & Objective:* Increase and/or maintain adequate flows for wild salmon. The objective is to reduce waste of appropriated water.
- *Salmonid species targeted:* Bull Trout, Chinook, Chum, Pink, Steelhead.
- *Habitat Factors Addressed:* Channel conditions; water quantity.
- *Costs:* RCO: \$700,000 (56%); Local: \$550,000 (44%); Total: \$1,250,000. Sponsor Match: Grant/Federal: \$25,000; Grant/State: \$525,000.
- *Description:* Irrigation districts and companies withdraw water from the Dungeness River to irrigate the Dungeness Valley. The water is delivered to irrigators through a system of canals, ditches and pipelines. As much as 50% of the water conveyed in the open canals and ditches is lost through seepage and evotranspiration. Peak irrigation water demands coincide with the naturally low, late summer flows, exacerbating already limited habitat conditions and high water temperatures for salmon. Salmonids utilizing the Dungeness River include ESA-threatened Puget Sound Chinook, Hood Canal Summer Chum, Bull Trout and Puget Sound Steelhead Trout, as well as Dungeness Pink (depressed) and Puget Sound Coho (species of concern). In addition, many open ditches discharge polluted surplus irrigation tailwater to Dungeness Bay, which is closed to commercial shellfish harvesting due to fecal coliform contamination. Through this project approximately 2.8 miles of open irrigation ditches will be replaced with pipelines to prevent an estimated 2.75 to 3.25 cubic feet per second (cfs) of ditch losses. Three cfs (950 acre-feet) of flow is equivalent to about 2.5 percent of average summer flows in the Dungeness River and as much as 5.0 percent of late season low flows. This project will also eliminate tailwater discharges and associated contamination to Meadowbrook Creek, a tributary of Dungeness Bay.
- Joe showed on map areas left to be piped and areas for proposed fish screening. Joe said if money was available it would be best to pipe entire system to give water on demand for irrigation. Estimated cost: \$700,000/water savings: 2.25 cfs.
- Robin Berry asked if the overall loss due to leakage loss was 2.25 cfs and if the water eventually goes back into the river, how is piping effective? According to aquifer recharge studies (at sites near there) the calculated return to the river (via seepage) was about 95%. Joe said it (piping) has been recommended in all the management plans; he hadn't looked at the actual net gain or loss to the river. Robin said the piping was started before the AR studies. Pete Schroeder said every project should look at that. Pete asked if there were any figures from Phase I, any baseline numbers for monitoring. Joe said that Phase I consisted of a lot of piping throughout the Valley and the data shows over 9 cfs savings. The goal is about 30 cfs.
- Diane Hood asked about something she had heard about where holes are put in irrigation pipes to allow leakage. Joe said the irrigators put out that idea a few years ago, and Graysmarsh intended to conduct a pilot. Excavation was most of the cost; the idea was to place perforated pipe next to regular pipe. During high water times, water would be run down the perforated pipe, so as to leak down into the aquifer. The project never got underway. Pete thought the reason it didn't take hold was that it was too expensive; Shawn Hines thought maintenance was the problem (perforations potentially clogging), and Robert Brown thought there were engineering problems. Joe said the irrigators were concerned the pipes would silt up.
- Other piece of the project proposal: Towne Road to end of project: 1.6 miles of ditch to pipe. Would eliminate tailwater to Meadowbrook Creek. Estimated cost: \$550,000/water savings: 0.075 cfs (and tailwater).
- Tom Martin asked what is different with what irrigators have now and with an "on-demand" system. Joe said piping the whole system is the only way for maximum efficiency. This way the system can be "off" or closed when not irrigating.
- Joe talked about Nash Huber's 200 acres of unconventional crops (not typical grass or hay land) that are planted in small plots with different crops and in different stages of development that needed to be irrigated at different times. It is more difficult to manage than pasture. Extremely variable and needs a lot of control.
- Judy Larson asked about the dike removal and savings to cost. Byron Rot said that none of the land in the dike setback is irrigated. Judy asked about contamination. Joe said anytime a ditch is open there is potential for contamination. Ditches will be piped all the way up to dike. Emergency overflow soaks into ground before water hits Hurd Creek.
- So far 28.73 miles of ditch has been piped to achieve 9.31 cfs to Trust Water Right Program.
- Schedule: Final design work is underway. Construction to begin in 2010. Complete before irrigation season begins.

- Cheryl Baumann noted that SRFB doesn't require water be saved to Trust. Joe said at least 2/3 has to be transferred to Trust (returned to River) per Trust Water Right MOU (between Ecology and WUA). 1/3 reserved for future irrigation needs. Tom asked who determines how much is saved. Joe said it depends on the program, sometimes on the life-span of the project, 25 years for the piping project – after that it may not work as efficiently. DOE has directed outcome to be permanent based on what has already been determined that has been lost. All projects require measurements and data keeping to be sent to DOE.
- Milton Griffing asked if there was any tool by which water rights can be sold to the City of Sequim, (with the growing demands put upon the City). Sequim has water rights so is allowed to divert water. Joe said that with regards to irrigation districts, County could possibly sell shares, but with WRIA 18 Rule-making (for instream flows and water management) he doesn't think that will be possible. Regardless, less water will be diverted with this project.
- Pete Schroeder asked about the statement on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page of the project proposal, where the project positively affects fish species with increased habitat and increased cfs; it is not actually year-round, need to clarify that it is seasonal. Joe said the irrigation season is from April 15<sup>th</sup> to September 15<sup>th</sup>. They are allowed to divert stock water year-round. Happens all year (except February – March when shut down for maintenance).
- Diane Hood asked how long irrigation has been in area. Joe said the first ditch was dug in 1895. Diane asked when problems were first noted. Apparently there were complaints in the 1920's. In 1924 water users rights were adjudicated. People began to realize that there were more water rights than there was (wet) water.
- Joe said that in the late 1940's BOR recommended piping all the ditches in the Valley, but the irrigators said it would cost too much.

**Program Proposal: Dungeness River Floodplain Acquisition II – Cathy Lear, Clallam County**

- *Project Sponsor:* Clallam County Community Development
- *Goal & Objective:* To protect degraded habitat from further degradation with the intent to restore the habitat. The objective of the project is to protect degraded salmon refugia, and habitat part of key ecological processes.
- *Salmonid species targeted:* Bull Trout, Chinook, Chum, Pink, Steelhead.
- *Habitat Factors Addressed:* Biological processes; channel conditions; floodplain conditions; loss of access to spawning and rearing habitat; riparian conditions; streambed sediment conditions; water quality.
- *Costs:* RCO: \$575,000 (85%); Local: \$101,550 (15%); Total: \$676,550. Sponsor Match: Donated labor: \$10,550; Force Acct – labor: \$5,000; Grant/Federal: \$86,000
- *Description:* This phase of the Lower Dungeness Watershed Restoration is the No. 1 ranked project on NOPL's 3-year workplan, and will further progress the Corps dike setback, reconnection of the river to a floodplain, and restoration of associated habitat on 1.8 miles of the river. The project will benefit all migratory salmonids. The overall project goal is to restore the ecological processes of the Lower Dungeness River.

The Channel is constrained along the east side by a dike constructed by the Army Corps of Engineers in 1963, which has resulted in an increase in channel confinement, aggradations, bedload instability, and water quality impacts associated with the current DOH Shellfish Closure Areas. Dike setback and channel restoration in this reach will provide sorely needed floodplain and side channel habitat.

When the Corps Dike is set back, considerable floodwater will exit the channel at the WDFW and Clallam County properties. After traversing the floodplain, these waters will reenter the channel predominately on the Chang property and to a lesser degree on the Clallam County and Athow property. In future phases, portions of properties owned by Shults, Melancon, Najera, Deford, Sherman and Forbes are required to place the setback levee on the consensus location and they provide 45 acres of floodplain (72 acres, including Chang, Athow, and all parcels that lie west of Towne Road).

- Project is a continuation of land acquisition in the Lower Dungeness Floodplain. The project will set back the middle Army Corps of Engineers dike on the east bank of the Dungeness River from RM 0.8 to 1.75. Ultimately it will reconnect the river with approximately 117 acres of floodplain and provide an expansive channel migration zone and allow for the formation of complex instream habitat including wood jams and side channels. This current project represents the next phase in acquisition of parcels in the lower Dungeness floodplain. Cathy showed map with parcels already acquired and those yet to be acquired.
- Restore formerly productive fish habitat and supports restoration of ecosystem function.
- *Parcel priority:* Both parcels are in the historic river channel, modeling shows that the water depth through these parcels was up to 10' deep through the Chang parcel and a depth of 6' through the Athow parcel. Purchase of these two parcels would allow the dike setback east of these parcels. This increases river migration area and decreases river velocities.
- Limiting factors include (but aren't limited to) the dike, water withdrawal, low amount of large woody debris and channel acceleration. The construction of dikes, roads and bridges has disconnected the river from its floodplain and truncated its meanders. The withdrawal of large quantities of water for the purpose of irrigation has reduced the amount of water in the river at times, creating difficulties for fish passage.

- 10 anadromous fish stocks use the Dungeness River. Four are listed species, two are on the critical list, all would benefit from this dike setback action (reduced velocities, meander/side channel development and LWD recruitment availability for migration and rearing).
- Restores formerly productive fish habitat and supports restoration of ecosystem function: Increases river floodplain area; increases channel meander zone; increases LWD recruitment; increases the quantity of spawning, rearing, and transitional habitat in the Dungeness River; reduces flow velocities.
- Working partnerships with: WDFW, Department of Ecology, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe, USFW, WDOT and ACOE.
- So far Clallam County staff has worked with an advisory committee and WDOT toward successful appraisal, offer, acquisition, relocation, and reselling structures of two key property owners in this area of the floodplain. Landowners seem interested, may be an outcome of the current economic (buyer's market) condition.

**Project Proposal: Seibert Creek Ecosystem Protection, Phase II – Alison Lutz, North Olympic Land Trust**

- *Project Sponsor:* North Olympic Land Trust
- *Goal & Objective:* To protect intact habitat from degradation. The objective is to protect salmon refugia and habitat that is part of a key ecological process.
- *Salmonid species targeted:* Coho, Cutthroat, Steelhead.
- *Habitat Factors Addressed:* Riparian conditions.
- *Costs:* RCO: \$478,736 (85%); Local: \$84,482 (15%); Total: \$563,218. Sponsor Match: Donated labor: \$22,061; Donated land: \$33,421; Grant/Local: \$29,000
- *Description:* In lower Siebert Creek, 2 miles of contiguous freshwater and estuarine salmon habitat will be perpetually protected using conservation easements and fee simple acquisition. These actions are listed as a high priority in the Siebert Creek Watershed Assessment. Siebert Creek flows out of Olympic National Park where conditions are pristine. Downstream the creek remains largely undisturbed and supports healthy populations of winter Steelhead, Cutthroat, and Coho salmon. Siebert Creek is characterized in the LFA as having ideal fish habitat throughout. The limiting factors this project will correct and prevent are: lack of large woody debris, erosion, and impacts of future conversion from open space to residential. Key landowners in the lower stream reach are willing to work with NOLT and SRFB to preserve the salmon habitat on their properties in perpetuity. These properties contain intact riparian buffers and habitat forming processes such as large woody debris recruitment. Phase I of this project was funded by SRFB in 2002 and protected 94 acres of the lower reach including the estuary (#01-1403). Completion of Phase 2 will add 27 acres and connect fragmented conservation easements on Siebert Creek that were acquired in Phase I. Together, Phase 1 and 2 will protect in perpetuity a contiguous corridor from the estuary to RM 2. Watershed residents, Tribes have been active in restoration, education, and watershed planning in Siebert Creek for over a decade.
- Phase 2 completes the corridor. Two opportunities: Miletich property (20 acres) and Adolphsen's (7 acres). In phase 1 the landowners weren't ready, but seem willing at phase 2.
- Miletich parcels: Agricultural zoning. 1 homesite/parcel. 2 parcels of 10 acres each with no need for any stream restoration. Risk: landowner may sell to someone else. It is permissible to build 2 homes on the site + outbuildings and roads. Benefits: protected stream and wide buffer. Uplands: open space and preserves the rural character of the area. Cost: \$328,791. Protects 20 acres and 1,500 stream feet.
- Adolphsen parcel: 7 acres. Rather than sell the property outright, if acquired, NOLT would manage as habitat. One homesite, 1,300 stream feet. High riffle/pool ratio. Benefit: protected stream encourage mature conifer forest. Cost: \$145,522 for 7 acres and 1,300 stream feet.
- Acquisition would fill in gaps, completing the corridor, protecting undisturbed stretch of Siebert Creek riparian habitat.
- Timing for acquisition is good, landowners willing to sell, risk that they will sell to someone else. Not a lot of stream restoration work is needed.
- NOLT is also working with County Parks and Recreation on acquiring 200 acres west of Siebert Creek for park on Olympic Discovery Trail.
- Cathy Lear acknowledged the volunteer group that worked on sections of Siebert Creek in Steelhead habitat restoration efforts.
- Miltin Griffing asked how acquisition (whether for easement or land title) affects the real estate tax base. Concerned that change in tax status will result in loss of tax base and revenue for County. Alison said that NOLT pays the tax on the land. Easement classification changes taxable value of property, but increases the value for citizens with the acquisition of open space. Miltin argued that in the interim someone needs to make up the lost taxes to the County. Alison explained that the community gains with the investment. Open, protected space is a desired characteristic and may actually increase land values around the acquired lots.
- Pete Schroeder drew attention to the "hazardous waste assessment" line item (\$5,000) in the Phase II summary cost information for all properties part of the application – and asked if someone from NOLT couldn't do that assessment. Didn't think there would be any sort of hazardous waste on either property. Large discrepancy in charge for this

assessment on the two properties. Alison said that NOLT has been trying to get someone in NOLT accredited to conduct the assessments to keep that cost down.

- Bob Caldwell brought discussion back to Miltin's point on loss of public taxes – this acquisition is an investment into the community infrastructure and actually adds to the well being of the community. Hospitals, ballparks, and agricultural zoned areas are also taxed less as part of a public policy decision.

**Project: Jimmycomelately Riparian Protection – Byron Rot, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe** (not included in ranking for NOPL east WRIA 18)

- *Project Sponsor:* North Olympic Land Trust
- *Goal & Objective:* To connect the Jimmycomelately Creek restoration to public lands.
- *Salmonid species targeted:* Chum, Coho, Cutthroat, and Steelhead.
- *Habitat Factors Addressed:* Biological processes, channel conditions, floodplain conditions, riparian conditions.
- *Costs:* RCO: \$527,693 (81%); Local: \$127,500 (19%); Total: \$655,193. Sponsor Match: Donated labor: \$3,500; Donated land: \$124,000
- *Description:* A  $\frac{3}{4}$ -mile length of Jimmycomelately Creek will be permanently protected through the purchase of a conservation easement on 62 acres from a single, private landowner (63.7 acres – Schenk easement). Moderate to old growth riparian forest and channel conditions on the property are excellent, and conservation easement will ensure it stays this way. No timber harvest, road building, or other development activities will be allowed to occur within the riparian forest.

According to the Recovery Plan, the lower 1-2 miles of the watershed must be restored and protected to effect and ensure the recovery of the Strait population aggregate. Protection, restoration and maintenance of the Jimmycomelately and Salmon/Snow watersheds are of paramount importance... Protection of the freshwater reaches is the highest priority (for JCL Creek)." This is the only unprotected riparian property within the anadromous zone and is the remaining major element for the restoration/protection of the lower watershed.

The \$7 million JCL restoration project included restoration of the estuary, adjacent nearshore, and lower  $\frac{1}{2}$ -mile of stream channel. It also involved tremendous community support, and funding support from state and federal funding agencies including SRFB, ALEA, NAWCA, NRCS, and others. This project will link the currently protected stream reaches above and below the project site. Directly downstream is the JCL restoration project, and upstream is state and federal forestland.

- *Timing:* Landowner interested in making corridor available. Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe approached landowner (Schenk) but wasn't interested in selling the property or an easement. NOLT put some money on the table and the landowner became interested.
- *Funding:* Can apply for portion of Hood Canal Summer Chum funding (\$350,000 available).
- Byron encouraged DRMT to write a letter of support for the project to the Hood Canal Lead Entity.
- Byron showed the area of easement on a map. Judy Larson asked if there would be any control over the property on the easement, or any restrictions for the landowner to restrict traffic on their land. Byron and Greg Good both replied that there are prohibited uses and acceptable uses whenever you create a conservation easement. Landowner can create trails for the family to access the creek.
- Pete Schroeder asked if there was a gradient through the property. Byron replied 1-2%. Pete asked if it Byron thought it would become as productive (in summer chum) as the creek on Beebe property. Byron answered that summer chum produce a lot in recovery situations.
- Miltin Griffing asked where is the public access - public money is being used to acquire. Want to see some means of public benefit. Byron said there are benefits, Miltin responded, "show me".

**Cheryl Baumann thanked all the project sponsors for presenting.**

- Technical review group held meeting yesterday (July 7, 2009). Long 4-hour meeting. The initial task was for \$5 million, the project sponsors carved down budgets so that Lead Entity can fund all 8 projects. In the past the money was allocated in such a way that projects had to "use it or lose it". Technical team thought all the projects were technically sound, well put together, and all had restorative value. Team wanted to be very strategic with allocating the funds. There were three camps for funding recommendations: (1) fund all the projects except the last project, Valley Creek project, which was thought not to be a good fit for SRFB funding. (2) Fund everything but the two ranked last, Siebert Creek and Valley Creek projects. Wanted to set aside money for future projects. (3) Fund all projects. Prior protection with Siebert and Valley Creek projects.
- Scoring, ranking and TRG summation is available from Cheryl Baumann.
- Cheryl made recommendation for the DRMT to make a motion to follow through with a letter of support for the Jimmycomelately easement project. Sooner than later, they will be ranking projects for funding on July 29, 2009.
- Scott Chitwood made a motion which Pete Schroeder seconded to send a letter of support for the Jimmycomelately Riparian Protection project to the Hood Canal Lead Entity and the RCO. Motion passed unanimously. Melissa Coughlin will send e-mail to Shawn Hines after this meeting to notify her of the passed motion.

- DRMT members need to get project ranking to Shawn Hines within a week. Hard copies of the ranking process and form were available to those who found downloading them difficult. Shawn will compile all comments and ranking and return to Cheryl Baumann.

### III. Questions from Public to Project Sponsors

- DRMT members were allowed questions during the presentations; no one in the public audience had other questions.

### IV. Other Business

#### Sequim Speaks

- Judy Larson announced that decision on candidates for Sequim Speaks committee members was delayed from the last meeting. Frank Needham announced that the Council will meet on July 13<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> to look at final list of candidates. City Council and staff selected Craig Ritchie (attorney for City) as City liaison for Sequim Speaks.

#### Puget Sound Partnership – John Cambalik

- Reorganization efforts have begun to better focus on actions in the Action Agenda.
  - Part of the reorganization is an effort to consolidate salmon recovery coordinator team with regional liaison team. John now works for Joe Ryan (Salmon Recovery and Implementation Manager). John will be responsible for action agenda for all salmon recovery efforts for Strait.
  - John will not be able to attend all meetings all the time in the future. Will be relying on the Strait Eco-net to provide regular communications in addition to e-mails, listserve, etc.
  - Actions: Continuing to form Strait Ecosystem Recovery Network. September 11<sup>th</sup> is the next meeting. Steve Tharinger, Scott Chitwood, Joe Holtrop, and others have been participating.
  - Working with 3 jurisdictions: Clallam County, Sequim, Port Angeles to update Master Shoreline Plans – due 2011.
  - Working with Cheryl Baumann to increase capacity of Lead Entity to do more projects, faster. Funds for Lead Entity to accomplish this.
  - Robert Brown asked if this meant loss of visibility for DRMT. John said Steve Tharinger participates on various levels and will be reporting to DRMT. If matter is critical, John will be here to convey.
  - Tom Martin asked if any stimulus funds were going to Action Agenda projects. John replied that Washington State will receive about 10% out of NOAA stimulus dollars, \$177 million. This is significant to Puget Sound. Lower Elwha will receive about \$2.5 million.
- Robert Brown did a great job of chairing the meeting and conducted full agenda with 10 minutes to spare!

### V. Meeting Adjourned at 4:50 P.M.

#### Handouts:

- *Summation of the Lead Entity's Technical Review Group's July 7, 09 Scoring Meeting* – NOPL, handed out by Cheryl Baumann
- *Sequim-Dungeness Irrigation Conservation* – Salmon Program, State Recovery Projects Application Project Summary – handed out by Cheryl Baumann
- *Dungeness River Floodplain Acquisition II* – Puget Sound Acquisition & Restoration Fund, Puget Sound Recovery Projects Application Project Summary – handed out by C. Baumann
- *Siebert Creek Ecosystem Protection, Phase II* – Salmon Program, State Recovery Projects Application Project Summary – handed out by Cheryl Baumann
- *Jimmycomelately Riparian Protection Pre-App. Joint Hood Canal* – North Olympic LE – Handed out by Byron Rot.