

# Dungeness River Management Team Meeting

February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2008

Notes prepared by Melissa Coughlin

## Team Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Steve Tharinger, Clallam County  
Hansi Hals, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe (alt)  
Scott Chitwood, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe  
Cynthia Nelson, DOE  
Pete Schroeder, Riverside Property Owners  
Al Moore, Riverside Property Owners  
Mike Jeldness, Water Users Association  
Bob Caldwell, Water Users Association (alt)  
Don Hatler, Sports Fisheries (alt)  
John Cambalik, DOE (alt) and PSP

Tom Martin, Clallam County PUD  
Allison Lutz, NOLT  
Virginia Clark, Dungeness/Quilcene Planning  
Judy Larson, Protect Peninsula's Future  
Joe Holtrop, Clallam Conservation District  
Robert Brown, Dungeness Beach Association  
Michael Blanton, WDFW  
Scott Hagerty, USFW (alt)  
Laura Dubois, Mayor, City of Sequim

## Others in Attendance:

Byron Rot, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe  
Robin Berry, Graysmarsh  
Cheryl Baumann, NOBLE  
Andy Brastad, Clallam County  
Elizabeth Van Sickle, Local resident  
Norman MacLeod, Olympic Stewardship Foundation  
Ben Rotter, LWRCL  
Sonja Rotter, LWRCL  
Diane Hood, Property owner  
Steve Rankin, Streamkeepers

Shirley Nixon, C.E.L.P.  
Lyn Muench, Clallam resident  
Butch Lauritzen, Clallam resident  
Teren MacLeod, WRIA 17 planning  
Phil Wiatrak, WRIA 17 planning  
David Sullivan, Jefferson County Commissioner  
Welden Clark, Dungeness River Audubon Center  
Bob Boekelheide, Dungeness River Audubon Center  
Melissa Coughlin, Indep. Contractor/Note-taker  
Hannah Merrill, Clallam County

2:05 P.M. Meeting called to order.

## **I. Introductions /Review Agenda / Approval of 1/9/07 Meeting Notes**

- Chairperson Steve Tharinger called the meeting to order. Introductions all around.
- Reviewed agenda, added: SRFB grants and 3-year recovery council workplan to section VI and DRMT birthday plans and PSP update to "Other Business".
- 1/9/08 DRMT notes were reviewed. Virginia Clark moved to approve notes; Cynthia Nelson seconded the motion, which then passed unanimously. Discussion on minutes – no comments.

## **Public Comment:**

- Judy Larson interested in hearing about WRIA 17 homeowners on-site septic training.
- Cynthia Nelson reminded team of 5:00 adjournment – River Center is booked for class after DRMT.

## **II. DRMT Coordination with WRIA 17 – Commissioner David Sullivan (Jefferson County), Teren MacLeod (Jefferson County Association of Realtors, WRIA 17 Planning), and Phil Wiatrak (DOE, WRIA 17 Planning)**

- Mr. Sullivan wanted to clarify that the Board of Health of Jefferson County was giving the on-site septic training 2/14/08 which Judy Larson had mentioned. There have been many changes the last couple of years in regard to on-site septic codes. Homeowners will have option to train to inspect their own septic systems (rather than hiring someone to inspect). Increases options for homeowner to save money. Many homeowners are just becoming aware of septic issues.
- Came to DRMT meeting to discuss Puget Sound Partnership Action Areas, as Jefferson County is split between two. Interest down Hood Canal to Brinnon. Discovery Bay issue for many. Smaller city than neighbors. Have to stretch resources farther. Interested in discussing common issues.
- As planning unit (Inventory area - WRIA 17), had adopted WRIA 17 watershed plan in October 2003. (Available for review on website). Adopted in January/February 2005 as plan. October 9, 2007 Detailed Implementation Plan to the Quilcene-Snow Water Resource. Reviewing and prioritizing 11 different projects –busy implementing as well as discussing and planning.
- Handouts were circulated for review.
- Instream Flow Rule process coming along. There have been leadership changes in the Department of Ecology since the rule-making process began. No new money coming into Department of Ecology in that time. Limited number of ideas that fit in the law; planning group has found some frustration in watershed planning finding things that work. Have experience with this to share.
- 2001 Memorandum of Understanding (Shawn Hines e-mailed to team and had hardcopies available at meeting) between WRIA 18 Initiating Governments and WRIA 17 Planning Unit described a plan

for areas that overlapped WRIs 17 and 18. Wanted to get members together now to discuss how to plan for the current overlapping jurisdictions.

- Teren MacLeod said it was an exciting time to implement plans. One consideration is how we work with this area (part of WRIA 17 that is in Clallam County). It is her first experience connecting the dots with WRIA 17 & WRIA 18.
- Steve Tharinger brought up that on January 24<sup>th</sup> DOE sent a letter to the County Commissioners in regard to the area that is in both WRIA 17 and Clallam County; it suggested waiting until after the rest of rule-making process for WRIA 17 was complete before beginning the rule-making for the part of WRIA 17 that is in Clallam County. Differences in ecosystems make this logical. Recall two rules in WRIA 18: one for east side and one for west side. Clallam Commissioners agreed with the phasing proposition by DOE. The Tribe, PUD and other parties (water purveyors, initiating government groups) also need to agree.
- Steve Tharinger said that with the Puget Sound Partnership there is a new layer of involvement for all Strait Action Area from Point Wilson to Cape Flattery. There was an initial conference in January with 90 people describing all that they were doing in their watersheds, and on March 7<sup>th</sup> there will be a workshop where Puget Sound Partnership staff will spend time on status and threats to ecosystem. At the local level there will be work on filling the gaps for the different Action Areas. Will also be putting together work group to manage the information and work.
- Steve Tharinger also said that in choosing his alternate for the Ecosystem Coordinating Board he will choose a person from Jefferson County.
- Tom Martin clarified that the Agnew District for WRIA 18 is the largest water purveyor not PUD.
- Scott Chitwood said that the Jamestown Tribe also received a letter from DOE with the phasing suggestion regarding portion of WRIA 17 that's in Clallam County; Tribe is supportive of ideas to help the rule-making process in WRIA 17 proceed, and generally the Tribe supports the suggestion. Not quite sure where the piece of WRIA 17 in Clallam County fits in the order of rule-making steps.
- Pete Schroeder asked to hear discussion on Hood Canal Coordinating Council and how planning units work together with them.
- Steve Tharinger: Within Hood Canal there is overlap with summer chum; David Sullivan has talked with Council - no direct relationship with WRIA 17; affects WRIA 16 more closely. Sharing resources.
- David Sullivan: According to the RCW there is an order for Instream Flow rule planning. If the work is not complete by a certain time, the control goes to Ecology. Outreach to involve us.
- Steve Tharinger asked if implementation funds were being accessed – how without the rule?
- Phil Wiatrak answered that funds for projects as well as for facilitation were available.
- Steve Tharinger said that the Commissioners were frustrated with the time it has taken for the instream flow rule and WAC to move forward. It is a very slow process. Development can't happen without water, water can't happen without the rule. Very interested in moving the process as expeditiously as possible. Folks with questions on the process aren't helping when they don't move it forward. Demand for water exceeds quantity – come up with a management plan.
- David Sullivan explained that the Instream Flow Rule recommendations haven't been completed. Had some of the data for some of the streams, but numbers were difficult to get; some streams had no data or not enough data to make the rule. Data sets aren't as complete as you'd like to make these decisions. Record rains, global warming, changes have to be put into equation. Need more resources; the Department of Ecology doesn't have them either. Need to move forward, but water law is complicated. People don't want to give up what they have now. Maybe the Instream Flow Rule should be renamed the Senior Water Right Protection Rule to make it more clear to people. It protects senior water rights for the instream flow, when you look at what's junior to that, how do you accommodate people who want to develop their land, how do you account for agriculture. Want to see small experimental farms succeed and provide local food supply. Challenge for them to get enough water at the right time. Need to work together. What is the enforcement for those out of line? How do you share what you've got, when you need to? Need representation for all.
- Teren MacLeod: Many similarities, but there are differences in the planning areas. Not every size fits all. Difficult to quantify, qualify in Jefferson County. There are no irrigation districts. 90-95% of the county is park or forest land. Small restricted agriculture areas. The build-out is under projected averages. Different river conditions and zoning. Need to recognize the differences in the planning areas.

- Scott Chitwood: As we plan (the last two and a half years) – more water is being removed from the water supply. How do we move forward with incomplete or less-than-perfect data sets on the smaller streams?
- David Sullivan: 1) Show me there is a problem before we try to correct it. 2) Show me you know what you're doing before you let anyone do anything that might impact it. Cautionary approach. How do we reconcile these? Lack of resources really hurt this.
- If you are going to make changes, limit uses, make right by landowner (easements, buy outright); deal with consequences with people that are impacted. Accommodate for changes. Minimize pain. Deal with people in short run to meet long-term goals. In the state-wide picture - one size fits all. The differences must be accounted for.
- Cynthia Nelson: Case law makes up a lot of the Water Law in the state.
- David Sullivan: Consequences for not acting – some of the problems get worse. Projects that we should have started aren't started or they aren't funded. Important to keep working on it. Key is to be empathetic to other points of view.
- Scott Hagerty asked how overlapping areas were handled by Shared Strategy.
- Steve Tharinger said that Shared Strategy was developed around Chinook evolutionary significance unit – now management of Shared Strategy has rolled up into Puget Sound Partnership. Water quantity, quality was part of that, but more focused with habitat issues and restoration. Instream flow rule could be characterized as a water right / protection rule for species.
- Scott Hagerty: Have the two WRIAs gotten together to discuss priorities and greatest issues and restoration needs in the common area? Steve Tharinger said, no – but they are working on it. Hood Canal has its project list for chum. SRFB will allocate this week a certain funding amount to Hood Canal Coordinating Council for summer chum recovery, with the caveat of more habitat focus.
- Scott Chitwood answered that there are recovery plans for all ESU species. One plan for summer chum, covering entire ESU area. One Puget Sound Chinook recovery plan includes 15 chapters, of which Dungeness is one, Hood Canal is one, etc. Coordination exists.
- Cheryl Baumann: The instream flow is an issue we see moving project lists forward – questions from technical people with regard to instream flows coming together. Looking at this when projects are moved forward.
- Tom Martin: Too much demand for available supply – in common. What are the high priority strategies? Elaborate on Aquifer Recharge strategies and any other.
- Phil Wiatrak: Jefferson County is doing feasibility study on aquifer recharge storage — first step. County reclaimed water grant: \$197,000 focused on sewage treatment plant for the Hadlock urban growth area. Hopefully get more money for implementing membrane system to replenish Chimacum Creek with reclaimed water.
- David Sullivan: Storage study: PUD bought Peterson Lake – option for the future. Talked with DOE about rain catchment - bill is still alive. Looking at 30,000 gallons a year in storage part of the instream flow rule. Local Department of Health has concerns for drinking, challenge to make sure it is safe. Looking at storing Quilcene water – using for Hadlock UGA part of the year and wells for the drier part. Permits for the City, complications for each step that have to be worked through.
- David Sullivan: Can develop list of things for the future- without all the information or agreements.
- Teren MacLeod mentioned projects in process now, supported by DOE grants: USGS Study of Chimicum Basin – wells, (to give idea of agriculture needs, how much that is allocated is actually used). Study ends in 2010, will be very helpful, but we're not putting anything on hold waiting for results. Another grant proposal is a survey of Jefferson County residents (may include Clallam area) where two groups can work together.
- Steve Tharinger: Dungeness has a groundwater model; divides watershed into quarter mile grids and then 1/8 mile. We have a lot of the data- should provide guidance for rule-making. We haven't handed off to implementation group. Cynthia Nelson said that the implementation of projects continue throughout the rule-making process.
- Judy Larson asked if there is an overview of what was covered at the January 20<sup>th</sup> Puget Sound Partnership session.
- Steve Tharinger said some information will be in the update today. Check the PSP website.
- John Cambalik said he is working with facilitator on flipchart notes which will be available soon. The results from the March 7<sup>th</sup> workshop will be on the PSP website.
- John Cambalik said the two watershed planning units have talked about quantity, what about coordinating on water quality; both have had shellfish closures...

- Steve Tharinger sees that as an issue on coordination, how it relates through Partnership and Action Areas. Is that enough, or should other discussions between planning groups be set up? Use Action Areas to do a lot of the work.
- David Sullivan said a lot will be for the local Board of Health, others for the planning units.
- Phil Wiatrak: PSP coordination – even Partnership doesn't know how coming together. Concern that things may fall through the cracks. Priorities need to be communicated, as do concerns of the other WRIAs. Issues to think about.
- Steve Tharinger: Local planning groups need to drive what works in the Strait – see that balls aren't dropped. Work in workshops (like the March 7<sup>th</sup> workshop). Fill in the gaps (status, threats). Redundancy helpful, keeps it in front of PSP. Drive what is important in the near term. Adaptive management, accountability, monitoring. Evolve as we move forward.
- John Cambalik reminded people that if they can't make the workshop, check the website.
- Phil Wiatrak asked if everyone agreed to the phasing approach for the overlapping area. Members answered that they all agreed. Reminded that the MOU between the watershed planning units needed to be revisited – something for DRMT. County will want to be included for the rule-making. David Sullivan suggested the MOU be updated, the spirit to remain the same. Steve Tharinger agreed.
- Michael Blanton pointed out he was the only watershed steward for WRAI 17 & WRIA 18.
- Another difference/consideration in WRIA 17: No creeks at all on Marrowstone Island and Quimper Peninsula. Both have fish. Instream flow rule important in fish recovery, but what about creeks choked with Reed Canary grass – does the federal government have role (for example in providing shade species for planting)?

### III. **Dungeness Artificial Recharge Study – Modeling Scenarios – Ann Soule (Clallam County)**

- Last briefed DRMT in October. Ready to begin modeling scenarios, deciding best locations for benefit and impact of recharge.
- Aquifer Recharge Technical Advisory Group (AR TAG) had 5-hour workshop last week to review findings of preliminary considerations and make recommendations on locations to guide consultants on where the modeling should be run. Wanted to brief DRMT and get support for recommendations.
- Two ways to get water into ground: injection and infiltration.
- Conclusions from February 6<sup>th</sup> workshop:
  - Intents of aquifer recharge: Improve Dungeness low flows (includes some benefit to side channels); Support small streams and wetlands; Provide for or mitigate new water development in place of exempt wells; Reduce potential for seawater intrusion.
  - Other conclusions: Injection wells not practical due to high cost of maintenance and pre-treatment (require a lot of maintenance); Infiltration too near the Dungeness River in spring would discharge too soon; Soils are critical; Depth to water table is also critical, must be >20 ft. to avoid local flooding; Pilot testing only way to learn true potential of a site; Permitting difficult if combined sources in facility (e.g., river water, reclaimed water); EIS likely.
  - Scenario recommendations: Year-round (reclaimed water) will be done based on 3.1 cfs east side, 0.5 cfs west side; Seasonal scenarios (river source) will be done at both 5 and 50 cfs to test for linear response (if not linear –learn more about the curve) – a more realistic river source volume will be determined after initial runs are complete.
  - Costs for infiltration: capital costs, monitoring wells, environmental impact considerations.
  - Costs for injection: higher, dual purpose (pump goes both directions) aquifer storage and recharge well =\$1 million (max), environmental impact considerations. Class A water not good enough for injection.
  - 7 location scenarios were selected (see map on back of handout). Discussed sites on map.
- Flow velocity in shallow aquifer was discussed.
- Don Hatler asked if any overlay was done with contamination maps (nitrate problems) and map on handout, and would you expect to see a plume indicating source. Ann Soule answered that it was a good idea, but she hasn't seen it done.

### IV. **Status of County's On-site Septic System Management Programs – Andy Brastad (Clallam County)**

- Plan is on time. Handouts on state requirements and Clallam County work group recommendations for on-site septic systems were distributed. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) available on county website.

- Homeowners are responsible for having conventional systems inspected every three years, and any system requiring a pump must be inspected every year. County is supposed to track this.
- Marine Recovery Area: same as Clean Water District. Boundary for Clean Water District meets county line. County is required to identify all septic systems in the Marine Recovery Area. Are in the process of discovering what records are in the database. Working with permit plan database expert to see what records are outstanding to make database more accurate (Funding from DOH).
- Eventually will take all information from database and create GIS layers with that information.
- Public outreach planned to get the information not yet included in database.
- County and Department of Health have provided some funding. Recommendation to do assessment on septic systems. Using a consultant, will conduct a simple feasibility study to look at county requirements based on recommendations of what the program should include. Will include solutions for low-income homeowners who can't afford inspection.
- Lots of discussion on who will inspect; can the homeowner's inspect? County has supported concept of homeowner training. County sent in proposal to Department of Ecology and was awarded a grant to set up pilot education plan for homeowners (depending on which system they have). It will enlist about 100 volunteer homeowners for training to inspect their own septic system. Program will evaluate the training and the inspections. Findings will be reported through the Internet. Setting up with a company to receive the information and report on County website.
- Judy Larson brought up the MRA – first time inspection by professionals. Andy Brastad answered that would be the case for first inspections and suggested people review the FAQs on the county website.
- There was a discussion on qualifying pumpers to inspect. Fewer qualified inspectors mean higher prices for homeowners. Now only designers are qualified to inspect.
- Mike Jeldness asked about sanctions for non-compliance. Andy Brastad said that the workgroup has ideas on this; thinks the majority of homeowners will comply as they become educated and aware. Some people will not be able to afford compliance; workgroup is working on this. Steve Tharinger suggested talking to state legislatures on funding to help homeowners. Andy Brastad reminded that in WRIA 18 Watershed Plan there is a section that reflects the need for strong operation and maintenance in the watershed.
- Don Hatler asked how many qualified inspectors are in the area. Andy Brastad answered that 8-12 designers are licensed through the state in the area.
- Time didn't allow for more discussion although it was apparent many people wanted to comment.

**V. ACOE Levee Setback Update – Hannah Merrill (Clallam County)**

- Hannah Merrill said that on 1/28/08 Byron Rot chaired a committee meeting that discussed grant for acquisition of parcels and the 5-year design grant. (The parcels acquired will dictate set back design).
- Need feedback from County and Public Works on the road.
- Habitat importance and awareness of water quality impact on Dungeness Bay concerns as move forward.
- County oversees grant. Army Corps of Engineers owns one dike, Beebe owns another. Waiting to hear from Beebe family if they are willing to work with Fish & Wildlife.
- Department of Public Works will be offering technical support.
- ACOE locally affected by national cutbacks. Responses are taking longer from them, but they don't have that many projects in the Pacific Northwest.
- Byron Rot said the grant is for restoration, not just flood mitigation – cost/benefit analysis has been done. Different analysis for ecosystem restoration. Felt that driving the cost/benefit analysis was a key element.
- Hannah Merrill said the plan is to work with local designers.
- Steve Tharinger suggested we have a monthly update on progress.
- Bob Caldwell asked if the parcels would be acquired out-right or through condemnation. Steve Tharinger answered that the Corps only works with parcels in public ownership. Voluntarily acquired.

**VI. NOBLE Request – Cheryl Baumann (NOBLE Coordinator)**

- Lead Entity separation into two Lead Entities last summer. Redoing bylaws.
- 10 years ago policy group made up primarily of government representatives. Statutes specifically require citizen input in ranking projects.
- Technical Review Group (TRG): 16 members review projects. Bring their recommendations to DRMT, WRIA 19 and Elwha-Morse which act as citizen input groups (Citizen Facilitation Groups (CFG)). But

these groups only rank the projects in their specific areas. Rank projects in nearshore, Dungeness, WRIA 19, Elwha-Morse > now have to be integrated.

- Discussion of Lead Entity structure. Handout of process was distributed.
- Options: (1) Add citizen to recommending group, (2) also ask each citizen group to participate or look for citizens to serve on Lead Entity Groups. Geographically want representation throughout all watershed groups in area. Lead Entity Group needs to look out for all the watershed groups. Wanted feedback from DRMT.
- Judy Larson asked if DRMT members should go back to groups they represent and come back with ideas. Cheryl Baumann said yes.
- Steve Tharinger asked if a broader citizen review at the Lead Entity level in addition to the citizen groups at level today was needed.
- Cheryl Baumann answered that citizens are suppose to rank the final project list. Get recommendations then Lead Entity prioritizes.
- Steve Tharinger proposed that we don't know the priorities of other areas. Cheryl Baumann responded that maybe we just keep it the way it is now, which may be an option – on the other hand with more money coming in from legislature, there will be more scrutiny. Must be right with statutes.
- Scott Chitwood thought process should be reconsidered, smaller area now – just the Strait. Refocus from purely habitat restoration effort to Puget Sound salmon recovery.
- Virginia Clark suggested ranking our projects, and then rank others. Also suggested placing ad in paper for citizen volunteers.
- Steve Tharinger supported having WRIA 19 project sponsors presenting to DRMT. Virginia Clark thought proposals could be reviewed in written form.
- Byron Rot said they want one group to prioritize for whole area. They want to know what the # 1 project across the Strait.
- Cynthia Nelson clarified that either (1) planning units asked for members to attend other meetings area-wide across Strait. Have more updates; or (2) LEG – look for someone (citizen) to represent.
- Steve Tharinger suggested Cheryl Baumann come back with more specific proposal. Cheryl Baumann invited comments–LEG will ultimately make the decision, but would like to hear comments.
- Pete Schroeder asked what other Lead Entities are doing around the state.

## VII. Other Business

- Cheryl Baumann: 3-year workplan – also SRFB grant schedule. Looking for Letters of Intent by March; asking for comments now. April – May – June: Projects. Then will be calling for additional projects for workplan.
- Reminder: Puget Sound Partnership workshop in Blyn March 7<sup>th</sup> at the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribal Center. If you have inventories of projects that you're working on – send to Puget Sound Partnership website.

## Public Comment

- No time

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

### Handouts:

- August 28<sup>th</sup> 2007 letter from DOE to Commissioners re: Instream Flow rule for WRIA 17\*
- State of Washington County of Jefferson – Resolution No. 68-05 Policy Statement\*
- Handout & map: "The Department of Ecology's Commitments to the Quilcene-Snow Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA 17)"\*
- Newspaper handouts: "At Home in the Quilcene-Snow Watershed" and "Water Quality, Quantity, and Habitat in Your Watershed" \*
- Memorandum of Agreement Between WRIA 17 Planning Unit and WRIA 18 Initiating Governments (sent by e-mail from Shawn Hines and copied for distribution)
- Dungeness Aquifer Recharge Feasibility Study – Modeling Scenarios Summary for DRMT - Ann Soule 2/13/08
- Clallam County On-Site Septic Management Plan *Status of Work Group Recommendations 2/11/08* (Andy Brastad)
- New State Requirements for On-Site Septic Systems (OSS) What they are and how do they affect Clallam County homeowners?- from Andy Brastad
- Flow chart on LEG Ranked Project List process from Cheryl Baumann

\*Brought by WRIA 17 guest attendees