Dungeness River Management Team Meeting
Dungeness River Audubon Center
June 11th, 2008

Notes prepared by Gayle Baker for Melissa Coughlin

Team Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Steve Tharinger, Clallam County
Cathy Lear, Clallam County (Alt)
Shawn Hines, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe (Alt)
Scott Chitwood, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
Cynthia Nelson, Department of Ecology
Pete Schroeder, Riverside Property Owners
Mike Jeldness, Water Users Association
Walt Blendermann, Sports Fisheries
Michael Blanton, Washington Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
Don Hatler, Sports Fisheries (Alt) and Cl. Cons. District (Alt)
Al Moore, Riverside Property Owners
Allison Lutz, North Olympic Land Trust
John Cambalik, Puget Sound Partnership (DOE Alt)
Virginia Clark, Dungeness/Quilcene Planning
Judy Larson, Protect the Peninsula's Future
Tyler Ahlgren, Protect the Peninsula's Future (Alt)
Robert Brown, Dungeness Beach Association
Dean Yoshina, US Forest Service
Pam Sanguinetti, USFW-Dungeness Wildlife Refuge
Laura Dubois, Mayor of Sequim
Tom Martin, Clallam County PUD #1

Others in Attendance:

J. Parker, LWV
Milton Griffing, Tax Payer, lower east side
Cheryl Baumann, North Olympic Salmon Coalition
Byron Rot, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
Sonja Rotter, LWVCL
Diane Nelson, LWVCL
Welden Clark, Dungeness River
Jack Osborn, Conservation Engineer
Randy Johnson, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
Elizabeth Van Sickle, property owner
Hearst Coen, LWV/NOLT
Steve Rankin, Streamkeepers
Linus Hayden, Innovated Waste Water Mgmt.
Gayle Baker, Volunteer Note-taker

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

I. Introductions /Review Agenda / Approval of 3/12/07 Meeting Notes

- Chairperson Steve Tharinger called the meeting to order. Introductions all around. Linus Hayden Innovated Waste Water Management, offered handouts on services he provides.
- Tharinger recognized Pat Neal, PDN Columnist.
- Reviewed agenda, added item: Logo Contest after public comment.
- Cathy Lear introduced Gayle Baker-volunteer note taker. (Covering for Melissa Coughlin, who is recovering from an injured hand.)
- Robert Brown noted "other business" topic was left off agenda. Tharinger responded yes, because of the tight schedule.
- Cheryl: Technical review group comments were handed out for each project.

Public Comment:

Mr. Milton Griffing: To start off I would like to ask have any of you built anything or worked on a planning team, or a watershed project or river based project? Just a very few. Has anyone ever had to go through the process of cost benefit analysis of the projects and lead those through all the various cabinets that you have to go through and a water-shed project that uses federal money? I ask because one of the things has raised its ugly head again, that I thought was laid to rest sometime back. That is the relocation of the Corps dike from the school house bridge on southwards. On northward, I don't think there is that much of a problem because there is already going to be a different thing going on there. The cost of the land rights for relocation that way are going to be prohibitive. I think I'm looking at a million dollars sitting right there at the head of the table (indicating Steve Tharinger). Based upon my tax appraisals of my property and comparing that to what he (Steve Tharinger) has there plus all the relocation costs and everything…I think they would have to pay Tharinger at least a million dollars. Because one of the things that they don't take into consideration, the people out here without any experience don't take into consideration, is that for every household that is moved, and every business that is moved, you have a forty thousand dollar requirement for relocation costs for federal funded, and this would be a federal project because only the Corps could move that dike. Now, when the Corps looked at what the probability was of looking at the dike a few years back, they said only if there would be a new bridge built there at the school house, at the old school house bridge as they call it on East Anderson there. That bridge is a very sound bridge; I don't know whether how many of you got off there or in it or underneath it or looked at it—that isn't going any place. But, and there is plenty of room for overflow on to the west of it. Alright—Tharinger would not be the only person in there. We set aside-or we didn't set aside-there was a consortium in Seattle area-that set aside the farm lands that Huber rents in there south of Tharinger. What was…I cant' think of the name. (Multiple comments from attendees

supplying information). (Delta Farms/Puget Sound Coop/De Palma was the result of the input). Milton continues: "Ok, alright, then you go across the road from that and you've got the Brown dairy farm.

Tharinger: "Milton, I'm going to interrupt you. Because this first phase is to talk to property owners and do the feasibility studies to answer some of the questions you've raised, and so that's the process that's going on and so I think a lot of the questions you are bringing up and the concerns you are bringing up will be addressed as this process moves forward. For example the bridge project there has been exchange with the Corps about that and clarifying some of the studies we've had and that makes that less of a priority for them then before."

Milton: "Alright, but it would take you again another million dollars to buy out the Brown farm…"

Tharinger: "Right now the Brown farm is not in the mix. That's what I'm saying; a lot of issues you are raising are going to be addressed. A lot of that property that you are talking about is not in the mix via this first phase, and it is an analysis for feasibility for construction."

Milton: "Alright, but the analysis is not there!"

Tharinger: "That's what's being done now."

Milton: "Wait! Wait! Just wait a minute, please! You said you would take yourself out of it. Remember?"

Tharinger: Laughs

Milton: "Well, you're out of it."

Laughter. Tharinger: "That's for sure."

Milton: "They ah, if there ever was any of us that needed to be acquired by eminent domain. Eminent domain requires a computation or proof of necessity. None of that is a necessity. And then you get into the cost part of it. You can not show you're given enough increase of salmonry in the whole darn river to justify the expenditures it would take to move that dike. Now, moving away from that dike. Several of you were involved in supporting the removal of the dams on the Elwa. The dams on the Elwa are operating, they are doing the ah, they are generating electricity at the lowest price of any electricity being generated anyplace in the United States. And they have all been paid for. They have all been completely paid for, they don't owe the, so that the only thing that you are considering in the power generation from them is the variable cost for the small handful of people that use them. Now, you take those two dams out of the generation pool and you're gonna replace them with carbon burning fossil fuels. This is not being green at all. It's not sensible at all. When we're working with…"

Tharinger: "You're going to have to wrap this up."

Milton: "Yes, hush, if you wouldn't interrupt so much, but…these two things are not sensible. Neither one of them have one depth of common sense in them. And if you insist upon going on with that…then there is one last thing. That I said this early on in the river basin study—when they started putting logs and cable logs in the river using tax money, because grants are tax money, don't kid yourself—that we would need an audit. Now is the time that I call for an audit of everything that is being done in this river basin. Showing where the monies went, what they went for, and what benefit they had from them. Thank you.

Tharinger: Thanks Milton. Anyone else to take advantage of the public comment period?

LOGO Contest:
Tharinger: "As you know we reviewed a bunch of student art and we selected the top three choices and then we handed those off to the Tribe which is managing this whole thing and they gave it to a graphic designer and have come up with three or four designs to actually combine the student art into what would be a logo. So, Shawn has examples of these and what we're trying to do is make a selection —we all need to be Vanna White's here…" (In reference to efforts to hold up the different logo designs). "So, there are five of them." Ok, these two are sort of the same, one is colored, one is not. Then there is the two that are—there is this one that is sort of a square you know the larger folk, people larger than the fish. Then there is the one that

has basically the same information as the round one but it is just in a rectangular form. And then there is the one that Mike has which is sort of a black and white in the rectangular form as does Virginia has that is color in the rectangular form."

Some questions from attendees…

Tharinger: "So the executive committee looked at these and recommends this as being the number one." (Referencing the colored logo). Other questions and responses about tweaking the logo to make them work: Colors, fonts, lettering, etc.

Virginia Clark made a motion to accept the executive committee's choice of logo number one. Al Moore seconded the motion. No other discussion. All in favor "ayed."

II. DRMT Scoring Sheet for SRFB Project Proposals

Steve Tharinger introduced topic: "Everyone who has been on the team for a while knows that each year, as a citizen advisory group with the Dungeness watershed to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board process. The projects have to be reviewed by us and ranked by us so that's what this next hour or so will be - to have presentations on the two projects and then I guess discussion on the ranking process".

Cheryl handed out applications for Team to consider when they are ranking. The applications provide more detail about the projects being proposed. Shawn showed scoring sheet for DRMT and briefly explained the process for scoring. Forms need to be submitted to Shawn by June 23. Shawn will consolidate comments and average the scores to come up with a ranking order of the projects. The consolidated comments and ranking will be given to Cheryl by end of month.

III. 2008 SRFB Project Proposal Presentations:

- **Washington Harbor Restoration Design Project—Randy Johnson (Jamestown S'Kallam Tribe)**

"This project is called the Washington Harbor Restoration Design Project. Developing this project we utilized several reports. The Historical Changes Report, the Dungeness Chinook Recovery Plan, the Summer Chum Recovery Plan, Puget Sound Recovery Plan, and the WRIA18 Limiting Factors Analysis. And on the north Olympic peninsula lead entities three year work plan, this project is ranked number 4 of 37 total projects. This is a, oh probably most folks have a pretty good idea where Washington harbor is in the old Bell Creek estuary. This is a near shore habitat project and is it's meant to restore habitat for juvenile salmon, especially ones coming out of Sequim Bay, but also Discovery Bay, points further to the east possibly—but especially the Jimmycomelately stock. And also Dungeness River Chinook and possibly summer chum.

The Jimmycomelately (JCL) Ecosystem Restoration: Most of you are pretty familiar with that project? Have an ESA listed stocked salmon down there, the summer chum, and it's historically the western strong hold of this population. Some of the rivers further west, like the Dungeness, Morris Creek, the Elwa have had summer chum documented in them but in terms of large numbers, Jimmycomelately was the farthest west. The project is specifically meant for those fish, but I think it is also going to benefit Chinook salmon too. This is a little pocket estuary in the Skagit River ecosystem called the Lone Tree Lagoon and the Skagit coop folks have done some research there and look at the incredible number of fish that they have now been utilizing this little estuary system—chum and pink, over 9000 fish/hectare in that habitat for chum salmon. And then wild Chinook salmon also using the upper part of that system. A lot of research has been done on the Skagit river eco system. They concluded that the so called pocket estuaries are a really important part of the salmon production ecosystem for wild chum and Chinook and interesting that a lot of pink salmon have also been utilizing that habitat. On JCL creek, summer chum had dropped very close to extrication as a 2 year average. JCL creek was intensively altered from it likely looked like in 1800. Settlers came along, channelized the creek, delta pro-graded in response. Roads were built across the estuary, fills placed, creek rechannelized, the log yard built, the whole area developed around it. Really incredible changes in the ecosystem, to the detriment of summer chum habitat.

Back in the late '90's the land owners and the technical folks began working together to devise a plan that makes things better for people and for fish down there. And came up with this wish list that seems

very very wistful, just kind of a dream that the habitat biologist dreams and how much of this could ever actually happen, well I guess about all of it has happened now: Industrial log road removed, bridge built on Highway 101 so the stream could be reconnected with its estuary, the old estuarine channel that had filled in behind a tidal dam that had been built down here is mucked out, here's the new bridge in the channel that had been straightened via that of the way of the agricultural practices was re-meandered, linked up with the flood plain, logs put back in, and the restored estuary down here.

2001 & 2006 very dramatic transformation. That's on the habitat side. Stock recovery work has been underway also. And on that two year average of twenty some returning fish in 2004 we had almost 1700 adult salmon returning. We are starting to see some really encouraging numbers of Coho using the streams. The current prediction based on smolt traffic is for the production of a little over 2000 Coho smolts this year. I think it's actually going to be higher than that. And that's an equal number to what's predicted for the much larger streams—Siebert Creek and McDonald Creek. So JCL creek has the appearance of becoming quite a nice little salmon factory. Figure JCL creek down here: remember I had the photo about intensive use of estuarine type of habitat that has been documented elsewhere for Chinook and chum salmon. Well then at JCL, even though we had this major restoration project, there still is not what you would call an enormous amount of estuarine habitat down there. And just like up on the Skagit they are finding that the estuarine habitat immediately associated with the river mouth in many cases appears to be getting maxed out by salmon use and salmon are moving farther down the marine migration corridor and using the so called pocket estuary habitat. Well, in the vicinity of JCL creek we have several pocket estuaries that these fish can use: One right there by the tribal center, the Chicken Coop Pocket Estuary; and then out by the spit, the Paradise Cove Pocket Estuary; Pitship Pocket Estuary; and then Washington Harbor—all within five miles of JCL creek, all within a range that a summer chum fry could potentially migrate in one day. And it's just about five miles up to Washington Harbor. So that is the sweep of pocket estuary habitat in the immediate vicinity of JCL Creek. Now Chicken Coop Pocket Estuary and Paradise Cove Pocket Estuary do not have any marsh—any significant amount of tidal march habitat associated with them. Pitship and Washington Harbor do. They both happen to be crossed by roadways and much of them, well, near all of the marsh is inland of the roadway and up at Washington Harbor much of the marsh is inland of the roadway. And you might say well, maybe the marsh is a result of the roadway. Maybe keeping the waves out or whatever. Well that would be a logical conclusion from this small data set, but it would be erroneous. And I'll get into that some more in just a minute. Mentioned the eco system for JCL chum accessing the pocket estuaries and then Washington Harbor which they can't hardly even swim by without getting into. The biggest producer of eastern stream water summer chum is salmon creek down here, they are faced with the same habitat issues as JCL summer chum and they have a small suite of pocket estuary habitats also and 16 miles down their migration corridor they also run into Washington Harbor. So I would hypothesize that Washington Harbor is very likely a vital part of their ecosystem also.

I have to apologize, I tweaked this slide show a little bit today and things aren't in quite the same order as I remember. That's the Pitship Pocket Estuary with the roadway in the marsh. The 1870 coastal survey map shows that at that time this indeed was tidal marsh and in fact was very similar with what we see today with this showing up as a little lagoon feature. This is a magnificent spring system that up wells here. And there were spits that came from either way with approximately a 30 foot opening or so, to the best that I can measure off a the old map. So the marsh predated the road. Now down in Quilcene Bay, at the head end of Quilcene Bay, it's a similar situation where you have an expansive tidal marsh up stream of a road. Now in this case, the roadway actually did engender the development of some marsh. With the mud flat historically extended a little farther inland. This is an area that receives a pretty major amount of wave energy. But anyway, similar in the sense that you had sand spits, roads were built across, small culverts installed. This is a scour hole from the tidal marsh draining through the small culvert—a 60 inch culvert. A real problem for habitat forming processes and fish access in and out of the estuarine system. Down there the Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group replaced the culvert with this bridge. The Pitship Pocket Estuary—the same treatment is being proposed. Replace the culvert with a bridge to reestablish high habitat conductivity. And what the Skagit River scientist have learned is that for fish to physically be able to access a piece of habitat does not mean that there is a high likelihood of significant habitat utilization. The habitat can be physically accessible, but if it does not meet a certain standard for conductivity then it will be under utilized and be severely under utilized. So, in other words you might say: well, during a perfect flood tide event maybe fish will get in to that little culvert there. But that provides very poor habitat

conductivity and most of your fish are going to be past this point and not going to be accessing it because of the poor conductivity.

Out at Washington Harbor this is the first coastal survey map—first detailed coastal survey map—the T sheet. Shows the salt marsh feature up in here. And it's the salt marsh habitat that has been found to be probably the premiere habitat for the juvenile Chinook and chum salmon. This is what it looks like today and this would be as the project the site for our proposed design project. So this roadway with these little seven culverts in it goes roughly across this area here. You can see that the marsh is still intact up here. There were reports that there were once rich expansive eel grass beds in this part of the bay that have declined or disappeared completely because of the change in tidal hydrology caused by these little culverts. Again we have really poor habitat conductivity up here. This is the site with culverts. Thirty three acres are impaired by this low conductivity and then there is actually another four acres above this that is separated from the rest of the system by a dike. Thirty three acres plus the four above this other dike.

So what we are pursuing would be the funds to design a structure that will cross this estuarine system to allow tidal hydrology to be restored and habitat conductivity to be restored.

We were out there on a field trip recently. At this point in time there was a minus 2.9 tide in progress. It had receded to a minus 2.3 at this time. You can see mud flats right and left on the seaward side and the water is still just belching out of those culverts; high velocity flow, enormous scour hole, approximately half acre scour hole on both sides. You can see this long roadway and this is the only option for fish to move into the upper 33 acres. Here it is at minus two and half feet and at minus 2.9—so we're at low tide here. Water is still rushing out, scour holes on either side. Yet on the inlet we still have impounded water and we've got quite an expansive length of shore line for fish to figure out OK how I get out of this place. And in the outlet obviously not favorable fish passage conditions at all. You may not be able to read this legion very well. This roadway was built as a place to put the sewer outfall pipe for the city of Sequim. And it's buried in there. They don't use it much if at all. But they have to have it to serve as backup to their existing system. That's a reality is that they got to get their line through there. I'm sure the landowners would also like to maintain their access across here, so we're looking at most likely having some kind of a roadway. But how could it be modified to restore tidal hydrology and make things good for fish. And meet the needs of the landowners. There are three landowners in the area. The project site is entirely upon one property and then the duck club here very nearly adjoins it as does this other property. So we look as these folks as being pretty important stake holders along with these guys—the landowners. I don't know what the tidal stage was when this photo was taken. It must have been really low. The water is still draining through this pool; it is almost drained, but not quite. And anyone who has spent time out on the mud flat when the water is shallow on a sunny day, it really gets warm. I hate to think of the thermal pollution. And if indeed the anecdotal reports of the demise of the eel grass beds are true that could be a contributor. And this would be a very hard thing for fish trapped up in this part of the estuary.

The preliminary budget for the conceptual design analysis, cultural resources review, thirty percent design, local technical team meetings, final design, permitting, an ancient cultural review: approximately $117,000. So at the end of the process we would hope to have final design in hand, all the permits would then be ready to go straight into construction.

And, what would it look like? Well, we don't know. That's why we need to do the study. Will this do it, recognizing that there would be some type of structure over this opening here. O.K. here's an opening I've painted in there that's about as this channel down here. Maybe that's good enough. Well, I see there's actually two channels down here so I'm going to add those two channels and we get this. Now that's got to be good enough. Then somebody comes along and says well, what about the rest of this part of the tidal prism needs conductivity. OK, maybe it does. So we suddenly have another opening here. Conductivity through the marsh—oop, well now we have another opening. Does the whole thing need to be removed and the line put on a causeway. I don't know. I don't know which of these alternatives I showed or what else in the mix might restore that tidal hydrology and work with the landowners and fish. That's what the project would be all about: defining those alternatives; selecting one and getting it engineered and then executed."

Questions & discussion following presentation:

1. outfall piping
2. feasibility issues
3. eel grass
4. overhead photos
5. scour holes
6. other creeks and deltas affected

- **Meadowbrook Creek Restoration Project – *Dan Golner (Ducks Unlimited)***

"This project is Meadowbrook Creek Restoration Project. It is a project that is based in the Dungeness/ Meadowbrook Creek Watershed. And the Meadowbrook Creek (MBC) Watershed has some limiting factors which include: limited capacity of tidal exchange; low water quality; quantity; and poor riparian habitat. It's also just east of the Dungeness system and was historically connected to the Dungeness. And this proposal is addressing those limiting factors, but kind of on a larger scale. One of the elements is to connect up the MBC system with the Dungeness system. Thereby providing additional habitat to some salmonids that currently use the Dungeness system. There have been documented use of Coho and steelhead in MBC, but there is also Chinook and chum and pink, the species that Randy mentioned, that utilize the Dungeness that after this project is completed would have access to an additional 50 acres of habitat. The goal is to restore estuarine habitat plus plain habitat which would provide over wintering and rearing habitat for those species. I stole some material from Randy, he gathered quite a bit of historical data on the system and this shows the original marsh habitat that was in the area. The same area showing the marsh habitat overlaid on a 1942 photo. Here's the Sequim Dungeness Road, this is Meadowbrook slough, Dungeness is over here, this is MBC and this is the property that we are talking about. Now one of the advantages that we have on this project right now is that we are working with willing landowners. You know, I mean it would be great to restore that marsh habitat that was historical there. However, we are limited with roads and homes and all the other areas that have destroyed habitat. And so we are somewhat limited with what we can do here. And we are fortunate that we would be working with the landowner on this piece, which is MBC (here's MB slough). The Dungeness Habitat Farms own this property and this property, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife owns this property. And our restoration would encompass these three properties. And we have a couple of restoration elements that I would like to talk about specifically: I do want to mention that this request is for actual restoration money. We had already proposed a feasibility study which would help us determine a lot of specifies of these project elements and that money we did receive feasibility money from the SRF Board. And we just got that money under agreement. So we are going to be able to start spending that money and develop some of the specifics of the project elements. I want to talk today about some of the conceptual things that we have. And our plan was: we would get feasibility money, finish our feasibility work on this project by fall, which would allow us to put the permits and then actually have the restoration money in hand to begin restoration in 2009. So again these are the parcels that we are talking about. And I was just talking about the elements on specific parcels.

Now this is the first piece—here is MBC. And what we would like to do on this piece—again this is private ownership, but one of the nice things this property is recently, ah, the landowners have donated conservation easement to the North Olympic Land Trust (NOLT), so this property is protected in perpetuity, which was one of the steps we wanted to see in place before we would essentially spend money on doing habitat work; we wanted to make sure that that habitat was going to stay in place for a long time. So one of the first elements that we are talking about doing is removing the levy along the MBC here. We want to breach that levy, remove it to grade, which would allow tidal flow throughout this whole property. This property already has some salt water influence. When you are on our site you can tell that there is quite a bit of vegetation here that is influenced by saltwater: there are quite a few salt water plants out there.

One issue that is yet to be determined, which will help with the feasibility study and will be determined by the feasibility study, was whether or not we need to do anything along this boundary. This is Sequim Dungeness Way. And if we are opening the tidal flow to this property what does that mean for the road. And we do have a topographic survey that shows a fairly low elevation, low grading system. So we may have to build some kind of protection here to protect the road. This is the first element—this opening the river and restoring some of this flood plain habitat. So essentially when the tides comes in and the area floods up, rather than be restricted just to the channel itself this would be inundated with water as well. And juvenile salmanoids would have the opportunity to utilize this area versus just …you know.

Another element on this piece, and again I just kind of adjusted direction so this is where the breaches would be. This would be open to the tidal end. And some of the information that Randy had gathered, there was an indication that MBC historically ran up this way to state property. And right now—as the situation exists currently—there is a culvert here and the majority of the water runs through this lower system. And part of the project is to restore historic the MBC and so we would divert the water, pull up the culvert and allow the majority of the water to go back into this historic channel. This shows what a currently MBC comes through here—runs through this culvert, which does restrict quite a bit of habitat. This is the culvert right now. What we want to do is pull that culvert, connect up the channel and then meander it back to its historic channel. And this is private ownership and this is owned by the Duck Club and if you like to hunt this is their property. So we would need to provide some kind of access so they can access this as well. So we propose putting in some kind of foot bridge—once this culvert has been removed—putting some kind of foot bridge so they have access to that parcel.

Another element of the project is once we convert MBC back to its historic channel, there is an opportunity to take this system, which had most of the water and now it's going to be restricted, now it won't have as much of the water once the flow will go north, we want to be able to provide more open water habitat. This is what the land owner would like to see out there. And one of the options is to take, which will be a remnant channel, and kind of grade that out and create some more open water area. And one of the things that we've got proposed, and is yet to be determined is how we want to manage the system. In a lot of cases we like to use some kind of water control structure. And what that does, is it allows us to manage the water level and the water duration. And by doing that that helps us manage the seed bank and the native plants better, once we hold water back in the system a little bit longer. So, this is just proposed. We could achieve the same thing simply by excavating. Possibly. We haven't made that decision yet. But, we have found success using a water control structure. There's been an issue with using a water control structure and fish entrapment. That's not our goal; we're not going to be doing that. We've got a fisheries biologist on board, who has analyzed essentially our type of structures that we use. We do quite a bit of flood plain habitat work and occasionally we use a water control structure.

That's the southern channel. We would then grade this out and create possibly some more open water habitat. Again, the main MBC would be restored back. This is the diagram of what I'm talking about as a potential water control structure. It's called a half-ton riser. This is the wet land unit side and it's just a half round culvert with a number of boards in it. You can manage the water level by having a board—you know the top board manages the water level of the wetlands. It does allow fish passage. There is a notch in the top board which allows fish to get out of the system. And this is actually one I placed down at a project in Vancouver Lake area that we did. Again, here's the top board, here's the wetland area, the fish are in here and they are able to get out. There's always a constant flow through this system so the fish are able to get out. When the water level is drawn down, this top board comes out, the second board is removed, the top board goes back in and constant flow is reestablished.

Another type of system that could possibly be used on that—same general principal, it's much lower impact—it's just a series of boards and again the top board would have a notch in it. Again, we're not sure if that's what we're going to do yet. That's all a part of the feasibility study that's going on right now.

Another element of the project, now this piece would be to do some small excavations. These would be just seasonal in nature and then we're just talking about excavating out some area, they would be filled by rain fall and they would be just connected to this system and would just be a separable fresh water use and then they would dry up early in the year. As soon as the rain stops. This is the MBC property, this is the WDFW property.

Another element which definitely affects, or addresses one of our limiting factors is the poor riparian conditions. In this piece the habitat's already in very good shape. In terms of flood plain habitat, it's in good shape. However, you can see that there's quite a bit of lack of riparian habitat. So what we plan to do is just develop a planting plan which would exist of native trees and shrubs and reestablish more shrub/scrub community then exists there now.

This element is really the largest—this gives us the biggest bank for our buck. Right now, as I've mentioned, we've got, part of the problem is limited tidal action into this system from the bay and essentially from Dungeness. And, one of the elements that our feasibility is going to address is what we

do with this opening. With this feasibility money we are going to be completing a hydrodynamic model that essentially will be looking at three options. The first option is: do nothing. Document the current conditions in terms of tidal flow, tidal exchange that currently exists with the existing system. The second option would be to lengthen this bridge out to increase the opening here as well as the exchange between the two. The third option is: if we can't for some reason or other modify this bridge because of adjacent land owners or because of additional risks associated with the opening up here. The third option would be to look at a connection further down the road. That's what our hydrology models will tell us. Is help determine what's the best options here for _____ in that tidal connectivity. And this is conceptual, but say the option of doing anything with the current bridge is not feasible, then we would look at establishing another channel and connecting it with MB slough. But again, the bigger portion is excavating a channel here which connects it up with the Dungeness system. So then the MBC and Dungeness would all be interconnected. The option of what we do here is still to be determined. It could be a bridge. It could be an arch culvert, a squash culvert. We haven't determined that yet. A lot of that is going to be decided based on the hydrology information that we gather from our feasibility study.

Those are the main elements. This is cost estimate of the work. Total cost is $262,000. The road culvert work is the biggest unknown at this point and what we're proposing to do is we've requested some of the restoration money from SRF Board. But we also have a request going into the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, which would pay for another portion of the project. And because there are concerns with the structure, if we use a structure, and some of this roadwork—we have the option of utilizing SRF Board money just for the project elements which are more applicable to SRF Board monies. Such as the channel excavation and the removal of the levy and so on. So we do have some flexibility associated with our funding sources.

This is our timeline. Right now the feasibility study and the modeling effort—that's going to be completed this summer. At which point we should be able to have close to a 90% design once our modeling effort is done. That will allow us to apply for permits in the fall. We generally allow a timeline of about a year to get permits in place. We're assuming we would get the funding in line to begin the restoration efforts and then those efforts would take place in the fall of next year.

Questions & Discussion following presentation:

1. mosquitoes
2. west side of Sequim Dungeness connection to Meadowbrook
3. maintenance of water-structure boards
4. buildings on property
5. hunting ammunition restriction
6. impact of conductivity changes on fish
7. reconnect MBC to Dungeness
8. ranking of this project
9. Cheryl has technical forms for ranking
10. project voting

IV. Questions from Public-At-Large to Project Sponsors

Questions raised and answered upon completion of each presentation.

V. Water Users Association's Hydraulic Permit Approval

Tharinger: The next item is an issue that's been on our agenda, we have talked about it on the team for the past couple of months. It's been an issue about work that was done in the Dungeness River under Hydraulic permit for the water users. Michael (Blanton, WDFW) Fish and Wildlife is part of this; they issued the HPA. I know Peter you're here because you're the landowner that noticed this and had some concerns, so we're glad to see you here. I'm going to turn this over to you Michael to explain this process.

Michael Blanton: My colleague, Chris (Chris Byrnes, Area Habitat Biologist, WDFW), is here and we're going to tag team so to speak to try to answer any questions. One of the things that we will try to do is give an overview of the HPA process. Chris can tell you more about that.

Byrnes: One of the primary responsibilities that I have is to review hydraulic projects and issue the approvals for the work that is carried out under those approvals. I don't know how much folks actually know about the

hydraulic code or the hydraulic project approval process. But normally the way it works is the people apply to us for work that is going to be taking place within the ordinary high water mark of any of the fresh or salt waters of the State. And then we review those proposals and issue permits that condition the work, timing and conditions for the protection fish life. In the case of irrigation, in general, and specifically on the Dungeness River, it's somewhat unusual. And it's unusual because the hydraulic project approval that takes place is it's a perpetual permit. That's in place without needs for modification or renewal. And I believe that that is the case because these water rights are private property and in the case of the Dungeness I believe these water rights have been in place prior to statehood and prior to the enactment of the Hydraulic Code, which I believe is 1949. So, we have these approvals in place that allows the irrigation companies to do the work necessary to deliver water diverted from the river and provide it. So it's somewhat unusual in that it's perpetual. The other thing that needs to be understood is that the irrigation companies are legally mandated to deliver the water. So they are not doing this in an elected fashion. The parcels that the water is delivered to are assessed at that on April 15th the water must be delivered legally. I don't know if any of the irrigation folks are here...There is! Oh, OK.

They have to deliver the water. I mean it's not like they are elected to do it. They have to provide the services. In the case of the Dungeness, what we have is a pretty dynamic channel that over the last—well, just since I've been working here on the Dungeness…the river keeps moving around and it keeps leaving the diversions. And so there's been a number of points in time where we were forced to conduct work in the channel to bring the water back to the diversion and put it into the out-take and then to the screens. So, what we have here is sort of a balancing between private property which is the water and the rights and the public property which is the fish and wildlife and everything that is dependant on that water. And, that's what we have strived to do, is to balance those two things and coordinate our efforts and try to minimize any negative interactions to the extent that's possible. In actual implementation it's almost impossible to eliminate the negative interaction. I mean if you actually have to go into the river and do work, excavate or divert a channel during the period of the year when the fish are in the river or eggs are incubating in the gravel it's almost impossible not to have some type of negative impact. So, over at least the period of time that I've been involved we've enjoyed really good cooperation from the irrigation folks. They have tried to contact us and coordinate their work and we were able up until the fairly recent past to be fairly responsive to their calls and meet with them on site and do the work that they proposed to do. Probably as most of you know, there is also a lot of cooperation that is taking place with the irrigators; in the Irrigation Efficiencies Project, in the upgrade of the screening facilities, in the installation of the weirs to measure flow, the voluntary in stream flows that are in place where companies have agreed to a minimum main stream flow that actually impacts their water right. I guess we need to keep that in mind. That we've made an awful lot of progress by people cooperating and working together and, you know, doing the best that they can to meet their goals and objectives and minimize their impacts. So, I guess, the main thing that came out of this most recent incident is you know the need for communication, and coordination and you know the ability to ensure that whatever work has to take place is minimizing the negative impact, especially on this river.

Questions and Discussion following presentation:

1. What does X on gauge mean? (Probably recalibration)
2. Does WDFW have responsibility for permitting and monitoring the City of Sequim?
3. Is there any chlorination being done on the infiltration beds?
4. Thanks to WDFW for helping with the Happy Valley Pruning issues
5. Notification rules

Tharinger asked for information on general projects that WDFW deals with.

Byrnes: Well, it seems like we do a lot of culverts and bridges. Of course we work with the county road department, public works, the department of transportation. In the Dungeness we've worked with a lot of different home owners over the years with problems of erosion, and threats to their homes and properties. In more recent years we've tried to sort of evolve our techniques and get more woody debris and courser structures. And then of course, obviously, we work with the restoration projects, the installation of log jams—any and all of the projects that are within the channel and directed toward restoration or improvement of habitat. Essentially it's any project that will use, obstruct or change the bed or flow. So anytime that you get into the water, you're going to need a hydraulic approval. Through the SEPA process, the State Environmental Policy Act and our review through that--our involvement in projects can actually get pretty far from the water, can get pretty far a field. Because SEPA holistically evaluates the entire project. We actually, in some rare instances, where some other agency isn't filling the need, we'll provide direction or conditioning for work that's

actually taking place fairly distant from the water, but for which we're making the case that it will have the possibility of an impact on fish life. We don't do anything through the hydraulic code to protect wildlife. We only focus on hydraulic load on fish life. Wildlife are protected under other statutes.

Tharinger asked if it was all classes of water or all classes of streams, wetlands, nearshore?

Byrnes: It's everything. It's all of the fresh and salt waters of the State. And so there will be many instants in the case of small or isolated wetlands where we will not be involved simply because it is too distant and not important enough for fish life. Even if fish don't live in a particular body of water, that body of water may have a downstream or distant positive or negative impact on fish life, so we would be involved there as well. So wetlands, non fish bearing streams, salt waters, estuaries, inter-tidal, everything.

Tharinger: And then this perpetual permit that the irrigators have because of their property right to water—Are there other perpetual permits that other constituencies might have.

Byrnes: I don't believe so. There are certain types of other permits for agricultural activities that are in a separate category. But I believe that those are periodically reviewed. I'm not one hundred percent certain. There's not very many instances of perpetual permits and water rights are one of the few that I'm aware of. So, there are a number of instances where work relative to the irrigation system requires approval because it's within a quarter mile of a return or for other reasons. But the actual permit for the diversions the existing water rights is perpetual.

Question: If you find that stormwaters are being diverted into irrigation ditches which then also end up in the tail waters of one of our creeks, is that something that would be involved with your review?

Byrnes: It actually would. If the stormwater outfall is close enough to the return that it could have an effect upon fish life, then yes. We would regulate it. We're using a rough figure of a quarter mile. So we provide approvals for all storm water outfalls that deliver.

Question: In some instances, it has not always been well documented as to how various drainages have been developed; roadways and so forth that have been in place for a long time. And it turns out that sometimes they're not just dry wells, but they actually do connect to irrigation ditches which then connect to, in fact, tail waters.

Byrnes: Yes, there has always been a fair amount of discussion surrounding: what's a stream, or when is a stream not a stream. But, the basic premise is that any natural body of water that's been altered is a stream. So, even if it's in a ditch and even if it's been in a ditch forever, it's still a stream as long as it's carrying natural flow. So, there are a lot of modifications out there on the landscape and we regulate all of those that are streams.

Tharinger: A couple of questions: The area you cover and how many active permits are you processing right now?

Byrnes: I cover all of Clallam and Jefferson counties for everything except for RMap Forest Practices and a portion of other Forest Practices. So we have certain applicants for Forest Practices that are handled by other individuals and then we have a forest and fish biologist that handles all of the RMap, which are the road projects for forest practices, drainage upgrades, breaches and all those types of things. Outside of forest practices, basically all you have for all of Clallam and Jefferson County in freshwater. There is a different biologist for marine water.

Al Moore: The county road department doesn't have an automatic permit? The reason I ask, you get a high water event that does damage—they are out there the next day. So do you give verbal permits on that?

Byrnes: Yes we do. In the event of emergency we have the authority to issue verbal approvals, which we are then supposed to reduce to writing within thirty days. On a year like this we get so many verbal emergencies that we can't even remember them all and some of them are still yet to be…Michael said he would help out with that. (Laughter)

Question: I was wondering about the interaction of federal property. Do you get involved in what goes on in Federal property?

Byrnes: We do. We have a memorandum of understanding with the Forest Service that includes, what we call a probermatic HPA, which says that for all activities that fit within a set of sideboards in that MOA, it is there approval. But they have many projects that they exceed or the scope of project is wider than what was contained within that agreement, and so we issue individual HPA's for those projects. We work with the Forest Service a lot, but the truth we're so challenged to meet all the needs that we just got to meet with them once or twice a year and go over the work that they're planning and address those individual permits that they need. So to the greater extent they are operating without. We just no longer have the resources to participate very much. My impression or assessment is that they are doing a good job and we are pretty pleased with the work that they're implementing.

Tharinger: Do you go out to the sites?

Byrnes: We have either been on site when the work was done or followed up with an inspection after the work was completed. In this most recent case, I haven't been on the site but did get feed back from Byron that he did visit the site and based upon the redd information that we had concluded that we didn't impact any—at least any Chinook—I don't know about other spawning salmon. In the case of this permit the mitigation is essentially negative impact in order to deliver the water. We have had to do some pretty dramatic things. There are few instances or entities that would actually be able to do what we are doing. I mean, how do you make a river do what you want? It's almost impossible.

Tharinger: That's a good sag way into our next into our next 20 year Anniversary. Thanks Chris and Michael.

General Comment:

Tharinger: Next month's meeting we are going to be talking about:

- Watershed planning
- Priority date for when the basin is closed.
- Storm Water Grant

Tharinger asked for comment on past 20 year timeline following the food break.

VI. DRMT Logo Winners

The design was presented and awards handed out as follows:

1st Place: Brysen Welch of Five Acre School -- $100.00 Gift Card
2nd Place: Grant Shogren of Helen Haller School -- $50.00 Gift Card
3rd Place: Lisette Garcia of Helen Haller School -- $25.00 Gift Card

Pictures were taken following a break and upon arrival of Grant Shogren. 40-50 students submitted logos to DRMT for consideration.

Additional Public Comment:

Judy Larson presented a video of a journey down the Dungeness River.

Ann Seiter, a first generation DRMT member, complimented DRMT for action started 20 years ago.

Gary Smith, Maple View Farms, originally on Sequim Bay Watershed Planning Group. Appreciated the cooperative way work has been accomplished versus litigation.

Other Business:

John Cambalik announced important documents and upcoming events:

- Priorities for Puget Sound

- Action Area Profile
- July 17, 2008: Action Area Workshop for the Strait from 1-5 pm at the Red Lion
- September 4 & 5, 2008: Leadership Council for the Partnership at Jamestown S'KlallamTribe
- October 1, 2008: Eco system Coordination Board

Meeting Adjourned at 4:00 P.M. for DRMT's 20th Anniversary Celebration