

# Dungeness River Management Team Meeting

December 10, 2008

Dungeness River Audubon Center

Notes prepared by Melissa Coughlin

## **Team Members/Alternates in Attendance:** Steve Tharinger, Clallam County

Cathy Lear, Clallam County (alt)  
Scott Chitwood, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe  
Shawn Hines, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe (alt)  
Cynthia Nelson, WA Department of Ecology  
Virginia Clark, Dungeness/Quilcene Planning  
Les Jones, Dungeness/Quilcene Planning (alt)  
Pete Schroeder, Riverside Property Owners RM 3.25-4.25  
Mike Jeldness, Water Users Association  
Walt Blendermann, Sports Fisheries

Don Hatler, Conservation Dist. /Sports Fisheries (alt)  
John Cambalik, Puget Sound Partnership  
Laura Dubois, City of Sequim  
Allison Lutz, North Olympic Land Trust  
Joe Holtrop, Clallam Conservation District  
Judy Larson, Protect Peninsula's Future  
Robert Brown, Dungeness Beach Association  
Tom Martin, PUD# 1

## **Others in Attendance:**

Matt Heinz, Dungeness Farms  
Scott Sullivan, North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity  
Amanda Cronin, Washington Water Trust  
Evan McLean, Sequim Gazette  
Michele d'Hemecourt, North Olympic Lead Entity  
Eric Carlsen, North Olympic Lead Entity  
Robin Berry, Graysmarsh  
James Karr, Resident  
Virginia Erwin, Property owner

Elizabeth van Sickle, Property owner, resident  
Steve Rankin, Streamkeepers  
Cathy Misch, Sequim Realtor  
Chuck Sullivan, Sequim resident  
Virginia Erwin, Property owner  
Cheryl Baumann, North Olympic Lead Entity (NOPL)  
Bob Boekelheide, Dungeness River Audubon Center  
Powell Jones, Dungeness River Audubon Center  
Melissa Coughlin, Independent contractor/note-taker

**2:30 P.M.**

## **I. Introductions /Review Agenda / Approval of November 12, 2008 DRMT Meeting Notes**

- Chairperson Steve Tharinger called the last meeting of the year to order and introductions were made.
- Agenda for today's meeting was discussed and accepted.
- Mike Jeldness moved to accept November 12, 2008 DRMT meeting notes; Virginia Clark seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously. No additional discussion on November 12, 2008 meeting notes. Chairperson Tharinger thanked Melissa Coughlin for good job, who in turn thanked Shawn Hines for all her help with the meeting notes.

## **Public Comment:**

- Joe Holtrop shared that Don Hatler and Ben Smith were recent co-recipients of the Wayne Reed "Young Tiger" award from the Washington Association of Conservation Districts. The award acknowledges Conservation supervisors who make outstanding contributions and have served less than two terms. Don was also elected the representative of the Northwest area for the Washington Association of Conservation Districts. Meghan Adamire, planner for the Conservation District, was awarded Employee of the Year for the Northwest area.
- Robert Brown learned that this summer the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe planned to use lot #1 (which is owned by Dungeness Farms) on River's End Road to access their restoration project. Robert said that area is a wetland and wanted to know how that would affect access and if anyone had knowledge of the plans. Matt Heinz (from Dungeness Farms) stated that originally they were going to use lot #1, but now plan to use lot #4 (owned by County). Robert Brown commented that the County is not a member of the Dungeness Beach Association (DBA), nor is Dungeness Farms. Steve Tharinger asked if this was an issue that should be brought to the Team for discussion. Robert Brown thought that the mutual parties could work it out. The road is owned by Dungeness Beach Association, and road access is an issue. Matt Heinz mentioned that Washington state common law allows egress/ingress areas to access property. Robert Brown stated that it is the DBA's solid position (per their attorney) that the road is not part of the property itself and there is no easement for that. Scott Chitwood explained that the Tribe is helping with the restoration project in that area, along with many other participants. They need to insure that the necessary equipment gets where it needs to be. Robert Brown warned that a large number of people need to be aware of where they are placing vehicles and should not block road and people's property; if people park vehicles without approval, the sheriff will be called out by the DBA.
- Judy Larson generously brought 12 copies of the EPA publication, "Protecting Water Resources with Smart Growth" for Team members. Judy directed other people who wanted copies to call 1-800-490-9198 or to request copies through the website: [www.epa.gov/smartgrowth](http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth).

## II. Instream Flow and Watershed Management Rule Update – Cynthia Nelson, WA DOE, Amanda Cronin, WA Water Trust

- Cynthia Nelson handed out “Dungeness River Basin (Water Resources Inventory Area, WRIA 18) Water Resources Management Program Summary of draft proposed rule, 12/5/08”. It is a draft summary of the topics that will be addressed in the draft Instream Flow and Water Management rule. Department of Ecology representatives are taking bits and pieces of the draft to different audiences all over (including the DRMT).
- The draft proposed summary is laid out in the same manner as the proposed draft rule (currently). Summary in bullets and short sentences for each section.
- Cynthia walked Team through document. General process: the draft rule will be filed after its development plus 180 days for public comments (which are collected and responded to in writing), somewhere around March/April. Any small amendments will be made if needed and then the rule will be filed. If there are any substantial changes the process will have to start all over. Final rule is in effect 30 days after the DOE director has signed it. Prior to all this, one formal hearing will be scheduled.
- Workshops on rule language will be scheduled to help people understand rule basics and to spread information. Formal comments will not be taken at the workshops, but people are encouraged to ask questions and comment as they see fit. Formal comments will be accepted during the hearing.
- Rule will apply to Eastern WRIA 18 and will include Dungeness watersheds. Area covers Bell Creek to Bagley Creek.
- Watershed plan influenced the draft proposed rule. If you have any comments on the handout, please direct them to Cynthia Nelson. E-mail: [cyne461@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:cyne461@ecy.wa.gov)
- Cynthia continued walking through the summary. Section 030. Definitions. The second part of beneficial use is efficient use, which means not wasting water. Robert wanted clarification on closing allocations from stream or river – does that mean closing the shallow aquifer? Cynthia answered that seasonal closures included all. Walt Blendermann wanted control stations for each creek (or location) defined. Cynthia answered that they are defined, but not on a chart. Walt asked list to be made available; it would be helpful if they were on the chart. Instream flow affects water rights decisions and allocations after the rule is in effect. There will be provisions in the rule to lay out a pathway to get water. Walt used today’s numbers as an example – in December with flow of 186 cfs (which does not exceed the 575 cfs), what would happen? Cynthia Nelson remarked that it’s wintertime, generally not irrigating, there are a series of instream flow levels (set for protection of Chinook and other species month by month), when the flow is less than allowed by rule, no new water rights will be issued. We are looking at feasibility of whether water can be diverted for storage during high flow events and used for aquifer recharge. For drinking water, source must be non-interruptible. There will be a mitigation/exchange to cover drinking water for the summer months. Walt asked if the table (in the handout) displayed instantaneous flow or monthly average. Cynthia answered instantaneous flow. Walt wanted to know how that is managed, take one day when the flow drops down, how is that managed instantaneously? Cynthia replied that there are two situations where water is diverted: 1) snowmelt (somewhat reliable) and 2) stormflows – we need to learn how to take advantage of these.
- Discussion took place when Mike Jeldness pointed out the documented flows for Siebert and McDonald Creeks were identical on the chart on page 3. Cynthia explained that the numbers in the chart are for managing for the availability of water, based on hydrology, stream channel measurements, and fish monitoring. Mike argued that the flow numbers seemed too high. Cynthia explained that the numbers for the streams were arrived at via the toe-width method from Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Ecology and also WRIA 18 planning process numbers. They do not represent actual measured flows at the streams, but rather they represent the flow value that must be reached before new water rights would be considered on those streams. Cynthia remarked that the closure will be from July to the first half of November, so level is moot at these times. Robin Berry asked where along the streams were measurements taken. Cynthia answered that the control stations are generally at low spots. At Siebert Creek it is just below the Highway. May be possible to take water in the winter at high flows. Mike Jeldness maintained the numbers were incorrectly high. Steve Tharinger suggested Mike check back to the watershed plan and report back. Mike declined.
- Section 060 Maximum future allocations: high flow opportunities. 1) make water available 2) protect channel flows. Once flow is met, amount of water that may be withdrawn is 25 cfs to 50 cfs (withdrawal may be ½” difference). New territory. In the future people may want to do more, at that time we may have to open the rule to make amendments.
- Section 070 Future water appropriations. No new withdrawals allowed where there is hookup to a public system. Robert Brown asked if that meant any sort of communal system, or just a public entity. Cynthia answered any “A” system with 15 or more connections and “B” systems with 2 hookups and above. Set up

with PUD for water if it can be done in a “timely and reasonable manner” (not well defined). Looking at what is being done in other locations, not yet defined; sometimes it is based on cost.

- Walt Blendermann wanted to go back to Section 050, first bullet; does surface and ground water closure mean no wells will be allowed to be drilled in first aquifer? Walt thought the first aquifer (shallowest) will be closed year-round. No wells drilled in the first aquifer, within the watershed. Cynthia answered yes, any exempt wells drilled after the rule must be drilled in a confined aquifer. Future wells must be drilled in deeper aquifers (as in the watershed plan). Don Hatler asked in terms of the Dungeness, does a particular well in a particular parcel look to the closest watershed creek or the Dungeness River? Cynthia said that it is looked at on a watershed by watershed basis. The Dungeness ground water model has been recalibrated with aquifer recharge studies. Looking at hydrologists dividing into zones, looking at watersheds and aquifers. Work in progress. Mike Jeldness offered that information will get better with efforts of NASA tools, and other new data.
- Section 080 Reservations. This section covers domestic water supply, outdoor use during off season, for drinking water. Section 120 will cover more.
- Section 090 Lakes and ponds. Standard rule language.
- Section 100 Future changes and transfers. Opening rule and amending. Not eager to do.
- Next public workshop will be at the end of January, then time for public comment.
- Steve Tharinger asked with the closures discussed, how will you get water? One mechanism being discussed was reserve – then that sort of went away, now we’re looking at a hybrid of reserve and bank, Washington Water Trust is working with Department of Ecology and rule making process. Introduced Amanda Cronin of Washington Water Trust.
- Amanda Cronin reminded Team she was here in August. Washington Water Trust is under contract to the DOE to develop a feasibility study and from there a proposal for water exchange to support the rule. Working with Ecosystem Economics, a group out of Bend, OR. Ecosystem Economics, has a functioning operational water Bank in the Deschutes Basin.
- In August representatives from the Washington Water Trust began by interviewing stakeholders for current and future water needs. Discussed how mitigation should serve those needs. In November they produced a draft feasibility report, which is currently under review by DOE. The report reviews current conditions and discusses desired outcomes. Combines mitigation and restoration efforts.
- Now in the strategy and design stage. It is a collaborative thought process of County, DOE and JSKT, and others.
- Exchange will serve needs of new groundwater users of the Dungeness as well as supporting river restoration.
- Mitigation for new home builders and larger needs. Envision mitigation from 1) purchase of retired agricultural water rights through irrigation companies, reclaimed water, conservation, recharge (convened a technical group of hydrologists and biologists to consider this), acquisition of stock water (in winter) larger developers, and PUD may want to develop their own mitigation proposals outside of the exchange. There is a whole list of transaction types being considered for mitigation.
- Mitigation funds will support mitigation. People will have to pay some sort of fee (currently undefined).
- Have the option of getting water on their own.
- River restoration will be supported by restoration funding (private and public sources). Restoration dollars from sources today.
- Walt Blendermann asked if data in Cynthia’s handout reflected any restoration, or if it was pre-restoration efforts. Cynthia replied if there was restoration at the channel those are the numbers. Numbers are based on instream flows, there has been Dungeness mainstem restoration efforts. Walt remarked the numbers are very large. “Target flow” recommended by NOAA fisheries for water users is 105 cfs. Watershed planning suggested 100 cfs. NOAA changed by 5 cfs. Restoration has happened through cooperation by irrigators which have restored the flows in late season. 180 cfs in summer – is the threshold for future water available. Walt clarified: 105 to 180 cfs if we used control point. Cynthia explained the control point is Schoolhouse Bridge. Walt didn’t think the river flowed 180 cfs at the Schoolhouse Bridge in September, Cynthia agreed, that would be the time of closure; sometimes flow is 150-200 cfs. Walt asked why not just close river year round? Walt asked if the numbers will change if flows are actually restored. Cynthia thought it was possible. There hasn’t been enough change in channel and restoration of habitat function to demonstrate that water is no longer a limiting factor to salmon.
- Judy Larson brought up using historical information for studies. Cynthia said that the last 80 years of hydrology data was used. Judy said that at the Flood Plan Open House Ann Seiter, in her review of all data, had been impressed with the levels of extremes appearing in the last 10 years. Extremes could be caused by

many things – and asked: do you want to use 80 years of data or just more recent data (last ten years) that reflects current situation more accurately. Steve Tharinger remarked the larger the data set, probably the better the numbers, many variable coming in the future. Cynthia said this is something that has been discussed, send an e-mail for more conversation or if you have questions.

- Pete Schroeder asked about fee collection; will that go into a general fund? Cynthia stated that fees will go to support mitigation. Pete said there were many types of mitigation in the list of transactions. Amanda said that there will be a set fee for mitigation for one household (don't know what that will be at this time); it could be derived from any of a number of sources. Pete asked if the money will be tracked. Amanda answered that there will be a central, organized body administering transactions from start to finish. Cynthia explained that there are many things happening simultaneously: 1) rule is on a tight schedule. 2) Mitigation Exchange: Washington Water Trust working on that, needs to be functional 3) MOA between County and DOE to work out water administration 4) simple, easy to understand User's Manual that Washington Water Trust is to develop.
- Judy Larson said at the Town Hall meeting Kevin Van de Wedge had last night, a question was asked whether there will be funding for ordinances that will help with the implementation for all this. He did not have an answer.
- Walt Blendermann asked if we are still pursuing the ratio of recovery at 3:1, is that a RCW ratio? Amanda said ratio has not been set yet. Joe Holtrop asked what ratio was in Walla Walla. Cynthia said 1:1 and everyone pays a one-time fee.
- Don Hatler asked about acquiring a water right and going between watersheds. Amanda said that in October a tech group (hydrologists and biologists) had convened to figure out mitigation if you are in one watershed and have impact to another. Ideally you want mitigation in the precise location of impact. In-kind, on-site is preferred. In-kind, on-site restoration for flow impact. May have instances where flow restoration may have in-kind, off-site impact. Working on order of priorities. Complicated scenario.
- Robert Brown revisited Section 070 on hookup. It states that withdrawals will not be allowed where there is public hookup – but what if public hookup has exceeded available capacity? Cynthia said that was where “timely and reasonable” manner came in – may wind up with well on their own. Steve Tharinger offered that is the time the class “A” or class “B” purveyor goes to the mitigation bank to expand their system. Tom Martin added that this is a dilemma of the PUD – they are asked to serve more people, but looking for mechanism to get more water. Individuals can get their own mitigation choice out there. Rule may state you have to hookup. Cynthia said if they can hookup, it is predicated on capacity. Conservation and efficiency prior to asking for more. Joe Holtrop brought up example where there are mitigation and conservation measures in place but an exempt well goes dry and you have to drill to a deeper well. Cynthia said that you can drill a replacement well. Robin Berry asked if you have to get a permit to drill to the second aquifer. Cynthia said she needs to ask groundwater people that question, but said you can drill a replacement well and you may put that into the next aquifer.
- The DOE Website contains all the presentations from Washington Water Trust are under “Water Resources” → “Rules under development” → “Dungeness” <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wr/rules/rule-home.html#ruledevelop> . Contains workshop graphics, handouts and presentations. Lets you know what's going on in Walla Walla and across our state.
- Walt Blendermann asked about the priority date. Cynthia replied that the priority date is going to be the effective date of the rule. That is 30 days after the rule adoption date. Because there was development (1,800 permits were filed) in intervening time it will have to be acknowledged (through mitigation /restoration). Fall of 2009 – the dates in question before were July 2000 or Fall 2009.

### III. Other Business – All

**North Olympic Lead Entity** – Cheryl Baumann introduced two new restoration planners:

- Scott Sullivan, will be working part-time in salmon restoration.
- Michele d'Hemecourt, will be working until the end of June jump starting projects on the workplan.

**Puget Sound Partnership** – John Cambalik

- December 1<sup>st</sup> Action Agenda was adopted by Leadership Council.
- Steve Tharinger gave his impressions of the event: good press, lots of people (Senator Murray was there), everyone was happy to have completed this deliverable. This is a start not an end. Action Agenda is a legislative requirement. Implementing is the next step. With the restoration effort they are positioning restoration activities under the umbrella of stimulus investment. Restructuring rivers, estuaries, and ecosystem restoration means jobs, builds a greener economy, results in a healthier ecosystem. Steve warned of dwindling funds at every level for the type of work we're doing. Gave example of drastic cuts at WDFW, and SRFB

funding dollars will probably be cut in half from amounts available last year. The capital funds have been hardest hit.

- DOE has been hit hard by budget cuts, they have dedicated resources for toxic cleanup, but watershed planning and rule making expenses comes from their general funds. There must be cuts to make the budget. Building budget is for next two years. Capital funds can borrow bond money (legislature can increase amount to be borrowed). There will be large scale cuts. Just have to work smarter to continue work in this environment.
- John Cambalik instructed Team to go to the PSP website (<http://www.psp.wa.gov/> to download: 1) Action Agenda, 2) Appendixes, 3) Science Workplan and 4) Toxic Loading Study (from DOE).
- John said to pay attention especially to the third question on the Action Agenda, what actions do we need to take – actions are identified by number, priorities are prioritized by 5 categories for Puget Sound. Imbedded in question 3 are both longer actions and near-term actions (actions the Partnership will be seeking funding for in the biennial budget).
- Question 4: Prioritize list of actions for each of 3 of the 5 categories: protect, restore and reuse.
- Action Area Profiles: 3 column table of information. First column lists ecosystem benefits provided by action area; second column lists local threats to ecosystem benefits and the last column are priority action area strategies (majority of what the planning unit does).
- Important to develop DIP (Detailed Implementation Plan) for area sometime soon.
- Matt Heinz asked where shellfish protection was in the plan. John showed that it was listed under “reduce sources of water pollution”.
- Next step for the action areas is to further define actions: who will be responsible for action, where funding will come from, and a timeline for getting it all done. Currently the PSP staff is reorganizing to facilitate. Do not anticipate changes in territories, but in focus. In January more staffing discussions will take place. The liaison program is strong, some employees are full-time, some contract liaisons are part-time positions.
- Steve Tharinger told group that he served on a sub-committee to look at local integration and coordination of different efforts. A chart was created proposing a Clallam Council of Governments to coordinate the restoration efforts in the area. This may be a recommendation from the task force to the Puget Sound Partnership. Steve asked Team if there was an advantage for the DRMT to form some sort of an Ecosystem Coordinating Council for Clallam County, it would cover work being done in WRIA implementation, Marine Resources, DRMT, Lead Entity and would prioritize the work we want done in Clallam County within the action area boundary (summer chum ESU). In consideration of current financial environment, is there a way we would prioritize all the work being done? PSP has its own Ecosystem Coordination Board. Role for Clallam County restoration body. Governor’s budget may force us into something like this. We now depend on work from DOE and DF&W, but if those budgets get cut dramatically, this may help. We will have some support from PSP, don’t see the action areas going away, Steve suggested getting together quarterly to address threats, but not to implement. Need smaller body at county level for implementation. May be a way to work smarter with diminishing resources. John Cambalik added that accessing overall progress and accountability is a function of PSP. Walt Blendermann sees a need for what Steve proposed, in context of PSP, but what concerns him is that ranking or prioritizing projects across a wide spectrum of projects assumes all funding will flow to and from PSP. There are other funding sources which will not flow into PSP. Steve Tharinger didn’t accept the assumption that it is a PSP issue, but thought it was a county issue. Walt didn’t see advantage to prioritize a project that has been funded. Steve said it didn’t matter if a project was funded locally, federally or by the state. Pete Schroeder said the project would still have to be tracked and this may avoid redundancy. Walt brought up that currently the tracking mechanism is a large on-line database that is updated by NOPL, the Habitat Workplan, funded by the DF&W. Steve said that funding may go away. Cheryl Baumann said the PSP may tie into the Lead Entity 3-year Workplan. Steve said that he is looking to sustain what we’re trying to do with funding dollars drying up. Cathy Lear asked how it would improve what we have on the ground and what is redundant (and how do we effectively integrate).
- James Karr said that we can’t afford to keep doing what we’ve been doing. Doesn’t work. Used a medical analogy with the river as a patient with 16 MDs working to fix it – one doctor likes fish, one likes bugs, one likes the groundwater (one is a brain surgeon, one a heart specialist, etc). All are working in their area of specialty without asking how their treatment affects other treatments. Thinks this is a great idea, and will enable the “doctors” to understand their synergistic effects.
- Robert Brown asked about the likelihood of not getting funded by the DOE – set up a taskforce to look at what is going to happen at County to support ISF rule, what is the County willing to give up, etc.? Look at options now.
- Scott Chitwood followed up on Dr. Karr’s analogy, which he agreed with, but if you’ve been in a train wreck you actually want 16 medical doctors/specialists looking at you. Agreed that it is critical to recovery to see

interaction. Don't know which stage we're at currently. At one point we need to do cross-over and evaluation of what treatments are doing (monitoring programs may be the answer). Steve Tharinger said it was important (using Dr. Karr's analogy) to have someone checking "X," "Y" and "Z", we don't have an advocate for the patient to insure all is going well. We don't have a place for the County, City and Tribe to get together to talk about how we're going to manage stormwater. How are we going to prioritize stormwater management? We are strong in the salmon recovery area, we have the scientific review, workplan, project sponsors, additional staff, but do not see how that fits into the recovery of the whole patient (river). We need to spend less time talking about treatment/ planning and how we're going to fix it and more time implementing. With a board at the County level it would strengthen our relationship with the PSP, if there were dollars available at the PSP we would be able to approach them already having worked it out, having the data, knowing what we need to do. The PSP is not an agency to dictate, but look to their model for of the ecosystem board for a coordinated approach to restoration.

- Don Hatler and Steve Tharinger got into discussion about functions of PSP. Don asked if PSP was a granting agency, we were told there was no new money, do we look at PSP as additional filter for projects that prioritizes? Ecosystem of Puget Sound has some necessary, enormously expensive projects – may be a way (as combined effort) to get funding. Steve Tharinger said there are ways, such as a district-wide flush /parcel tax, it is a big basin to generate dollars. Ron Simms can spend \$9 million to restore an entire harbor. Steve talked about using fee in lieu of mitigation. Steve used widening 101 at Kitchen-Dick Road and Shore Road (found out this involved property that was "perched wetland" and now overwhelmed by cost of project) as an example of being flexible – use funding instead to move levy back in Dungeness. Steve needs list of specific projects, engineers are looking at widening 101 example now. Collaborative effort if we work at local level. Dennis Canty (PSP) is looking for a pilot project to see how this could work. Capital projects are the key now, get multi-faceted bang for your buck.
- Judy Larson asked if there was a code (like that used by OFM - Office of Financial Management) to see where various funds are allocated and possibly linked. Cynthia Nelson said they are coded by category for the governor and that information can be extracted, but is not easily done. Judy thought that would be advantageous to see where various projects are.
- Walt Blendermann also thought forming an Ecosystem Coordinating group would be a good idea on the basis of accountability. An accountability function is needed, a group could bring accountability into the process, that it is a part of every project. Steve felt that monitoring provides that function, asked Pete Schoeder for his thoughts. Pete Schroeder said that accountability is needed for legislative funding. The whole process dating from the early '90's was intended to be bottom-up and transparent. In triage situation one person (or broaden to committee - restoration workgroup) decides. The monitoring situation state-wide is focusing. December 3<sup>rd</sup> there was a meeting which included the Northwest Power Conservation Council, SFB, DOE, Puget Sound Ambient Monitoring Consortium, WDF&W and NOAA, (all have salmon restoration programs) two days after the Action Agenda was adopted. Representatives from all those agencies and groups were at this forum for monitoring. Some people at the meeting thought salmon recovery was secondary to ecosystem recovery. Pete agreed idea for group was good for locally performing "medical" recovery functions.
- John Cambalik thought it important to prioritize and conference across ecosystems. Judy Larson felt it important for long-term recovery process as well.
- Scott Chitwood noticed many agencies don't participate and their participation probably would be valued if they were more involved. DRMT includes a lot of agencies that don't participate. More efficient involvement and participation from represented agencies is needed (eyes scanned group for missing Team members).
- Steve considered a DRMT subcommittee to bring specific projects forward to DRMT. DRMT may meet quarterly instead of monthly. DRMT would bring forward specific projects that fit into the prioritized effort across the County. We don't determine policy. We need to rollup what we're doing here for financial reasons and because of Dr. Karr's analogy of a patient with too many doctors. Work plan list should include: aquifer storage group, clean water group, restoration workgroup, dike setback group, NASA, NOPL, and flood plan update group. All the work we're doing is good, but are we coordinating it the best we can? Steve asked for a proposal for a local Ecosystem Coordination Board – not more meetings, suggested combining existing bodies to do the work. Steve noticed it was 4:40 and the agenda noted a 4:30 adjourn time. When the governor's budget comes out it may force consolidation. Any thoughts or comments send to Shawn who will send out to Team electronically.

#### **IV. DRMT Workplan – Steve Tharinger**

- Because of time constraint, Steve said that the Executive Committee will work on this.

#### **V. 2009 DRMT Chair and Executive Committee Elections – All**

- Steve Tharinger announced there were ballots to vote on the Executive Committee and Chairperson positions. Scott Chitwood made a motion to roll over existing structure. Walt Blendermann seconded motion (Steve stated Pete Schroeder seconded motion). Steve asked for any discussion, Steve as Chair, rotating Vice-chair position, Executive Committee: Steve Tharinger, Cynthia Nelson, Mike Jeldness, Scott Chitwood, Virginia Clark. Robert Brown asked if there was anyone who did not want to go along with motion. No one spoke. Motion passed unanimously.
- Robert Brown wanted to mention that early this year there was supposed to be a shellfish garden started at Dungeness Landing, looks like it is deteriorating at the moment. Wanted to know what happened to that – no sign. Walt Blendermann said it is an actual project. Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe will be providing signage.
- Cynthia Nelson wished a "*Merry Christmas*" to all.
- Steve Tharinger thanked all and wished everyone "*Happy Holidays*".

## **VI. Meeting Adjourned at 4:45 P.M.**

### **Handouts:**

- From Judy Larson: 12 copies of EPA publication, ""Protecting Water Resources with Smart Growth". To obtain copy call: 1-800-490-9198 or request copy at website: [www.epa.gov/smartgrowth](http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth)
- From Cynthia Nelson: "Dungeness River Basin (Water Resources Inventory Area, WRIA 18) Water Resources Management Program Summary of draft proposed rule, 12/5/08" 5-page handout.
- From Ann Soule: "Scenarios for aquifer