



December 10, 2014

APPROVED Meeting Notes

Dungeness River Management Team

Dungeness River Audubon Center, Sequim, WA

2:00 – 5:00 P.M.

Notes prepared by: Shawn Hines

Team Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Scott Chitwood, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe
Ben Smith, Water Users Association
Joe Holtrop, Clallam Conservation District
Judy Larson, Protect the Peninsula’s Future
Matt Heins, Estuary-Tidelands/Riverside Property Owners
Lorenz Sollman, USFW Dungeness Wildlife Refuge
Don Hatler, Sports Fisheries
Robert Brown, Dungeness Beach Association
Shawn Hines, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe (alt)
Cathy Lear, Clallam County (alt)
Michele Canale, NOLT
Tom Martin, Clallam County PUD #1
Hansi Hals, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe (alt)
Robert Beebe, Riverside Property Owners

Others in Attendance:

Phil Martin, resident
Tobey Clarkin, URS Corporation
Patty McMamis, Nash’s
Deborah Kucipeck, Clallam County
Kate Houk, Community member
Ivan Stocker, Graysmarsh
BriAnne Eberle, Eberle Farm
Marguerite Glover, Sequim Realtor’s Assoc.
Eric Carlsen, NOPL
Chris Behrens, USACE
Zachary Corum, USACE
Alana Linderoth, Sequim Gazette
Valerie Ringold, USACE
Gretchen Glaub, Puget Sound Partnership

I. Introductions/Review Agenda/Review & Approve November DRMT Draft Meeting Notes

- Scott Chitwood called meeting to order. Introductions were made, sign in sheets circulated. After minor edits discussed, Judy Larson moved and Don Hatler seconded the motion to approve the November meeting notes with edits. Motion was unanimously approved.

Public Comment

- Scott noted the moving target of today’s river flow (it was 2,710 cfs at 9:15AM and by 2:00PM had reached 4,090). [Note that it peaked at 5,610 cfs at 11:00PM that day].
- Joe Holtrop announced that tomorrow, 6:00-7:30PM, there will be a PIC public meeting to present the Draft PIC Plan and introduce the associated pilot project. Comments are being accepted by Conservation District through 12/22/14.
- Lorenz Sollman announced the 100th anniversary of the Wildlife Refuge. There will be activities held monthly (see <http://www.dungeness100.com/janevent.html>), kicking off with a FREE talk on Sat, January 17, 1:00-3:00PM at Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe’s Red Cedar Hall. The kickoff event includes a talk on the Refuge’s history, displays and cake! There will be a Kid’s Day at the Refuge in June with hands on activities.
- Matt Heins noted it’s the Duck Club’s 100th anniversary, as well.

II. Lower Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration: Project Overview and ACOE Levee Setback Feasibility Study Results (Cathy Lear, Clallam County and Chris Behrens, US Army Corps of Engineers)

- Cathy Lear introduced the project update by thanking the DRMT for its support for the levee setback project, which was first recommended in the 1997/98 “Blue Book”, *Recommended Restoration Projects for the Dungeness River*. The Feasibility Study (of setback alternatives) has been completed and internally reviewed. It will go out for public review early next month. Cathy introduced the ACOE project planner and lead author of the study, Chris Behrens, who provided a PowerPoint presentation (**attached**).
- Objectives: reconnect historic off-channel areas to restore fish rearing, spawning, and refuge habitat; improve complexity of riparian and floodplain habitat; reestablish river processes that create habitat, and conditions that will sustain them.

- 3 Alternatives: 1- Towne Road Alignment, 2- Meadowbrook Alignment At-Grade Road, 3- Meadowbrook Alignment with road on levee. Tentatively have selected **Alternative 2**. Haven't gone through NEPA yet.
- Don Hatler suggested that one of the purposes of the projects should be for recreational access to the River. Chris responded that they haven't addressed that. The purposes could be refined during the design phase. It has been discussed, but not designed for.
- Kate Houk asked if the all the blue lines in the map that Chris showed are proposed channels. Zac Corum responded that adding log jams will create some new side channels, adding structure/robustness to the floodplain, and less chance for the river to migrate away from high quality habitat.
- Robert Brown asked why the dike is moved farther south since the barn in that area is abandoned? Zac responded that the original idea was to remove the dike all the way up to that area. The Tribe supported that. However, that area is mapped as floodway. USACOE doesn't want to raise flood elevations for property owners there; need to protect property owners south of the barn. Chris said that plans could change in the long-term. There may be an opportunity in the future to move the dike on the opposite side, for example, which would change things.
- Judy Larson wondered about the impacts of removing existing vegetation when the dike is moved. What will that do the temperature gradient in the river for fish? Chris said there will be some impact, but not certain how much. There are plans for replanting.
- There was discussion about the cost/benefit ratio of the project, and a comment that the project seemed huge for the amount of floodplain gained. Matt Heins asked if the cost/benefits took into account the areas up- and downstream of the project, as there is surely benefits outside of the project area, including to Dungeness Bay. Cathy said that the project will allow the river to reconnect to 112 acres of floodplain habitat. Chris said the relative cost effectiveness of the alternatives to each other was considered.
- Kate Houk asked about impacts of high water to Meadowbrook Creek. Kate is concerned about the "wall" next to the Creek and potential high water, and salt water. Zac responded that flood risk would go down considerably with this alternative. Elevation is +14 at the culvert. Tidal elevation is +11. Matt said that tidal influence ends at the DH2 property; tidal influence doesn't go all the way back up to there.
- Robert Brown asked about the yellow rectangle on Towne Road (on the map Chris showed). Chris answered that is a bridge. A wildlife-passible culvert was discussed, but the bridge turned out to be more feasible.
- Next steps: agency and public review, secure funding, negotiate partnership agreement, secure County easement for south access road.

III. WA Department of Ecology Updates (*Michael Gallagher, WA Department of Ecology*)

- Michael Gallagher's update focused on how the Dungeness Water Rule relates to new marijuana grow operations, and he provided the Team a PowerPoint presentation (**handout attached**) with relevant information, as well as examples.
- Michael reminded the group about what is stated in RCW 90.44.050, regulation of public groundwaters, and that exempt wells (which are limited to 5,000 g/d) can be used for commercial or industrial purposes, including irrigation, which marijuana grows fall under.
- Marijuana grow operations are divided into 3 Tiers: 1 = up to 1,400 sq ft, 2 = up to 7,000 sq ft, 3 = up to 21,000 sq ft. Based on anecdotal evidence from WSLCB, Tier 3 wouldn't need more than 3,900 gpd, which means none of the tiers need water rights if they are *outside* of Dungeness Water Rule area. *Inside* the Rule area would need to follow proposed mitigation fee structure:

Proposed Mitigation Fee structure for marijuana grow operations in Dungeness Rule Area			
	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
Regulated Grow Area (in square feet)	2,000 / 1,400	10,000 / 7,000	30,000 / 21,000
Daily Usage Rate* (in gallons per day)	260 / 182	1,300 / 910	3,900 / 2730
Consumptive Rate**	90%	90%	90%
Mitigation Fee***	\$3,400	\$13,500	\$38,600

* Water use rate based on anecdotal information from the Washington State Liquor Control Board.

** 90% consumptive rate based on WAC 173-518-085 (4) (C).

*** Mitigation fees only established for original Tier sizes and not yet established for updated Tiers sizes.

- Examples of marijuana grow applications for permits were discussed, showing that sometimes permits are granted, sometimes not, depending on what past water use has been. See handout for examples and presentation slides.
- Robert Brown asked if there is ever any follow-up to check validity of what the application says. Robert knows that one of the examples hasn't used irrigation water in over five years. He knows because the barn has been used for hay storage; no cows in last ten years. Mike said he would follow-up on that project.
- For further information: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/topics/marijuana.html> and <http://liq.wa.gov.mjlicense/permitting>

IV. ACOE Lower Dungeness Hydrology-Hydraulic Model Results (Zac Corrum, US Army Corps of Engineers)

- Hansi Hals introduced Zac Corrum, hydraulic engineer for USACOE, and the Dungeness River Tribal Partnerships Hydraulic Model Study – Levee Setback Analysis.
- Zac provided a PowerPoint presentation describing the project and results of modeling the setback phases (1-7) and scenarios.
- Study area: Lower Dungeness River, RM 4-0 (Woodcock Rd. to mouth).
- Study Levee Setback Scenario Phases:
 - Phase 1: Federal levee (Corps/County)
 - Phase 2: Federal levee near Dungeness Farms
 - Phase 3: Federal levee from Phase 1 to upstream end (includes 2 scenarios, one with less of a setback, preferred by USACOE because it follows natural high ground reducing levee height).
 - Phase 4: Beebe levee setback to Ward Rd., Ward road on top of levee for full length, plus interior drainage improvements to manage backwater impacts.
 - Phase 5: Rivers End levee.
 - Phase 6: Federal levee from Anderson Rd. to Meadowbrook Slough.
 - Phase 7: Ward Rd. setback from Woodcock Bridge to Phase 4 setback.
- In addition to modeling the Phases separately, the following scenarios were looked, including the amount of linear length removed and the acreage of floodplain gained:
 - Phase 1+3, Phase 1+4, Phase 1+3+4, Phase 1+3+4+7, Phase 4+7, Phase 1+2+3+4+6+7
- Zac showed a table of fill volume removed for each levee segment. Phase 4 involves the most amount of fill removed (122,960 cubic yards, or 43% of the total).
- Zac went over the model assumptions and results. Includes a “natural valley condition”, where all the levees, bridges, fill are removed – considered as the pre-development baseline floodplain condition. Used 1% exceedance, 9,000cfs, 100-yr flood.
- Showed each scenario with 100-yr flood, including existing conditions map.
- Matt Heins mentioned that Battelle did a model of Meadowbrook Creek.
- Judy Larson asked date of FEMA maps used. Zac said mid-1980s. Cathy Lear said they've been trying to get FEMA to update the maps.
- Marguerite Glover noted that several maps show Casselary Ck. to exist farther back than it actually does. Zac said that won't change the modeling results.
- Judy asked what caused the river mouth to naturally move. Zac referred her to the paper done by Collins for the Tribe: http://www.jamestowntribe.org/programs/nrs/9-screen_dungeness_080505.pdf
- Discussion ensued about whether any of the phases include widening of the Schoolhouse bridge. The Natural Valley scenario shows conditions without bridge. Matt Heins said that studies show there to be natural geologic feature in that area, even without the bridge. Randy Johnson said that half the natural conveyance has been lost due to road-fill. A lot could be opened up underneath by widening bridge.
- Zac expressed the importance of giving river area for depositing sediments.
- Don Hatler asked if that results in longer, wider, shallower, warmer water. Zac said there would still be gravel bars, and water will go to the lowest gradient channel.
- Michele Canale asked why no Phase 5. Randy replied that that area is passively restoring itself (Rivers End area).

- Randy made the point that the scenarios are not necessarily prioritized; they are just concepts at this point, “what ifs”, an estimate of how much floodplain could be restored using different scenarios to inform planning. 1, 3, 4 seem to complement each other; Randy acknowledged that Robert Beebe may agree or not.
- Matt Heins commented that Dungeness Farms sees leaving the levee the way it is now as more of a threat. Dungeness Farms is onboard as long as don’t have to rebuild.
- Conclusion slides:
 - River restoration through levee removal and set-back could potentially restore from 1 acre (Phase 7) to 164 acres (Phase 1+2+3+4+6+7) of active floodplain, and a similarly large amount of riparian buffer and future floodplain given channel migration.
 - Since levee setbacks will result in replacement of existing levee segments with those built to modern standards, flood risks will likely be reduced as part of ecosystem restoration efforts. This could result in lower flood insurance premiums for adjacent land owners if levees designed to contain base flood.
- Notes and conditions about the various scenarios were listed.
 - Phase 1: Upgrade of Phase 1 levee needed if Phase 3 constructed; Due to the large potential environmental benefit, consideration should also be given to adding a flow control structure through the setback levee to restore a small portion of the available river water to Matriotti Creek downstream of the Phase 1 project.
 - Phase 1+2+3 would have a high score in an incremental cost analysis due to net reductions in flood elevations and velocities and increase in new inundation area.
 - All restoration phases: the potential geomorphic changes resulting from large scale restoration efforts include restoring natural rates of sediment deposition, wood recruitment, bank erosion and channel migration. Consideration of the potential long term impacts of these changes on developed lands adjacent to the river is recommended as part of restoration planning.
- Robert Brown asked if raise in sea level was considered in deciding how high to make levee. Zac said that there would be small impact in 20 years, at least in Phase 1.

V. Other Business

- 2015 DRMT Chairperson and Executive Committee Elections: Shawn informed the Team that all 2014 Executive Committee members were re-nominated, plus Michele Canale (to replace Cynthia Nelson), and Scott Chitwood was the only Chair nomination. The Team then elected all nominees for 2015:
 - Chair: Scott Chitwood
 - Executive Committee: Ben Smith, Judy Larson, Michele Canale (in addition to the automatic appointment of Tribe (Scott Chitwood) and County (TBD)).
- Robert Brown expressed concern that there is no official Clallam County representative. Shawn said that Cathy Lear remains as alternate, and we are awaiting word from the County to find out who will be their representative.

VI. Adjourn

Action Items or Items Needing Follow-up	Date Recommended	Date Completed
Team needs to know who will be new Clallam County representative.	12/10/14 (by Robert Brown)	