



April 8, 2015

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
 Judy Larson, Protect the Peninsula’s Future
 Robert Brown, Dungeness Beach Association
 Shawn Hines, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe (alt)
 Cathy Lear, Clallam County (alt)
 Robert Beebe, Riverside Property Owner
 Don Hatler, Sports Fisheries
 Marc McHenry, US Forest Service (Advisory)
 Mary Ellen Winborn, Clallam County
 Ann Soule, City of Sequim
 Matt Heins, Estuary-Tidelands/Riverside Property Owners
 Michele Canale, North Olympic Land Trust

Others in Attendance:

Robert Knapp, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe
 Phil Martin, Citizen
 Chase Gallagher, Ecology
 Aaron Brooks, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe
 Christopher Burns, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe
 Michael Blanton, Puget Sound Partnership
 Bob Reandeau Property Owner
 Sue Thomas, USFWS
 Alana Linderoth, Sequim Gazette
 Jeremy Pratt, GEI Consultants, Inc.

I. Introductions/Review Agenda/Review & Approve March 11, 2015 DRMT Draft Meeting Notes

Scott Chitwood called meeting to order. Introductions were made, sign in sheets circulated. In reviewing the agenda, Scott Chitwood announced that Scott Williams of WDFW was called away, and so Item IV (*Canyon Creek Fish Ladder Project Update*) would need to be rescheduled. After reviewing notes, Matt Heins moved and Robert Brown seconded the motion to approve the February notes; Matt moved and Don Hatler seconded the motion to approve the March notes. The motions passed unanimously.

Following approval, Robert Brown noted that there were some needed follow-ups from last meeting, such as Sequim’s agenda item (Section III) on page 3 of the March notes. Ann Soule said that she could follow up with an email [*Shawn forwarded email to DRMT on April 20, 2015*].

Michele Canale asked about irrigation terminology used in March notes: “big guns” = water cannons, less water efficient, but more convenient; “booms” = “low pressure traveling booms”.

Public Comment:

Michael Blanton gave a summary of the Senate budget that came out today:

Request Name	Agency Request	Governor’s Budget	House Budget	Senate Budget
Capital requests:				
PSAR	\$140 M	\$50 M	\$40 M	\$25M
SRFB	\$40 M (state)	\$40 M (state)	\$40 M (state)	\$16.5M (state)
ESRP	\$20 M	\$10 M	\$10 M	\$5M
Floodplains by Design	\$50 M	\$25 M	\$43 M	\$0
Operating requests:				
Chinook Plan Phase II	\$1.7 M	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000
Marine Survival research	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$800,000
PSNERP*			\$800,000	\$0

Don Hatler wondered, given that it is expected to be a record pink year, whether there will be any water in the Dungeness. Scott Chitwood referenced the river flow forecast that he had sent out earlier; right now, the River is projected to be 30-50% of normal. There were 400,000 pinks the year before last; they occupied most of the

channel. Robert Brown asked where the forecast was from. Scott replied that these forecasts by NRCS are based on SNOTEL.

Judy asked who from the DRMT will be attending the upcoming climate preparedness workshops. Ann Soule, Don Hatler and Mary Ellen Willborn will attend water resources; Cathy will attend Ecosystems; and David Garlington will attend infrastructures. Judy requested that attendees provide summary of workshops at a future DRMT meeting.

II. Drought Year Leasing Program (*Amanda Cronin, Washington Water Trust*)

- Amanda Cronin reminded the group about previous water leasing programs – one led by the Water Trust in 2009, plus Ecology’s programs from 2001, and 2003-2005. Washington Water Trust will manage the current program, which will provide \$200,000 to irrigation district or company members for not irrigating. Washington Water Trust has sent solicitation to irrigators, who must respond with bids by 4/15. Funds will go to the lowest bids first, up to a capped amount. This has been found to be the most efficient process. No max price, paying out on a per acre basis. Contracts will be directly with the irrigators.
- Eligibility: must have irrigated 5 acres or more by 2014; member of WUA; no crop limitations, i.e. can be any commercial crop or grass, as long as long as it was irrigated previously; permission from irrigation company or district. Another condition is that they can’t irrigate with another source.
- Scott and Amanda reviewed the process by which the leasing program came about. The drought designation by the Governor triggered the release of drought emergency funds. However the dry year leasing program Amanda described is actually being funded from the 2012 Legislature proviso for Dungeness water projects. These proviso funds will pay irrigators NOT to water from August 15-September 15 (last month of irrigation season), subject to the eligibility conditions.
- Expect good participation from the irrigators, especially the last two weeks of the irrigation season, since we don’t know if there will be any water anyway. I.e., participants will still get paid, whether there is water to conserve or not.
- WWT will be monitoring for compliance; there were no compliance issues in 2009.
- Ann Soule asked what the irrigators will be giving up by participating. Amanda responded that it equates to a cutting; they will have two instead of three – but also depends on what is being grown.
- Audience question: The lowest bid will be accepted, up to the cap amount? What is the price per acre estimate? In 2009, the average price was \$86/acre, with nine participants, and 2.2 cfs conserved. In 2003-2005, average price was \$150/acre, with a few more participants and 10 cfs saved. Price depends on nature of crop. Not sure yet what will be offered. An estimate will be made of how much water is being saved by not irrigating. Will use the WA Irrigation Guide to help estimate how much water is needed per crop. Again, not paying for the quantity of water; based on average use.
- In 2009, had \$100,000 and spent \$32,000. In 2003-2005, spent \$200,000.
- Judy Larson asked how did the change go from 2 to 10 cfs saved. Amanda said that in 2003-2005 the duration was 45 days, instead of 30 days, plus more acreage was enrolled.
- Robert Brown asked about enforcement. Amanda reiterated that the Trust will visit all properties, also working with the ditch riders; wouldn’t get paid if caught watering.
- Ann Soule asked if there was a way to estimate if less water is being diverted at those times. Amanda said since it’s not a normal year, predictions will be high. Would need to figure out how to translate that information for an extreme drought year.
- Amanda reminded group about the 1998 Memorandum of Understanding between WUA and Ecology, a landmark agreement which stipulated that no more than 50% of the flow as measured at USGS gage could be diverted. In 2012, the irrigators and Ecology renegotiated, and the MOU was replaced with a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), which kept the 50% rule and added a requirement for leaving a minimum of 60cfs in the river at all times. The irrigators had been voluntarily abiding by the 60cfs minimum, but made it official in the MOA. This sort of agreement is not common in many places of the state; very forward-thinking of the WUA.

- Scott said the first trigger, then, is when the river is at 120 cfs (50% of that flow is 60cfs). When the flow is below 120 cfs, can't divert anymore. Will need a drought plan. Scott asked what the action date is for the leases. Amanda said the irrigators will get paid, regardless of whether there is water or not. Scott asked if the lease rates would get discounted in that case – so that the limited amount of funding could go further. Amanda said not able to do that this year; commitment has already been made to the irrigators.
- Audience: What if bid comes in on the higher side; any drought relief for that bidder, such as Ecology's drought relief funds? An Ecology representative said the request to Legislature is \$9 million, but specific decisions about allocation haven't been made yet.

III. Lower Dungeness Floodplain Restoration Update (*Cathy Lear, Clallam County*)

- Cathy Lear provided a PowerPoint update about current phase of lower river floodplain restoration. She went over the benefits of floodplain recovery for people, fish, other species, and reminded everyone that BirdFest is going on right now. Matt Heins added eel grass to the list of benefits.
- Cathy went over the various phases of the project; River's End purchases, restoration was Phase 1. Planning for that phase began in 2001, and there were many, many partners involved, such as County, Tribe, State agencies, etc. . In January 2002, the flood of record occurred. A big driver of the project was the fact that eight times in seven years the area in River's End had flooded. That phase of the project included moving houses, recycling structures in the floodplain, moving structures, and restoring the area. This was done in cooperation with the Housing Authority of Clallam County, plus DNR crews and Clallam County chain gain did some of the revegetation. The Tribe led the marsh reconnection project (to connect to River mouth).
- Phase 2 involves the Army Corps of Engineers Levee Setback and Floodplain Restoration. Aerial photos of the project site show how the river channel in that area is tightly constrained, so there are neither logjams nor floodplain channels. When high water comes, it can't spread out, and can only get deeper and faster, scouring out redds and leaving no refuge for fish. She compared that aerial to a view upstream of the Railroad Bridge, to show comparison of river with (upstream Railroad Bridge) and without side channels (levee reach).
- Cathy reviewed the history of the dike; Clallam County had requested the 2.6 mile dike be built by ACOE in 1963. The ACOE dike alone caused the loss of 410 acres of floodplain. Additional dikes were need on the opposite side of the river, which caused another 150 acres of lost floodplain. She showed several graphs which showed the cross-section of river and floodplain before and after the dikes.
- Expect preliminary design/planning for project 2015-1016, and construction 2017. Locals will take the lead on design, but with ACOE input. In the 1960s, ACOE designed it on their own. Matt Heins noted that ACOE has been involved in the overall project since 2006. The latest design was ACOE's idea, which removes part of the dike.
- Cathy said hopefully the next time she presents we'll be able to see designs.
- Matt mentioned that he wouldn't call Phase I a success yet, as there is still a sugar dike. Even though it has failed, it has not been removed. In fact, some new structures have been going in recently.

IV. Dungeness Spawning Ground Surveys (*Aaron Brooks and Chris Burns, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe*)

- Aaron Brooks and Chris Burns provided a PowerPoint on the Tribe's spawning ground survey efforts, noting that Jamestown does most of the Coho and Chum surveys, and WDFW does Chinook and Steelhead.
- The process includes walking the river in pre-determined index sections on 7 to 10 day intervals when stream conditions allow. Supplemental surveys are conducted in areas that are not surveyed on a regular basis during the peak of run. All redds observed are flagged and recorded on a note book and with a GPS. Live and dead fish of each species are counted and recorded.
- Why do spawning ground surveys and trap smolts? Data is used for many purposes: to estimate how many fish returned to the river to spawn ("escapement" estimate); Estimate egg to smolt survival based on escapement estimates and smolt trapping; smolt trapping is used to estimate out-migrating juveniles;

smolt trapping also aids in generating return forecasts for future years; used for Harvest Management and Habitat Management purposes and goals.

- Showed escapement charts for all species. Noted that estimates are getting more and more accurate with improved methods and more data.
- Noted the jump in Chinook in early 2000s due to the broodstock program. Ann Soule asked when the hatchery started up. Scott Chitwood said they were first released in 1905; Dungeness is one of the oldest hatcheries in the state, as is Quilcene's. Matt Heins said the Hurd Creek hatchery was for pinks. Scott noted that since 1970s, pinks haven't done well in Dungeness. Aaron said the 2015 forecast for pinks is 1-1.3 million. Concerns about flows.
- Chris Burns discussed the redd distributions of Chinook, coho, steelhead in Dungeness through 2014, as well as other efforts conducted during the surveys: collecting scale samples for age analysis; scanning carcasses for Coded Wire Tags; collecting otolith's from Chinook for analysis; collecting DNA Samples from Steelhead carcasses and from live Steelhead captured.
- Judy asked if there are habitat issues in the upper River. Chris said it is pretty pristine above the hatchery, other than some logging. Marc McHenry said there has been some road-building, wood taken out of the river, tree harvests, but for the most part the riparian areas in the upper river are intact.
- Don Hatler asked at what flow are redds/eggs decimated? Chris said depends on where they spawn.
- Phil Martin: how much spawning goes on in smaller streams, combined? Water Rule puts a lot of emphasis on small streams, such as McDonald and Seibert. Chris said you can't compare Dungeness with smaller streams; like apples and oranges. Can say they are important for smolts; McDonald had a record outmigration of smolts, for example. Nice spawning habitat, as well. Phil asked how far up they go in smaller streams. Chris said they go up pretty far. Scott Chitwood said one thing that you can compare is smolt production. For example, coho: Siebert 3-4,000, Dung 30-40,000. Steelhead : Siebert 1-2,000, Dungeness 9-17,000. Ration not quite 1 to 10.

VI. Sequim 120 Comprehensive Plan Update

- Chris Hugo said there were over 600 Sequim 120 participants, which updated Sequim's Comprehension Plan.
- Sequim's growth challenges: Nearly 50% growth at 2% annual rate; 2/3rds of growth is still outside the UGA; Too much "available" land, not enough water; Urban living connected to rural landscape; Impact of external growth on Sequim's infrastructure; Affordability to serve UGA; Difficulty to grow beyond "noose" of small parcels; Acceptance of more people
- Values that drive the vision: Small-town", Friendly, Convenient, Walkable, Affordable, Safe, Connected, Preserve Rural, Multi-generational
- Small town character and convenience: Building scale and details, Walkable, Friendly, Connected, Downtown vitality, Preserve Rural (avoid sprawl)
- Michele Canale asked how Sequim proposes to protect the rural character. Chris said that is the County's job. Can't protect without taking out of zone.
- Friendly people and places: Sidewalks and streets, Scale / design of buildings, "Connectedness", Gathering places, Strengthen neighborhood identity / function
- Walkable: Alternative transportation, Healthy, Friendly, Safe
- Safe: Protected" sidewalks and social front yards, Eyes-on-the-street (and alleys), Street system design (grid and 300' blocks), Multi-modal (TMP's "Layered network")
- Robert Brown asked about low income housing. Chris said there is no capacity. There are provisions in the plan. All high density housing is redirected to different parts of community.
- Judy Larson asked if there are incentives in the plan for using less impervious surfaces. Ann Soule answered that the Comp. Plan addresses that.
- Chris showed various types of housing and subdivision designs and discussed importance of energy leadership. Stated biggest challenge to our future is lots between 0.5 and 2 acres outside the City.

- Robert Brown expressed concern about lack of apartment housing; people working in Sequim live in PA because they can't afford to live in Sequim. Chris said there is plenty of capacity for apartments, if there's a market. Don't see a market currently.
- Ann Soule brought up transportation as a growth challenge that is not often talked about, and the other is stormwater. For example, every time a new place is built on Burn Hill, the site becomes a conduit for stormwater. City is dealing with stormwater that generates from parcels in the County. When that water hits channels, irrigation ditches – we've lost it. Getting that water into the ground is the goal.

Public Comment:

- Robert Brown asked about drought planning. Shawn referred to an email she sent about saving the date: May 21 – evening community drought forum. Stay tuned!

V. Adjourn

Action Items or Items Needing Follow-up	Date Requested	Date Completed
Drought planning	2/11/15	Update scheduled for community forum, 5/21/15.
County Public Works involvement with bridge repair	3/11/15	Emailed response to DRMT 4/20/15.
City of Sequim meeting 10 percent loss?	3/11/15	Emailed response to DRMT 4/20/15.
City of Sequim report on types of sewer leaks?	3/11/15	Emailed response to DRMT 4/20/15.
Canyon Creek Fish Ladder Project Update	4/08/15	
Update on April climate change workshops	4/08/15	
Update on drought-leasing program bids	4/08/15	