

## **APPROVED DRMT Hybrid Meeting Notes February 8, 2023 (revised 3/9/2023)**

Prepared by Todd Coward, Clallam County

### **DRMT Members Present:**

Hansi Hals (Chair)/JST, Shawn Hines/JST(alt), Danielle Zitomer/WDFW, Robert Bebee/Riverside Property Owner, Powell Jones/Dungeness River Nature Center, Ben Smith/Water Users Assoc, Tony Corrado/Protect the Peninsula's Future, Bob Phraener/Olympic Audubon, Bowen Kendrick/PUD, Alex Scagliotti/Tideland Owners (alt), Judy Larson (alt)/Protect the Peninsula's Future, Meggan Uecker/City of Sequim, Kim Williams/CCD, Lance Vail/Olympic Audubon (alt), Ann Soule/City of Sequim (alt)

### **Others Present:**

Phil Martin/Guest, Paul Moore/Guest, , Joel Green/Streamkeepers, Genie Mixson/Guest, Bruce Cornett/Guest, Kara Cardinal/Strait ERN, Todd Coward/Clallam County, John Perch/DOE, Mark Ozias/BOCC, Robert Knapp/JST, Ed Bolsby/, Jennifer Garcelon/Clallam County, Karen Affeld/NODC, Deborah Johnson/DOH, Rebecca Mahan/Clallam County, Kara Cardinal/Strait ERN, Jason Hatch/WWT, John Stednick/Guest, Neil Harrington/JST, Lisa Hals/Guest, Phil Martin/Guest, Scott Chitwood/Guest, Bob Simmons/WSU Extension

---

### **I. Introductions/Review Agenda/Approve January 2023 Draft Meeting Notes**

Hansi called the meeting to order at 2:00pm and asked each person in person and on Zoom to introduce themselves.

Hansi clarified Item 4. on the February agenda. There was an issue with hearing all of the comments prior to the proposed motion at the January meeting. Item 4 will be revisited so that those comments can be heard by all.

No additional comments were presented for the February Agenda.

Hansi asked if there were any comments regarding the January Notes. Ann mentioned that the Ranney well was spelled incorrectly in the January notes.

Robert made a motion to approve the January notes as edited, Tony seconded, motion passed with Judy Larson abstaining.

### **Public Comment**

Paul Moore commented on the safety concerns of the Off Channel Reservoir and mentioned the aesthetics of the project and questioned the proposed recreation in the area surrounding the reservoir. He also commented on the cost/benefit of the project.

Judy Larson had a question regarding additional piping of irrigation ditches in Clallam County and mentioned that it was a topic at the annual Sequim Prairie Tri Irrigation Company meeting. She asked who has access to the Project's EIS.

Joe Holtrop answered that there has been planning of the Sequim Prairie Tri Irrigation Company's piping for 2-3 years and that it is part of a Water Smart Grant. The Environmental Impact Statement is available by request from Washington Department of Ecology.

Judy then asked about the specifics of the project and if the EIS covered the latest modifications.

Hansi asked Judy to reach out to the Conservation District regarding her questions.

Commissioner Mark Ozias addressed the letter that the DRMT is considering and that the County is aware of the concerns that the neighbors and others have regarding the safety of the project. He assured the group that the project will be engineered to the highest safety standards. Commissioner Ozias stated that he didn't want the letter to be used as a cudgel and he thanked the DRMT for their support for the project.

Jeannie Mixon thanked the DRMT and Commissioner Ozias for hearing the concerns of the residents of Dungeness Meadows.

Bruce Cornett commented on the safety of the project, especially during a seismic event.

### **Member Comments:**

Hansi mentioned that this week in the Washington Legislature there were two hearings in the Agriculture and Natural Resources committee regarding the Foster Water Bill.

Also, on Tuesday, the Riparian Bill was considered with regard to the Lorraine Loomis Act for a voluntary approach to management.

## **II. Municipal Climate Planning Update**

*Karen Affeld, North Olympic Development Council*

Karen started by explaining that this is a regional climate change adaptation and mitigation project for Jefferson and Clallam Counties. She then explained what the North Olympic Development Council is and that their mission is to empower the North Olympic Peninsula to pursue and invest in its own economic and environmental destiny.

She explained the local climate risks and impacts which includes increased temperature, heavy rains, flooding sea level rise and landslides. There is also summer drought and the threat of wildfire. The NODC supports Tribes, local governments, and agencies in implementing coordinated climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies in Clallam and Jefferson counties. This is done by facilitating three region wide strategy meetings, developing a climate change implementation toolkit, and providing technical assistance to four local governments.

The priorities that came out of the region wide meetings were shoreline management and land use, wildfires and wildfire smoke, water infrastructure, water supply, availability and quality, energy resiliency, redundancy and independence transportation resiliency, adaptation and mitigation, and local food and agriculture.

The climate change toolkit has three focus areas: Transportation and Land use, Energy and Buildings and Water. The toolkit is virtual and can be downloaded at <https://www.noprkd/climate-action-toolkit>.

The technical assistance for local governments had four proposals submitted from Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe, City of Port Townsend, City of Port Angeles, and Clallam County. The proposals were reviewed by Cascadia Consulting and assistance was given to move the proposals forward.

During the regional meetings, it was found that Natural Disaster Resiliency Planning was an important topic. This became a parallel process during the Climate Change project. The goals were to identify and assess regional gaps and needs around integration of climate change considerations in Hazard Mitigation and Emergency Management Planning and prioritize projects and identify "shovel ready" implementation steps

that address these gaps and needs. It was determined that many of the regional plans incorporated many of the climate change impacts. Many of the plans were based on past experiences and did not factor the integration of future climate changes. Many of the strategies did not explicitly call out any co-benefits, nor did they specify a specific funding source.

Two meetings were held to identify priority areas of Emergency Preparedness. These priorities included sea level rise, flooding and landslides, wildfires and wildfire smoke, drought, extreme heat and water supply and multi-hazard and extreme event preparedness. Within these areas, projects were determined.

Karen then detailed the Next Steps that are needed for Project Development, Funding, and Implementation.

#### **Q/A/Comments:**

Judy asked if Western Washington University or Peninsula College was involved with input in the project.

Karen answered no, Cascadia Consulting was used for the project along with members of different agencies.

Robert thanked Karen and the NODC for their help with the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe in planning and addressing Climate Change.

### **III. Green Crab Season-End Update**

*Lorenz Sollmann, USFWS and Neil Harrington, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe*

Neil began by detailing the biology of the European Green Crab and that they are one of the world's top 100 invasive species. The green crab has no predators or parasites, so it does very well in North America. He then went on to detail the crab's impacts. These include eelgrass loss, saltmarsh erosion, predate clams and oysters and competition with native crab species.

The spread of the crab from Europe to North America was explained. Originally, the crab was contained in ballast water, possibly as planktonic larvae. The crabs made their way to San Francisco in 1989 and Dungeness NWR in 2017.

Trapping was focused on Washington Harbor and Travis Spit in 2022. Neil went on to detail the trapping locations in south Sequim Bay and had a map showing the locations of the traps and where crabs were caught. Two males were caught in south Sequim Bay. He also showed a table that compared caught crabs from past years and those of 2022. He went on to discuss the trapping efforts in Discovery Bay.

The trapping effort for 2022 was summarized in a chart that also indicated the types of traps that were used. The total number of crabs caught in 2022 was 76.

Neil shared a heat map showing where the green crab activity is located in Discovery Bay. Discovery Bay will be a priority for 2023.

Lorenz spoke next and detailed the trapping efforts in the Dungeness National Wildlife Refuge. The USFWS used thirty volunteers in order to survey and trap for the green crab.

A map showing the trapping sites was presented. It highlighted the Graveyard Spit Channel, Graveyard Spit East Lagoon and Base Lagoon. Lorenz summarized the 2022 Activity which showed that 14 green crabs were caught.

Lorenz summarized green crab control measures throughout the Sound. Between all of the agencies, 286, 332 green crabs were caught in the Coastal and Salish Sea regions.

**Q/A/Comments:**

A question was asked regarding the freshwater influence on the green crab.

Neil answered that they are usually found near a freshwater influence. One thought is that the fresh water keeps predators away. The green crab has a high tolerance for a wide range of salinity.

A question was asked about finding the source of the crab.

Lorenz explained that in 2017, crabs were DNA-tested and it was found that the crabs are related to those along the Washington coast. A possibility of spread is the El Nino event and there is a reverse flow that could be moving the crabs.

Judy asked if temperature and the heat dome effect has an effect on the green crab. She also asked if areas with engineered structures have a higher incidence of green crabs.

Lorenz answered that the cool spring delayed the crab activity. Neil stated that the crab's mobility may help them endure temperature extremes unlike the bi-valves. Neil said that crabs like structures, and that is where they usually set traps.

Rebecca asked if the green crabs in Discovery Bay were near the Olympia Oysters and if there is a know interaction between the two.

Neil answered that there is a known negative interaction between oysters and the green crab. The activity of the green crab is one lagoon up from the oyster bed. Neil explained that an oyster attached to a rock is harder to prey on than a baby oyster that is loose.

**IV. Seek approval of DRMT Draft Letter RE: OCR**

*DRMT*

Hansi clarified that the Draft Letter is back on the agenda from January. There was an approved motion in January to send a letter to Clallam County Board of Commissioners that recognizes the neighbors' concerns about making safety the highest priority and references the relevant DRMT goal with regards to safety.

There was a procedural issue with the motion due to the fact that an objection was not heard prior to the vote. It was later found that the Draft letter as written and forwarded to DRMT via email was in line with what Danielle would have supported.

Hansi asked DRMT members to comment on the motion and mentioned that correspondence with the City of Sequim indicated they may wish to make a motion today, since no action on the letter has been taken (i.e. it has not yet been sent).

Hansi mentioned that the County is not in a position to make the motion because they did not vote with the majority during January's meeting (County abstained in January).

Danielle asked if she would be eligible to make a motion due to the fact that she may have not been a voting member in January.

Shawn explained that though the Team did not see her vote\*, Danielle's email to Shawn indicated that she approved the language in the letter that was sent to Team. Danielle responded that she still has concerns and thought that the group would benefit from more discussion on the subject. [*\*Note – Danielle's email actually went to the full team; see 1/31/23 email from Danielle with Subject Line: RE: DRMT Meeting Follow Ups*]

Hansi mentioned that there is an approved action and a party that supported it can make a motion.

Ann stated that the City of Sequim read the Agenda and assumed that the group was still seeking approval for a draft letter and thought it was still an open topic. That is how the agenda item reads and how it is presented. It states "draft" on the letter.

Hansi stated that was true, and it was part of clarifying the motion. The topic came back to the Executive Committee since the operational procedure of hearing all comments on the motion wasn't able to be followed due to audio issue. Typically, if there is an approved action for communication that is done administratively, it is sent. Would the amended motion be, yes, we want to send the letter, but we want DRMT to review and approve the letter before it is sent? I.e., amend the motion to touch it again?

Ben moved to make a motion for what Hansi just said.

Hansi explained that Ben is moving to amend the motion from the January meeting, which was to send a letter to the County Commissioners, with a draft letter returning to the DRMT for approval prior to it being sent.

Ann asked for clarification of the amended motion and if the letter is to be reviewed.

Hansi stated that the letter would be edited by the group and this body would need to approve the letter before it is sent. If the Group does not have agreement, then the Group would have to acknowledge that they couldn't approve the letter to send.

Tony asked for clarification that the motion is on the table now to consider sending a revision to the letter, but no decision at all as to how that process will occur. There will be full DRMT approval before the letter is sent.

Hansi answered that the new motion being considered would amend the January motion such that the letter would be approved before sending.

Judy asked for clarification regarding the letters that were written on October 29, 2021, January 11, 2023, and January 13, 2023 and if these are what is being discussed by the Group. Hansi answered, "yes" the January 11, 2023 correspondence is the discussion point.

Hansi stated that the group is discussing the motion to amend the previous motion where the draft must be reviewed and approved by DRMT prior to sending the letter to the County. Hansi also mentioned that Judy was referring to the correct correspondence.

The motion to amend the previous motion was put to a vote.

The motion carried.

Hansi explained the Group has a draft letter. She asked how the draft will be edited. Shawn wanted to know if others had concerns regarding the letter. Hansi stated that if there are no edits or concerns, a motion to send the letter will be brought before a vote. There will be a one-week comment period for Group members to review and comment on the current draft letter. Shawn will send a revised Draft to Team. Continue with one-week due dates and hopefully there will be a final draft available for the March DRMT meeting.

Ben shared that he thought the letter is a little out of the DRMT's purview. He thought it would be appropriate that if there isn't consensus during the March meeting that the group should say that this is too far out of the Group's purview. He mentioned that the irrigators have expressed the concerns of safety to the County and the Project.

Break at 3:32 pm

## **V. Other Orders of Business, Announcements & Standing Agenda Items**

### **Standing Items:**

#### **WRTG Presentation: Topic 6.1 Groundwater Characterization**

*Ann Soule, WRTG Volunteer*

Ann explained that the Water Resources Technical Group determined needs and gave recommendations to the DRMT regarding Water Resources. A summary presentation was delivered to DRMT in July of 2022 by Tony. This presentation will focus on Topic 6.1 Updated Groundwater Characterization.

The three subtopics are to Assess status of groundwater levels and plan future monitoring and reporting, Update analyses on groundwater recharge, discharge and relationships between sources and Assess groundwater quality.

Ann shared diagrams of groundwater and explained the relationships between the layers, aquifers and flow lines. She then explained why more groundwater characterization is needed in the region. The main reasons were to update data which is over 15 years old and to answer modern questions such as snowmelt and recharge and groundwater development and its effects on aquifers.

The presentation then highlighted several studies related to the topic. This included the most recent study from 2009 showing well hydrographs in the Dungeness watershed.

This study also showed the connection between shallow, middle and lower aquifers. Ann then shared a graph of John Pearch's Department of Ecology study that was shared with the DRMT last year. This graph indicated the water levels in Carlsborg area along with river stage and precipitation.

Ann then mentioned the current state of the monitoring of wells and aquifers and the use of piezometers and transducers for efficient data gathering. She shared that there is information on the Ecology Information Management website.

The presentation then summarized groundwater quality reports, which the majority were twenty years old. Ann also spoke about current monitoring of septic systems in the region. This included a 2009 study of nitrates reported.

Ann then detailed the data that needs to be updated. This includes correlations between aquifer levels and river/streams and the relationships between aquifer levels and groundwater flow.

The impetus of newer data is to know the factors associated with aquifer declines in order to mitigate and possibly recalibrate the Model in the Rule.

Ann concluded the presentation by sharing her suggestions regarding groundwater supplies and quality. She then asked members of the WRTG for comments or questions.

### **Comments/Questions:**

Tony asked Ann to generalize how extensive and what would it take for the next phase to accomplish the goals that were highlighted in the presentation.

Ann answered that bringing people together for a grant proposal, find the gaps and figure out what areas can be done by existing staff and volunteer can accomplish. With experienced people, 4-5 meetings to determine the goals.

Joel mentioned that Streamkeepers may be involved in groundwater monitoring and have volunteers that have experience.

Hansi asked if there is any later data than 2007 for nitrates.

Ann answered yes there are. There are several reports online that Ann completed that are very site specific. The most recent is 2011. The County may have summarized data.

Judy mentioned Ann's articles in the Sequim Gazette from May 1993 and May 2019. She then asked if the PUD have any effective way of checking nitrates and possible reports.

Hansi answered that Carol may have more information on that topic, but she is not present.

Judy made a comment that surface water (irrigation ditches) is important in active aquifer recharge areas. She wanted to know if Ann had additional data regarding this.

Judy asked if the Powerpoint Presentation and information would be available to the group. Shawn can send.

### **WRTG Presentation: Topic 6.7 Interactive Hydrologic Map**

*Alex Scagliotti and Joe Holtrop, WRTG Members*

Alex started by explaining that the idea of this topic was to create a single location to find relevant hydrologic data. This map would have many layers that could be used for analysis and data depot. Layers would include land use groundwater levels and soil types.

Alex shared several maps from other sources that have desirable layers. Unfortunately, the data is in different formats and hard to compare directly.

Alex highlighted questions that need to be answered regarding the interactive map. These included who will maintain the database, what data is relevant, and what older data sets still viable.

The reason for the need of an interactive map would be so that decisions could be made with the most recent data, will reduce large studies, and help concentrate on conservation efforts. The map would also be the clearinghouse for all data, which will eliminate searching for data over many different sites.

Alex then spoke about the next steps that are needed to start the Interactive Hydrology Map. The first step is to determine what agency or organization would manage the GIS data. The next steps would be to develop baseline map data and coordinate with stakeholders on data collections.

Alex concluded by highlighting the impetus for having an updated single source interactive hydrology map. This includes access to the most up to date information, inventory infrastructure and their updates and have different forms of data that can be analyzed and compared.

### **WRTG Presentation: Topic 6.12 Shallow Aquifer Recharge Effectiveness**

*Alex Scagliotti and Joe Holtrop, WRTG Members*

Alex began the second presentation by defining the SAR which is an intentional and controlled replenishment of the shallow aquifer. There are currently nine aquifer recharge facilities in the region. It is important to evaluate their effectiveness because aquifer recharge has a huge storage potential for stream flows and wells. Refining the current knowledge and recalibrating assumptions about SAR will allow for prioritization of projects.

The presentation then showed the current effectiveness of existing conditions of SAR. This information is used for Water Rule mitigation and for the mitigation for piping projects. This portion also illustrated the diversions water budget using a bar graph.

Hansi asked Alex to explain the difference between ditch leakage and percolation. Alex answered that percolation is measured once it is delivered on the field.

Alex explained the four main aquifer recharge types, which are irrigation ditches, infiltration facilities stormwater runoff and ponds.

Alex then handed the presentation over to Joe who spoke about the current SAR projects. He explained that the nitrates in the ground water could rise if aquifer recharge isn't continued. He explained the relationship of the Water Rule mitigation and aquifer recharge.

Joe showed examples of SAR facilities which were infiltration pipeline inlet and infiltration trench to pipeline and infiltration trench inlet. Joe then shared a map showing the locations of the SAR facilities. Joe estimated that these facilities infiltrated over one-thousand-acre feet back into the aquifer. The next slide showed the nine sites, their infiltration per year and the aquifer impact (benefit).

Joe went on to explain the effectiveness of the SAR at several facilities. This included the limitations of the model infiltration and what data is used for the decisions.



Alex concluded the presentation by explaining what questions need to be answered in order to improve the effectiveness of SAR. He then stated that the impetus for updated studies would be to determine the most efficient and efficacious groundwater recharge zones to target.

Alex concluded the presentation by explaining potential next steps to orchestrate studies and explore grant opportunities.

**Q/A/Comments:**

Ann commented that she suspected that the benefit from the Casserly Creek example was benefiting the Dungeness due to flow into Hurd Creek.

She also commented that using the look up table is less accurate than using the model and look up table for aquifer recharge.

Judy asked if the County had records of where wells were deepened and if there is a correlation to piping projects.

Ann answered that Department of Ecology may have the information.

Off Channel Reservoir Update  
*Rebecca Mahan, Clallam County*

Rebecca shared that three meetings were held with the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe, WDFW and Dungeness Water Users Association to discuss the Consultant’s 30% design. The December 6 Open House recording is now available on the County’s Reservoir web site. Questions and concerns from the public are being compiled and answers are being generated and a FAQ section will be constructed on the County’s Reservoir site. Applications for permits are being generated. Dungeness Reservoir Partners Workgroup meetings are being scheduled for late February and early March.

Levee Setback Project Update  
*Rebecca Mahan, Clallam County*

WCC crews planted 11,000 plants in the disturbed area during January. There are still discussions regarding Towne Road.

**Q/A/Comments:**

Hansi added that the North Olympic Salmon Coalition helped with volunteers for the planting at the levee and closer to the hatchery.

Hansi continued with the Legislative announcement from earlier. The Riparian Bill is HB 1720 and the Water Bill is SB 5517. The City of Port Angeles has written a letter in opposition to SB 5517.

**VII. Future Agenda Items**

March return for the final draft letter. Would the DRMT want to consider the 2018 resolution related to the Off Channel Reservoir for 2023? Hansi suggested deferring this until after Workgroup meeting presentation.

Possible update of the DRMT regarding the Reservoir Workgroup meetings.

#### **VIII. Public Comment**

Bruce made a comment that the DRMT Operational Goals correlates with the Neighbor's concerns regarding the Off Channel Reservoir.

Ben mentioned that the Conservation District is having their election soon. Visit their website for more information.

Robert made a motion to adjourn, Tony seconded with the motion carried.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:50 pm.