



June 8th, 2011

DRAFT Meeting Notes

Dungeness River Management Team

Dungeness River Audubon Center, Sequim, WA

2:00 – 5:00 P.M.

Notes prepared by: Melissa Coughlin

Team Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Robert Brown, Dungeness Beach Association
Randy Johnson, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
Joe Holtrop, Clallam County Conservation District
Shawn Hines, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe (alt)
Cathy Lear, Clallam County
Virginia Clark, Dungeness/Quilcene Planning
Al Moore, Riverside Property Owners (RM 0-3.25)
Pete Schroeder, Riverside Property Owners (RM 3.25- 4.25)
Paul Haines, City of Sequim

Robert Caldwell, Water Users Association
Scott Hagerty, U.S. Forest Service (alt)
Hansi Hals, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
Michele d'Hemecourt, North Olympic Land Trust
Judy Larson, Protect the Peninsula's Future
Steve Tharinger, Clallam County
Les Jones, Dungeness/Quilcene Planning (alt)
Tom Martin, PUD #1

Others in Attendance:

Randy Johnson, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
Matt Heins, Dungeness Farms and Dungeness Habitat
Welden Clark, Dungeness River Audubon Center
Byron Rot, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe

Bob Boekelheide, Dungeness River Audubon Center
Steve Rankin, Streamkeepers
Cheryl Baumann, LEAD Entity for Salmon
Melissa Coughlin, Note taker

2:00 P.M.

I. Introductions /Review Agenda / Review and Approval of May 11th DRMT Draft Meeting Notes

- Robert Brown (Vice President of Dungeness Beach Association) served as chairperson in Scott Chitwood's absence. Introductions all around.
- Shawn Hines said that Cynthia Nelson was not able to attend the meeting today, so the WA Department of Ecology Updates should be taken off the agenda for this month. Scott Hagerty asked for time on the agenda to give an update on the U.S. Forest Service Action Plan.
- Changes to the May minutes were discussed. Judy Larson moved the April notes be approved with changes; Robert Caldwell seconded the motion, which then passed.

Public Comment:

- None were offered at this time.

II. 2011 SRFB Project Proposal Presentation for NOPLE (Cheryl Baumann, NOPLE Coordinator)

Cheryl introduced the process: There are \$2 million from taxpayer funds that will be available for projects. The process includes site visits, project proposal applications, review panel and final presentations. There is a difference in the amount of materials (handed out to DRMT) for the projects as the projects are currently in different stages. Some projects have some funding in hand (e.g., Washington Harbor). The other two projects have less documentation and are not at the same stage of development. The Technical Review Group scores the projects after the presentations.

WA Harbor Restoration: Construction Phase (Randy Johnson, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe)

See handout (from Cheryl) of project summary for further details.

- Work completed on project includes: cultural resources assessment; stakeholder group meetings; geomorphic assessments and surveys; design, engineering and contract drawings. Funding for construction is needed.
- It is #5 of 77 of the newly prioritized Lead Entity 3-year plan and is supported by many groups.
- The project is mostly about chum and also Chinook salmon habitat restoration work. Chinook is ESA listed.
- Randy used Lone Tree (on the Skagit River) as an example of successful restoration work that resulted in high numbers of returning summer chum and Chinook. The pocket estuary habitat is similar to that at Washington Harbor where it provides a safe haven from predators for fish.
- Randy showed (on a map) the shallow water migration routes of many local salmon systems (Elwha, Dungeness, Snow Creek, Jimmy-come-lately Creek) to the habitat of the Washington Harbor area. The area is a western stronghold for ESA Chinook. The project will transform the environmental muddle it is today into good habitat for many salmonid species. Randy used the 4,000 returnees to Jimmy-come-lately Creek as a success story for habitat restoration.

- On the map Randy showed the many pocket estuaries in Sequim Bay: Paradise Cove, Pitship, Chicken Coop, and Washington Harbor.
- WA Harbor is the richest, with a marsh habitat with channels, actually it is the best habitat for juvenile salmon. The channels have been adversely impacted by roads. This impact has destroyed eelgrass beds and the estuary marsh has been deprived of sediment and is believed to be eroding. In January 2010 a culvert was repaired at Pitship where clouds of summer chum were observed at this marsh afterwards. They would like to see similar results at WA Harbor.
- On another map Randy showed there is a mass convergence of spits at WA Harbor: Paradise Cove, Gibson Spit, Travis Spit, and South Spit. He showed that salmon came from the Dungeness River, Elwha River, Pitship estuary, Jimmy-come-lately Creek and elsewhere to WA Harbor.
- Currently the roadway crossing (first put in the 1870's) does not properly provide:
 - Tidal hydrology (water does not flush in and out; the entrance is shrinking).
 - Habitat connectivity.
 - Fish passage (especially chum salmon).
 - Habitat forming processes are impaired.
 - Small, narrow culverts.
 - 37 acres (of the best of the best habitat) inland have been impaired.
- The project has been studied and the plan and profile has been developed through collaborative efforts with stakeholders including the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe, the State, and City of Sequim to come up with a compromise to fix the situation with a 600 linear foot bridge. City of Sequim's outfall line will be buried. The 600' bridge will restore:
 - Tidal hydrology.
 - Habitat connectivity.
 - Fish passage.
 - And almost all habitat-forming processes at Washington Harbor.
- The need for a bridge was questioned– the property is privately owned, not county or city owned, the property owners need to have the access to the area they currently have.
- Michele d'Hemecourt asked who owns the property. Randy said there are multiple owners (Stephen Clapp, the Burrows family and the Pitship Duck Club) and the County has an easement. Judy Larson asked about the permitting authority in the 1960's that allowed the road to be built. Randy said that the hydraulics code was in place. The City must have procured the permit which was issued then by the WA Department of Fisheries (which has since merged with WDFW). Judy remembered options that were presented in a past DRMT presentation and asked if it was the property owners who decided on the 600' bridge. Randy said there was never an option under consideration that completely eliminated the road. Increasing the length of the road increases the desired outcomes. The compromise was between a 762' bridge and a 562' version. The stakeholder group was split. The landowners wanted the shorter bridge. The compromised was an intermediate bridge length.
- Randy went over the total funding cost (including the design work done):
 - EPA = \$131,288
 - ESRP = \$1,091,622 (Randy said that this funding looks pretty solid)
 - SRFB Design = \$116,697
 - **SRFB Construction = \$519,873 (amount requested for this grant)**
 - TOTAL = \$1,859,479 This comes out to \$50,256/acre (37 acres of habitat in the this project)
- Randy said that they have requested partial funding from the Hood Canal Council who has summer chum restoration money. They have been generous in the past, partially funding the Jimmy-come-lately restoration.
- Randy figured the average per acre for restoring estuary habitat ranges from \$110,000 (Salmon Creek) to \$250,000 (Jimmy-come-lately Creek) or \$170,000/acre.
- Robert Brown asked who would own the bridge once it was built, and did the plan meet existing requirements for the road. Paul Haines replied that the road meets traditional loading as well as meets the service needs and outtake needs maintenance. It will handle expected traditional conditions. Paul Haines said the City of Sequim probably doesn't want to be the owner of the bridge, but the easement is important to the City. Randy said it will be built requiring the lowest possible

maintenance. Al Moore asked about access, Randy replied that it will be limited as it is on private property.

- Bob Caldwell asked if the increase in the salmon run will be tied to a limited diversity. Randy said chum salmon typically return at variety of ages. Their population will have spawners with 2-3-4 year old fish. 70% may be from one previous brood year, but he doesn't know how if the 2009 return is the exact brood year that contributes to returning generations. Gene pool diversity problems may occur. Just can't say. Randy said in terms of strains from other systems they have found it is a common phenomenon to find pinks, chums and especially Hood Canal contributions.
- Pete Schroeder asked if there was a property line on the beach around there for walking in from the park. Randy said none of the area is open access, which includes the private tidelands. "No-trespass" is not enforced; access is at the pleasure of the landowner.
- Pete asked if the shallow waters wouldn't set up for predation by avian predators. Randy didn't think it would, the Kingfisher (for example) prefers hovering into a deep pool. Shallow pools are the mechanism young chum use for survival. He noted it is a good Bull trout fishing spot.
- Scott Hagerty asked if there were any concerns over logs and other debris constricting the movement of fish, and also asked what would be done with the riprap material that is to be removed. Randy showed the footprint of the excavation, the material will be a massive amount to excavate and haul. The disposal site has not yet been determined; however, the numbers have been produced for that. There is also an added 7% contingency in the budget. They are assuming a high success of returning salmon if they get the package funded. Logs crashing against the bridge may be an issue. It is compounded by the fact the buried City's outfall line may be hit as well. The bridge itself will be built sufficiently for extraordinary events. Piers and deck will be built with a hefty safety margin with analysis. For sea level rise the bridge deck may be subject to more action and the road can be raised on either side and raising the bridge will be an option.
- Randy answered that no marsh will be excavated. One of the problems is that the drift cell has been interrupted with the artificial riprap; this has caused a lack of sediment on the inside of Gibson Spit. They will excavate algae, but not marsh species.
- Tom Martin asked, in light of the Jimmy-come-lately project success, what are the expectations for the number of returnees at this pocket estuary site. Randy said there was no prediction or hope for some metric of "from one number to a thousand times higher". The science doesn't support that type of modeling. The return of 4,000 at Jimmy-come-lately Creek surpassed what fishery managers thought would be maintainable. Some of those are progeny from the supplementation process. Reasonable to think 1/2 of the 4,000 were wild fish, which is what the fishery managers thought would be a sustainable number.
- Pete Schroeder asked how the gouges that were created by the culverts over time would be filled in. Randy said that has not yet been proposed. Pete said that would move the big trout out of there. Randy commented the "scourables" are each over 1/4 acre in size. It is a good question which may be addressed during permitting stage. Pete suggested filling in scourables with the material that is excavated.
- Steve Tharinger commented on Jimmy-come-lately Creek reaching capacity, and asked how to achieve a return that can be handled. Randy said that one year factors (undetermined) may have supported the huge number of fish. The fish manager modeling tool is used to figure a number that can be supported. As far as predicting what a restored system can support – they were possibly either overly conservative for Jimmy-come-lately Creek or other conditions were so good that survivability increased. Good habitat means flourishing fish and resiliency through the population and lifecycles. Prediction of returnees is not absolute.
- Steve Tharinger said there was a discussion on a 70' bridge which used less financing to build. Randy said the cost was considerably less, and may have restored tidal hydraulics, which was the criteria used for that length. They looked at velocity that didn't exceed the maximum design criteria (from the fish passage handbook), but it did not achieve: shallow migration corridor or stop erosion of marsh, and the wave energy criteria was not met. Each of the options treats one or more problems; little would be gained from a 70' opening so it was rejected.

Meadowbrook Creek and Dungeness River Reconnection (Byron Rot, Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe & Matt Heins, Dungeness Farms and Dungeness Habitat)

See handout (from Cheryl) of project summary for further information.

- Project partners: Dungeness Farms, Clallam Conservation District and the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe.
- 10-15 years ago Meadowbrook Creek flowed to the Dungeness River and out to the sea. The project goal is to reconnect Meadowbrook Creek to the mainstem of the Dungeness River to expand available transitional habitat for the Dungeness. It will also improve access and habitat at Meadowbrook Slough, an old channel of the Dungeness and an important side channel habitat.
- Ducks Unlimited had begun a project there with grant money for Battelle to conduct a tide study, there was really no design work done for that project and Ducks Unlimited pulled out of after they decided to have a smaller exposure in this area.
- This project includes design and construction proposal. 3 objectives of proposal:
- Before Meadowbrook Creek was a creek it was a slough. 1) The project hopes to restore to the 1940's form. 2) There is a limiting factor (dike) which has to be removed as it takes away salmon rearing habitat. When project partners went on-site they discovered the creek had connected to the river. 3) They would like to expand the opening to make the area more functional. They would like to include building a new barrier (with logs) between Meadowbrook Creek and the bay.
- Issues for salmon: very few side channels in Matriotti Creek (side channels provide lots of smelts); freshwater input (salmon recovery see *Salmon Information –Species targeted* in proposal); rearing habitat can be restored; Sather Study (illustrates habitat use) shows that both pink and chum utilize slough channel. Quite a bit of Chinook use in channel/slough.
- Shawn Hines asked when the reconnection was discovered. Matt Heins said that about 10-15 years ago the mouth had closed up and caused backed-up conditions, neighbors and Dungeness Farms dug through the bank (or berm along shoreline) in anticipation of next storm. After the next storm it “took” and reconnected. For years there has been major flooding in 3 Crabs area and property owners have dug out on their own (without permission) when it closed up. Byron said that it is still pretty narrow given the size of the channel (showed photo from May). Scott Hagerty commented that the boat launch at the restaurant has had influence on the drift cell there. Byron said the cable to the lighthouse is from that area. He said the sediment has reconstructed the beach. The drift cell is larger process. Byron suggested that burying logs there could help as part of the design.
- Scott Hagerty asked the elevation difference between the highest and the narrowest spot closest to shore. Could sea level rise be cut off? Byron said from the barrier to beach is not very high. Matt said the area is all beach grass. Sometimes in the winter with 10' tides (with west wind), you'll get deposits in there.
- Ownership of area (Meadowbrook Creek and Meadowbrook Slough) was discussed: Cooperative effort of WDFW and Dungeness Farms. Matt added that it is a lot of protected wetland with a conservation easement agreement and land swap (19 acre salt marsh) with WDFW and Dungeness Farms & Dungeness Habitat.
- Progress to 2008: EPA Grant allowed removal of 2 small culverts to provide a lot of low gradient area (which is the most productive habitat near Dungeness). They propose opening up Meadowbrook Creek from ditch to channel. Ducks Unlimited got the project to the conceptual stage. Michele d'Hemecourt remembered the Ducks Unlimited presentation to the DRMT and asked about the feedback from that time; Matt had remembered they presented the Battelle study with 3 options. Byron said they are not proposing what Battelle had modeled for that study. The Ducks Unlimited study had produced some useful aerial studies which measured the cross-sections of various side channels. They had shown the DRMT 3 alternatives modeled. Joe Holtrop and the Clallam Conservation District has data for public meetings regarding that project. Matt said that the Conservation District has already presented at public meetings with the 3 Crabs growth people. Meadowbrook Creek is a big flooding issue for them. Study shows not a lot of change (salinity issue) from the 3 options. He said Ducks Unlimited did the study to direct public perceptions.
- The area has been historically mapped (cited Brian Collins study) in 1855, 1870, 1914, 1926, 1942, 2001.
- There is planting proposed at the River's End WDFW property; Byron noted it would be nice to access the Meadowbrook habitat.

- **Byron has estimated the cost of the project to be \$182,000. Dungeness Farms will match \$40,000.** Shawn asked if “ask” was reduced when the reconnection happened. Byron said the \$182,000 is a rough calculation.
- Matt commented that the drift cell is moving in our favor now, and the next cycle may be a concern. Michele asked if the project doesn’t meet the projected goals, what then – would that mean more extensive work? Byron said alternatives will be proposed in that case, the reconnection has already happened. Tom Martin said that given Brian Collins work that showed everything changes over time, how permanent can the solution be (and if it doesn’t work – wait). Robert Brown asked how you would know if it didn’t work, is monitoring included in the project costs in the proposal. Byron said that monitoring is not part of the project. Cheryl Baumann pointed out that these grants are not set up to include funding for monitoring. Robert Brown asked if this project will be folded into the SMP update. Byron said they haven’t done anything yet. Matt said that 90% of the work is on the east side of Sequim-Dungeness Way. Most of the work is fresh water restoration work.

McDonald Creek Barrier Rehabilitation (Byron Rot, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe)

See handout (from Cheryl) of project summary for further details.

- This project creates a 1% softened channel to allow year-round fish passage. It includes removal or reduction of riprap within the channel. It will create better spawning and rearing habitat. The design is flood-safe. Agnew Irrigation District and Washington Department of Transportation is on board with the project. They are asking **\$48,420. For the design-only portion of this project.**
- Time element: WDOT is widening 101 by Kitchen-Dick Road and Barr Road and the project team wants to be part of those plans early on. Project can be coordinated and completed during bridge construction (or independently). Property is owned by DOT.
- Historically McDonald Creek went another way. The culvert blew out before the bridge was built. A new channel was dredged and a lot of floodplain (about 400’) was lost (downstream of the bridge) in the process.
- Limiting factors: Poor habitat; poor access; 5-6’ scour by the bridge.
- It is 4.7’ at the deepest part of the dam crest to the fishway. The fishway doesn’t work well. It clogs at lower flows with debris and has very little water for fish. The project removes the fishway. There is fish habitat upstream. The project will benefit Coho and steelhead by providing up to 6 miles of habitat above the barrier. Currently steelhead are jumping the dam. McDonald Creek provides good habitat for steelhead and productivity is expected to increase with access to the upstream portion of the creek.
- In the early 1930’s they added a box culvert. 5.5’ is the invert elevation of the box culvert. It is a bad habitat area as a result of the bridge and riprap that was put in to armor bridges. The diversion dam and box culvert caused the sediment to move out of the habitat and scour downstream. The design puts in 1% grade (removing 3’ drop below diversion dam), retain gravel and withstand flood flows. USGS has surveyed cross-sections below and above the diversion (having this information already will save money).
- Initial concept: (from Bob Montgomery concepts) 1% grade; may be wood and/or rock; juvenile passable; flood safe (which means stability in floods, and allows the gravel to move downstream).
- Considered alternative ideas for roughened channel (used Woodard Creek as example).
- **Budget: Cross-section = \$4,000; Hydraulic: \$5, 000; engineering design = \$36,720; cultural survey = \$2,500; administrative = \$4,200. Total: \$48,420.**
- Joe Holtrop asked the location of the irrigation pipeline in relation to the box culvert. Byron said the box culvert is east, and it will be removed along with the existing bridge (which is bolted to the box). The new bridge will be set on pilings and the base will not be armored to allow the floodplain as much as possible.
- **Phase 2: NOT INCLUDED IN THIS DESIGN:** Design bypass piping for the Agnew Irrigation District’s ditch around McDonald Creek and may include removal of diversion infrastructure at McDonald Creek. (Water right issue would have to be resolved). Issues: Agnew Irrigation District has water right of 5 cfs at McDonald Creek; Agnew Irrigation District has 2 miles of piped ditch. Agnew uses McDonald Creek as part of their ditch system – Dungeness River water enters at McDonald Creek at RM 5.2 and flows down creek to be withdrawn at RM 3.2. Dungeness water is utilized for irrigation starting mid-to late-June. Irrigation season is from April 15 – September 15. Cheryl asked if they

could be started at the same time. Joe said the water that is withdrawn goes into the pipeline and goes to the other side of the creek and irrigation ditch is on the other side of the creek. Eliminate and invest in ditch on the west side (going down Barr Road). Wouldn't have to be piping, the ditch is already there, just work on enhancements of the ditch while highway is widened. Put in a pipe for increased capacity as they build the highway (unavoidable).

Cheryl briefly described the NOBLE ranking process:

- Cheryl said the Lead Entity vets the projects, technical team scores with criteria for capital projects and non-capital projects. (Cheryl handed out: "Brief Overview of Ranking NOBLE Project Proposals for CY 2011 /WH Pearson, 1 Jun 2011"). Follow the scoring and comments for all the projects.
- Cheryl said the technical team recommended moving all the projects forward. To do so they would need \$2.2 million, and only have \$1.9 million. They are hoping the Washington Harbor project will play well in the Hood Canal area and Hood Canal will use chum recovery dollars to pay for some portion of that project. Shawn sends DRMT scores and ranks to Cheryl which along with the TAG assessments which are all moved forward to the Lead Entity.
- Shawn Hines has e-mailed and has hardcopies for voting members. (Fill out page 3). DRMT voting members need to fill out electronically or by phone and return to Shawn by June 16th. Members and their alternates need to comment and rank projects for their area and send it in to Shawn who will compile all the comments and come up with rankings for the 3 projects to send to Cheryl Baumann who forwards it to the Lead Entity. Shawn will disseminate the results to the DRMT.

III. Other Business / Announcements

Shoreline Master Plan Update – DRAFT Inventory and Characterization – *Cathy Lear*

- Cathy Lear reminded group that the hardcopy of the consistency review ("gap analysis") was discussed at the last DRMT meeting. It compares current guidelines and knowledge and offers recommendations to update the update from the last version (Shoreline Management ACT of 1971 – 1992 was Clallam County last update). Comments still welcome.
- Inventory and Characterizations for streams that drain to the Strait will be ready in the next couple of weeks.
- Robert Brown asked about including the Meadowbrook Creek reconnection in the update, Cathy Lear said that it will be in the portion which discusses restoration plans, but may not be on the maps.
- Log on to the SMP Update page on the County website:
http://www.clallam.net/realestate/html/shoreline_management.htm
- *Current Schedule (from website above):*

- Mon: June 20, 2011 - SMP Status Update to Marine Resources Committee (MRC), Clallam County Courthouse Rm 160, Port Angeles, 5:30 P.M. <http://www.clallam.net/ccmrc/>
- Tues: June 21, 2011 - SMP Public Meeting Update to Watershed Resource Inventory Area 20 Implementation Body (WRIA 20-IB), Pacific Meeting Rm, DNR Building, 411 Tillicum Lane, Forks, 9:30 A.M. http://www.clallam.net/environment/html/watershed_planning.htm
- Wed: June 22, 2011 - SMP Status Update to North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon (NOBLE), Port Angeles Public Library, Raymond Carver Rm, Port Angeles, 9:00 A.M..
- Tues, July 12, 2011 - SMP Committee Meeting, Clallam County BOCC Rm 160, 223 E. 4th St, Port Angeles 12:30-4:30 P.M..
- Tues: July 12, 2011 - SMP Regional Public Forum, Clallam County Room 160, 223 E. 4th Street, Port Angeles, 5:30-8:30 P.M.
- Wed: July 13, 2011 - SMP Regional Public Forum, Crescent Grange #1123, 50870 Highway 112, Joyce, 1:00-4:00 P.M. Wed: July 13, 2011 - SMP Regional Public Forum, Lions Club of Clallam Bay-Seki, Lion's Den on 6th & Bogachiel Streets, Clallam Bay, 5:30-8:30 P.M.
- Wed: July 13, 2011 - SMP Status Update to Dungeness River Management Team (DRMT), Dungeness River Audubon Center, Sequim, 2:00 P.M. <http://www.olympus.net/community/dungenesswc/>
- Thurs: July 14, 2011 - SMP Regional Public Forum, John Wayne Marina, 2577 West Sequim Bay Rd., Sequim, 1:00-4:00 P.M.
- Thurs: July 14, 2011 - SMP Regional Public Forum, John Wayne Marina, 2577 West Sequim Bay Rd., Sequim, 5:30-8:30 P.M.

Discussion Follow-up on April and May Meeting's Branding Project Discussion

- Robert Brown suggested putting up a page on the DRMT website of "Frequently Asked Questions". Involve other agencies and organizations (County, Tribe) to come up with their FAQs and responses

and put them on the website. Need a place to start, that can be modified later. Encourage the organizations with public contact to keep questions and add those with responses (and contacts) to the webpage.

- Shawn Hines reminded the group that at the last meeting it was decided that this effort (to be able to create an “answer body”) would likely require upper management buy-in for person or subcommittee to facilitate phone call inquiries.
- Robert Brown noted that quantifying the input on questions and answers from the public will determine how big an issue this is, it will justify the effort. He suggested starting with an FAQ page and links to further information. Data will be needed to justify any sort of funding and support for this effort.

U.S. Forest Service Action Plan Update – Scott Hagerty

- Currently the Forest Service is winding up the aquatic habitat work in Skokomish.
- Dungeness is the third selected U.S. Forest Service focused watershed. They hope to have an action plan draft by the end of their fiscal year. This will include identifying priority restoration needs, primarily in the upper watershed. They will use Federal money and other grants to support projects.
- The 15 member working group includes representatives from Wilderness Society, National Forest Foundation, City of Sequim, environmental agencies and other organizations. They all give input to priorities.
- They have been focusing on aquatic habitat, but they are open to other areas of restoration focus. Public meeting at the Guy Cole Center at Carrie Blake Park in Sequim is scheduled for 6:30 P.M. on June 28th. This will be announced in the paper. They will share what they have done so far in the upper watershed to date and what sort of projects may come out of the action plan. They will solicit public involvement and input. On July 29th there is a field trip planned for interested public to visit proposed restoration sites.
- DRMT Field Trip is tentatively scheduled for August 10th. Haven’t identified all the stops yet.
- Robert Brown asked if projects take into extra account for climate change projections in the environment. Scott said that they will be incorporating that into the Action Plan. A lot of that will be upgrading to the appropriately sized pipes of the mainlined road that goes up to the Dungeness Trail. Have completed an analysis and paper with University of Washington climatologists on the Olympic National Forest resources over time and the likely affects there. May distribute that document with Shawn’s help. Judy Larson suggested sending out the website link. Scott said that they have been asked to post the document but have not been able to after losing their website designer. Hopefully they will be able to post it soon.

Meeting Adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Handouts:

Cheryl Baumann provided:

- “Puget Sound Acquisition and restoration Fund Puget Sound recovery Projects Application Project Summary – WA Harbor restoration: Construction Phase”;
- “Salmon Program State Recovery Projects Application Project Summary- McDonald Creek Barrier Rehabilitation”;
- “Puget Sound Acquisition and restoration Fund Puget Sound recovery Projects Application Project Summary – Meadowbrook Creek and Dungeness River Reconnection”;
- “Brief Overview of Ranking of NOPE Project Proposals for CY 2011 WH Pearson, 1 Jun 2011”