



### HCEC 45th Anniversary Conference: **SPLENDOR STILL AT RISK**

HCEC celebrated its 45th year on September 20, 2014, with a public conference hosted by the Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe at their Longhouse in Little Boston. The program, patterned after the Kitsap Sun's 1991 monograph Hood Canal: Splendor at Risk, was followed by salmon bake and birthday cake. The goals of this event were to present interval changes in the health of Hood Canal and to chronicle 45 years of HCEC effort to stem degradation and promote resurrection of this unique natural resource. It also hoped to identify vehicles of these changes, parameters which measure the Canal's health, and future challenges--and to stimulate production of a 25-year sequel to Splendor At Risk.

Following a continental breakfast and welcomes by S'Klallam Tribal Chairman Jeromy Sullivan and HCEC President Donna Simmons, the conference was introduced by Christopher Dunagan, Lead Writer for Splendor At Risk, wherein he reviewed the monograph's thematic concept of following a log from its birth to the sawmill. The first session, ECOSYSTEM, was initiated with a discussion of the "Integrated Watershed Plan" by Scott Brewer, Executive Director of the Hood Canal Coordinating Council; he showed 5-year strategic priorities, the Integrated Watershed Plan interactive website (<http://hccc.wa.gov/Integrated+Watershed+Plan/default.aspx>), and the status of the Canal based upon both environmental and human well-being indicators. The "Skokomish River Restoration" was presented by Dave Herrera, Skokomish Tribe Fish & Wildlife Policy Advisor and Member of the HCCC; he noted the river's history, the Cushman Settlement (restoration of normative flow pattern being a key requirement of the new 40-year license for two dams on the North Fork), and current estuary restoration. This session concluded with "Hood Canal and Puget Sound Recovery: Defining Priorities and Assessing Progress" by Stacy McKinstry, Ecosystem Recovery Coordinator for the Puget Sound Partnership (<http://www.psp.wa.gov>); she listed the nine Local Integrating Organizations in Puget Sound, eight Near Term Actions regarding Hood Canal, and regional accomplishments.

The second session focused upon RESOURCES and was moderated by Paul McCullum, Natural Resource Director for the Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe. "Timber Management" was discussed by Arthur Schick, Forester (retired) for Bangor and Suquamish Tribe water resources and Chairman of the Board of Directors for the Great Peninsula Conservancy; he opined for a timber plan balanced with regard to preservation of for-

ests for wildlife and sustainable management versus development (value of forest land often greater for development than logging). "Fish: Health of Rivers and Hood Canal" was reviewed by Thom Johnson, Environmental Program Manager for the Point No Point Treaty Council and former Fish Biologist for Washington Fish & Wildlife; he offered past and present comparisons (Hood Canal salmon populations, harvests, hatcheries, habitats, and recovery) and recovery plans--noting success with summer chum and devotion to the concept of "evaluation and monitoring". This session closed with "Shellfish: The Status of Hood Canal" by Bill Dewey of Taylor Shellfish Farms; he gave an overview of the farming process, treaty rights, water quality issues, and future challenges including ocean acidification, the Washington Shellfish Initiative, and other legislative issues.

The final session was on DEVELOPMENTAL ISSUES and was moderated by Phil Best, HCEC Secretary and former Kitsap County Commissioner. The "Kitsap County Master Shoreline Plan" was presented by David Greetham of the Kitsap County Department of Community Development ([www.kitsapshoreline.org](http://www.kitsapshoreline.org)); this included a brief history, definition of proposed shoreline environment designations, listing of shoreline activities, review of residential development ("no net loss" of shoreline principle), and "big picture" changes since 1991 (wetlands, stormwater, bulkheads, piers/docks, shoreline buffers, and in-lieu fee program). Mr. Best then finished the session with "Hood Canal Issues: What we have learned and done in 45 years"; this was a chronological exposition of HCEC activities on behalf of the Canal, progressing from the beginning of the environmental movement in 1969 and including the proposed Stavis Bay Marina (1969), the Boise-Cascade "Nettleton Lakes" Development (1970), Beard's Cove Development (1973), Hama-Hama Company Gravel Pit Project (1973-1976), and Bangor Submarine Base litigation over EIS (1973-1976)--and progressing to current "hot spots": Black Point-Brinnon MPR, possible Hama-Hama Gravel Pit re-application, Port Gamble Bay cleanup, Pit-to-Pier project, and more Bangor issues.

The conference concluded with a summation by Bill Matchett, PhD, HCEC Past President and elder statesman, who reflected upon past efforts and future challenges for environmental custodians.

## HCEC RESPONDS TO PLEASANT HARBOR RESORT DRAFT SEIS

Jefferson County's 2008 approval of a Canadian developer's proposal for the Pleasant Harbor Master Planned Resort (MPR) was conditioned on the adoption of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) that would serve as a supplement to the programmatic Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Seven years and numerous changes later, the Draft of the SEIS was released by the county on November 19, 2014. HCEC's response expressed concerns about serious deficiencies in the Draft SEIS and reiterated its support for the Brinnon Group, a local citizen group whose members would be directly affected by the proposed MPR. HCEC's letter included general comments about environmental impacts to the Hood Canal watershed and more specific project level comments.

From the broader perspective, HCEC expressed concerns over the gradual "piecemeal" chipping away of the natural landscape in the Hood Canal watershed, particularly in rural areas. The Draft's preferred alternative would add another mega resort to the watershed, including a golf course, 890 residential units, 56,608 sq. ft. of commercial area and many acres of resort related amenities. Very little land would be left in its natural state and a category 3 wetland would be converted to a "wastewater control pond". 1 million cubic yards of cut and fill would be allowed for golf course grading. More site-specific comments include the following.

The Draft SEIS fails to discuss the obvious environmental benefits of the no-action alternative when compared to the development alternatives. So-called "improvements" from the development alternatives ignore the fact that the same or higher levels of resource protection would be achieved if the currently available regulatory and other tools were utilized and enforced.

Some improvements from the original proposal have been made. However, the HCEC believes that the preferred alternative presents unacceptable impacts to the Pleasant Harbor/Black Point area for the following reasons.

The Pleasant Harbor portion of the proposed MPR is being evaluated under a separate process which does not require public involvement. This area should be included and subject to a full environmental review. The proposed MPR is planned to be constructed in 3 phases over a 10-year period. Market conditions and/or other circumstances could result in unexpected delays or even abandonment. HCEC contends that, due to the potential costs of cleanup and restoration, an impact cost deposit and performance bond should be required to provide funds allowing the county to ensure no net economic loss to the community.

One aquifer would serve the entire area. The greatest danger to the aquifer is saltwater intrusion, a problem that could be exacerbated by prolonged dry periods or other weather related influences. If seawater intrusion occurs, local well owners will bear the burden of proof as to whether the resort's water demands are responsible for the intrusion. In case of a drawdown, the developer plans to inject treated wastewater into wells which could introduce drugs and other unfiltered pollutants into the aquifer.

A wetland mitigation plan has not been done. To meet State no-net-loss requirements, the HCEC believes that all wetlands and buffers should be kept in their natural condition. As for the golf course, there should be a listing of all chemicals (herbicides, pesticides, or fertilizers) that will be used for maintenance and a plan for the developer to protect groundwater or stormwater runoff from their use should be developed.

The Draft seriously underestimates the economic impacts on the local community and traffic impacts to Highway 101. It does not discuss impacts to Jefferson County's staffing resources, additional costs to Mason County P.U.D. 1, or potential national security issues for U.S. Naval Base operations.

The Jefferson County Department of Community Development will hold a public hearing before the County Planning Commission to take testimony and written comments on the adequacy of the Draft SEIS. As of this writing, a date for this hearing has not been set.

For more information about the proposed MPR, visit the Jefferson County Pleasant Harbor webpage at [http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Brinnon\\_MPR.htm](http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Brinnon_MPR.htm).



Proposed Pleasant Harbor Master Planned Resort from Jefferson County webpage.

## EARLY HISTORY OF HOOD CANAL

### ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL

On July 1, 1969 two neighbors met along the beach near Seabeck and one showed the other general plans for a proposed development which would dredge out Stavis Bay to install a 350 boat marina. Other beach owners in the area were contacted and soon a meeting was held at the Seabeck Fire Hall to discuss the issue. At that meeting it was observed that this could be an example of proposed developments to come within the larger Hood Canal area, and that we should all be stewards of this sensitive and incredible place. So the group decided to organize the Hood Canal Environmental Council to address future environmental issues anywhere in the Hood Canal drainage basin, and HCEC became a Washington nonprofit corporation to advocate for a healthy Hood Canal.

At that time there were almost no environmental laws or regulations – no State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA 1971), Shoreline Management Act (SMA 1971-72), Clean Water Act (CWA 1972), National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA 1970), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA 1970), or Department of Ecology (ECY 1970). Local zoning was about the only land use control method available, so we prevailed on Kitsap County to change the existing zoning on an emergency basis to prohibit marina development and decrease the allowed density along Hood Canal until a full re-zone of the area could be developed and before any permit applications were submitted which could vest the development rights of the applicant. This worked, and the application for the Stavis Bay marina was never actually filed. HCEC was joined by many who took the opportunity to get involved and influence local and state governments to protect Hood Canal. More than 45 years later, some of those original members are still actively supporting HCEC today, and many more have become involved.

## KITSAP FOREST AND BAY

### PROJECT UPDATE

The current focus of the Kitsap Forest and Bay Project (KFBP) is the acquisition of property that will become the 270-acre Grovers Creek Preserve. The creek drains a high-quality peat bog and a rare grove of 200-year-old Sitka spruce, hemlock, cedar, Douglas fir and grand fir. It hosts steelhead, Coho, and cutthroat trout as it flows into Miller Bay about a mile downstream. The Preserve will provide a home for a wide variety of wildlife and a corridor for a future Sound to Olympics Trail.

KFBP is supported by a coalition of many local conservation organizations including HCEC. Great Peninsula Conservancy will acquire the Preserve with a combination of government grants and private fundraising. GPC made its first acquisition for the Preserve of a 21 acre privately-held parcel in January. A few days later Forterra exercised its option to purchase 175 acres for the Preserve from Pope Resources and is assigning its purchase right over to GPC to complete the transaction. This spring GPC is conducting a capital campaign to raise the remaining funds that will be needed to complete the Preserve, hopefully by May 31 (see [greatpeninsula.org](http://greatpeninsula.org)). The remaining acquisitions should be completed in 2015.

Work continues on the acquisition of the Port Gamble Forest block and the funding of a North Kitsap Community Forest which together will add another 3900 acres to the 1000 acres already acquired. The ultimate goal of the KFBP is to conserve a total of 6700 acres of forest and shorelines in North Kitsap.

## HCEC BOARD OF DIRECTORS

**Donna Simmons, President**

[donna@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org](mailto:donna@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org)

**Gary Cunningham JD, Vice President**

[gary@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org](mailto:gary@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org)

**Phil Best JD, Secretary**

[phil@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org](mailto:phil@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org)

**Don Seavy, PhD, Treasurer**

[don@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org](mailto:don@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org)

**Bill Matchett, PhD**

[info@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org](mailto:info@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org)

**Judy Matchett**

[info@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org](mailto:info@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org)

**Karen Best**

[karen@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org](mailto:karen@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org)

**Monica Harle**

[monica@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org](mailto:monica@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org)

**Barbara Moore Lewis**

[barbara@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org](mailto:barbara@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org)

**Alice Harris**

[alice@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org](mailto:alice@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org)

**John S. Arthur, MD**

[john@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org](mailto:john@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org)

**Bob Wiltermood, Editor**

[bob@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org](mailto:bob@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org)

The Board of Directors meets the fourth Wednesday of each month. If you would like to attend, call Donna Simmons at (360) 877-5747.



Sketch by Nicki Yarbrough

## Aquatic Herbicides in Lakes and Wetlands

### Part 1

Washington State Department of Ecology issues 5 year aquatic herbicide permits to remove both noxious weeds as well as native plants in lakes. DOE Water Quality Program personnel have stated there is pretty much no lake they would not grant a chemical herbicide permit for removal of aquatic plants, even those considered salmon habitat in water bodies with anadromous fish usage or threatened species, as well as in aquatic wetland areas.

The “General Permit”, language gives sponsors the option of rolling over current 5 year permit coverage into another 5 year permit, and Ecology stated chemical permits would generally be automatically renewed with minimal review, leading to some lakes with decades old chemical permits ruefully referred to by DOE employees, as “Lakes on Drugs”.

Although aquatic herbicides are classified within the Water Quality Program as “Short Term Pollutants”, the permits for lakes are valid for usage over 5 year period of time, and allow multiple herbicide applications per season within the WDFW timing window, some as frequent as every 14 days.

The DOE is required to set legal parameters for herbicide usage, review SEPA applications and subsequently issue permits. DOE is designated as ‘lead agency’, requiring WDFW to determine ‘timing windows’ based on the type of fish/ amphibian, etc., inhabiting each specific lake as well as resident and migratory waterfowl, Osprey, Eagle, Heron usage etc.

Information on aquatic herbicide usage can be found on the DOE website, for example the current 132 separate permit coverages. - 172 separate lakes or areas covered-listed under “Aquatic Plant and Algae Management General Permit Coverages.” There are also 4 more lakes currently in the process of obtaining new coverage. One can also see the 43 lakes listed on “A list of Lakes Receiving Chemical Treatments in 1993”

A comparison of specific lakes with herbicide coverages in both 1993 and 2015 indicates 21 specific lakes on both lists with chemical coverages at the minimum since 1993 - if herbicide permits have been continually rolled over as is allowed. Would 23 years of aquatic chemical usage to control aquatic plants be considered ‘lakes on drugs’?

What are the long term effects of these “Short Term Pollutants”?

**HOOD CANAL ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL  
YEARLY MEMBERSHIP REGISTRATION**

Individual - \$10 \_\_\_\_\_

Family - \$30 \_\_\_\_\_

Group - \$50 \_\_\_\_\_

Patron - \$100 \_\_\_\_\_

Contributions in any amount are welcome

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

MAIL ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

E-MAIL ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

Please send this coupon and your check to:

HCEC, P.O. Box 87, Seabeck, WA, 98380

## HCEC Concerned About Industrial Geoduck Farms in Hood Canal.

Hood Canal faces a very serious threat of industrial geoduck farming at a massive scale, causing potentially significant environmental damage. Visualize acres of plastic pipes 4 inches in diameter and spaced about 1 foot apart used to protect the baby geoducks, nets over the plastic pipes to keep out the natural critters that used to live there, a complete clearing of the pre-existing beach to plant the geoducks resulting in a disruption of the natural habitat, birds and mammals caught in the nets and dying, hundreds of thousands of geoducks filter feeding with possible harm to forage fish, harvesting geoducks with high pressure water nozzles that liquefy the beach which causes the substrate to become less stable and the habitat below to be significantly changed.

An application for a geoduck farm in Hood Canal along the Kitsap County shoreline south of the Hood Canal bridge was withdrawn after the neighbors became aware and HCEC and others requested an Environmental Impact Statement. In Jefferson County, permits are being requested for geoduck farms along the shoreline in Shine, just south of the Hood Canal bridge and north of the proposed pit-to-pier project. HCEC is following this issue closely and is looking for persons to become involved. More on this in our next newsletter. meanwhile, please see: <http://protectourshoreline.org/slideshow/>

**HCEC is looking for people willing to dedicate a small amount of their time to helping us protect the environmental health of Hood Canal. If you are interested, please contact any one of the board members listed in this newsletter. We appreciate your support.**

**Also we are looking for a computer person to handle our web page.**



Geoduck tubes in eelgrass beds at Shine

Left Inset: Geoduck tubes set loose by waves end up scattered on beaches and collecting out of sight in deeper water

**Hood Canal Environmental Council**

PO Box 87

Seabeck, WA 98380



To receive HCEC newsletters via email and save printing & postage costs please send an email to [bob@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org](mailto:bob@hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org).

This newsletter and back issues can be read online at <http://www.hoodcanalenvironmentalcouncil.org>.



Great Horned Owls by Bob Wiltermood