

# HOOD CANAL ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL

Winter 2011

## Resource Managers Consider Effects of Climate Change

Global climate change and its implications for the future management of natural resources in the Hood Canal watershed is emerging as an issue only recently coming to the attention of local resource managers. There is increasing agreement that governments and citizens alike need to reduce carbon emissions. We also need to address the way in which we manage and protect our natural resources, public safety and local economies.

The signs of climate change are already being felt in the watershed in the form of more intense winter storms, flooding and stream aggradation (gravel buildup in streambeds). In addition, scientists now believe that the growing acidity of marine water in portions of Hood Canal appears to be related to increased atmospheric carbon dioxide. In Hood Canal, the combination of increased acidity and low dissolved oxygen may ultimately lead to damaged natural systems and financial losses to the local shellfish industry.

All levels of governments are beginning to address the potential threat posed by climate change. At the local level, Jefferson County recently became the first of the Hood Canal counties to develop a plan to reduce county-wide carbon-based emissions. The Final Draft of its Climate Action Plan was prepared by the Jefferson County Climate Change Action Committee. It is available on the county's website at [www.co.jefferson.wa.us](http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us). For more information, contact the Jefferson County Department of Community Development at (360) 379-4450.

In its list of actions in the Hood Canal Integrated Watershed Management Plan (10-14-11 draft in progress), the Hood Canal Coordinating Council proposes to hold a Hood Canal climate change symposium to develop, refine and prioritize strategies to deal with climate change issues at the local level. The Puget Sound Partnership is also considering the issue as it works to update its Puget Sound Action Agenda.

Because of the potential threat to Hood Canal's natural resources from the effects of climate change, the Hood Canal Environmental Council is following these and other actions with interest and will continue to be involved in efforts to meet the challenges ahead. In particular, the Council will encourage Kitsap and Mason Counties to follow Jefferson County' lead and develop their own action plans.

## GREAT KITSAP FOREST AND BAY PROJECT

HCEC is actively involved in the Great Kitsap Forest and Bay Project, a coalition of community and business interests working with the "principal stakeholders" (Pope Resources, Kitsap County, the Port Gamble S'Klallam and Suquamish Tribes, the Cascade Land Conservancy and the Great Peninsula Conservancy) in seeking to conserve as much as 7,000 acres of forestland and 2 miles of Port Gamble Bay shoreline in North Kitsap County. As reported in our last newsletter, we were reluctantly opposed to the North Kitsap Legacy Project Proposal, the forerunner of what we can now happily support. That earlier proposal would have preserved the forest at the cost of the bay since it would have allowed 800 half-acre lots immediately above what would soon have ceased to be one of the Canal's most important areas for shellfish harvesting and the production of surf smelt, sand lance and herring, essential to the food cycle of numerous other larger, commercially viable species.

Though the health of the bay has been our main concern, we are of course delighted with the other benefits of the new project; the preservation of open space for public use and enjoyment (trails are already planned), the protection of Kitsap County's rain-dependent water quality and supply, the conservation of wildlife habitat and the economic benefits of sustainable forestry.

An option agreement between Pope Resources and the Cascade Land Conservancy gives us until the end of 2012 to make significant headway in raising the funds to purchase the land. This is not much time, but enthusiasm is high and some sources of funding are looking promising. It will take considerable community support and involvement, however, to accomplish this in one year.

**WORKING TOGETHER FOR HOOD CANAL.....**HCEC is of course not the only organization involved in activities important to the preservation of the Canal. There are eight to which we have in recent years offered modest financial support of varying amounts as an indication of our gratitude for what they do in our common interest. We thought our newsletter readers might appreciate our listing them: The center for Environmental Law and Policy, Great Peninsula Conservancy, Hood Canal Coalition, Kitsap Citizens for Responsible Planning, Olympic Forest Coalition, Washington Environmental Council, Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition, and the West Sound Conservation Council. In addition to financial support, we are actively represented in the deliberations of several of these fine organizations.

## Hood Canal Integrated Watershed Management Plan (IWMP)

The Hood Canal Environmental Council (HCEC) continues to be engaged in the Hood Canal Coordinating Council's (HCCC) IWMP process which has been ongoing for almost two years. Members of IWMP advisory committee include representatives of the Navy, shellfish growers, timber companies, KAPO, as well as environmental groups and regulators / scientists like National Marine Fisheries Service and the Forest Service.

The basic idea of the IWMP is to lay out what the community values about Hood Canal, identify "stressors" that impact these values and develop action strategies to mitigate the stressors. As a "plan" for Hood Canal, the IWMP provides a structure for requesting and administering grants and other funding to implement the IWMP

Currently, the process is in the action development phase. Importantly, care is being taken to align Hood Canal specific actions with the broader Puget Sound Partnership Action Plan.

You can learn more about the IWMP process by visiting the HCCC website at: <http://hccc.wa.gov/default.aspx>

## WRIA 16/14b Planning Unit Loses Funding

Members of the Watershed Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 16/14b Planning Unit recently learned that grant funding for local watershed planning has become yet another victim of the state's budget axe. After 10 years of working together to develop and implement its Watershed Management Plan for the Skokomish – Dosewallips area, the Planning Unit, which consists of representatives of Mason and Jefferson Counties and P.U.D.s, the Skokomish Tribe, and local citizen groups, will not receive funding after June, 2012, unless extended by the legislature.

The Planning Unit is currently discussing options for continuing its important contribution to the larger effort to manage water resources in the Hood Canal watershed. One of the options is to form a partnership with the Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC) in which the Planning Unit would play a stronger role in the council's effort to develop and carry out the Hood Canal Action Plan. There are a number of reasons why the Planning Unit would complement the HCCC effort. Most importantly, planning units encourage local prioritization of issues and collaboration between state, tribal and local governments and citizens to address watershed needs and opportunities.

The WRIA 16/14b Planning Unit will appeal to the state legislature to extend grant funding for the local  
**continued next column**

## Despite ADAGE Withdrawal, Biomass Incineration Continues to Threaten the Hood Canal Watershed

Hood Canal dodged a major bullet when ADAGE, a subsidiary of a partnership between AREVA (a French nuclear power corporation) and Duke Energy withdrew its proposed 65 MW Biomass incinerator on Port of Shelton's property off of John's Prairie Rd. in Shelton

ADAGE's withdrawal was preceded by a letter from the Public Lands Commissioner, Peter Goldmark. Commissioner Goldmark's letter was preceded by a meeting with HCEC Board Member, Vern Rutter, and Concerned Citizens of Mason County President, Beth McBain

The Commissioner's letter highlighted the huge potential demand for wood (~650,000 Tons/Yr) of the ADAGE incinerator, the fact that the proposed incinerator was only ~26% efficient and therefore he would oppose supplying wood from logging of state lands.

However, Simpson / Green Diamond in the guise of a subsidiary partnership, Solomon, are in the process of setting up a 55 MW incinerator on the Shelton waterfront. Due to prevailing winds, Hood Canal will be impacted by emissions from the incinerator. The difference here is that the company controls its own supplies of wood from logging and mill waste. The Solomon Shelton incinerator is a "Combined Heat and Power" facility which means it is considerably more efficient than the ADAGE plant in that it will also supply process heat and steam for Simpson's operation.

In addition to the public health threat from emissions, the Council is also concerned about forest health due to the potential for increased logging driven by incinerator demand in Western Washington.

---

### (WRIA continued)

watershed planning units – even if it only provides a shoestring budget to keep it alive and eligible to apply for project grant money.

The State's Water Resources Advisory Committee is currently preparing a report to the legislature on effective water management. Planning Unit members and others will take this opportunity to strongly recommend to the legislature that it continue to support local watershed planning and implementation efforts.

For more information, contact Donna Simmons, WRIA 16/14b Planning Unit member, at (360) 877-5747.

# Shoreline Master Program Updates

Jefferson, Kitsap and Mason Counties are each at a different stage in dealing with the state-required update of its Shoreline Master Program (SMP). Jefferson has completed its process and submitted its draft for approval by the State Department of Ecology. Kitsap's 20-member task force has been meeting with county staff and technical advisors since April 2010, aiming at completing the process in the spring of 2012; Mason County is just getting underway, aiming at the spring of 2013. HCEC Board member Monica Harle is on the Mason County Advisory Committee; our nomination for the Kitsap Task Force proved unable to serve, but several of our friends on the West Sound Conservation Council are representing our interests there.

Discussion topics in both counties include SMA shoreline jurisdiction, critical areas and buffers, state and local parks management, science policy (what constitutes "best available science"), environmental designations criteria and mapping (natural, urban and conservancy). comparison with

( continued ) Shoreline Master Program Updates other jurisdictions, shoreline residential designations, aquatic habitat, shorelines of statewide significance (which includes all of Hood Canal), existing development, mooring structures, and high intensity development goals and policies.

Mason County, with the furthest to go, is currently working through each chapter of their current SMP, analyzing what is insufficient and the means to bring the document into compliance with legal requirements which have changed over the years. They are currently recommending including their entire Critical Areas Ordinance into the new SMP, and are working through practices related to Forest Management, Agriculture, Archeological and Historic Sites.

Recognizing the need to include shoreline vegetation buffers in order to protect and restore ecological functions, protect human safety and property, increase slope stability, reduce the need for shoreline armoring (hard bulkheads) and protect plant and animal species and habitats, Kitsap is currently proposing a flexible approach with a standard buffer for optimum protection, a reduced standard buffer through site-appropriate mitigation, and a site-specific shoreline mitigation plan for lots constrained by size or environmental characteristics. This is a topic of significant discussion, and the basis of an outrageous scare tactic with the Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners sending postcards to waterfront property owners falsely warning of no financing for "non-conforming" waterfront parcels. HCEC is pushing back against such assertions. Shoreline protection benefits homeowners and the natural environment and is financially better for all of us.

Excellent sources of useful information on the SMP update process are located at the following web pages:  
<http://www.kitsapshoreline.org>,  
[http://www.co.mason.wa.us/community\\_dev/shoreline\\_master\\_program](http://www.co.mason.wa.us/community_dev/shoreline_master_program),  
[http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Shoreline\\_LocallyApprovedSMP.htm](http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Shoreline_LocallyApprovedSMP.htm)

### Streams (continued from page 4)

The three streams that still do not meet the standard are: Trails End, Big Bend and Deveraux. MCPH plans to continue monitoring streams and will take corrective actions when pollution sources are identified. For more information about Mason County streams, contact Amy Georgeson, Environmental Health Specialist 111, Mason County Public Health at (360) 427-9670 x544. More information can be found on <http://tiny.cc/hoodcanal>.

**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**

## Pleasant Harbor Golf Course and Resort

For the past 4 years, the HCEC has continued to oppose the Master Planned Resort (MPR) proposed to be developed in the Pleasant Harbor/Black Point area near Brinnon. We also support the Brinnon Group as it works to ensure that any development in this area is done in an environmentally sensitive way and preserves the rural character in the local community.

The on-going battle with the proposal's Canadian developer, Statesman Group, is presently the focus of a Supplemental Environmental Impact (SEIS) for the Pleasant Harbor Golf Course and Resort. The SEIS is being done because of the lack of important information in the original Environmental Impact Statement.

Last May, Jefferson County staff took over the job of writing the SEIS, which had previously been done by a consultant. A letter to the Statesman Group owner, Garth Mann, states the following: "What this means in terms of you as the applicant, is that you must not influence or be involved in directing the content of the technical reports or the conclusions they reach."

County planner, David Johnson, is working on perfecting the alternatives, reviewing the special reports with the consulting team and working towards a draft SEIS that he can review with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Responsible Official. A determination will then be made as to consistency with Jefferson County code, the comprehensive plan and the legal requirement for SEPA. According to Al Scalf, Director of the Jefferson County Department of Community Development, completion of the draft SEIS is still months away.

More information about the Brinnon Group and the proposed MPR can be found at the Brinnon Group website at [www.BrinnonGroup.org](http://www.BrinnonGroup.org).

## Good News for Hood Canal Streams

Much of the news these days regarding the environmental health of the Hood Canal watershed is downright disheartening. Hood Canal residents and others hear regular reports about fish kills, failing on-site septic systems, closed shellfish beaches, degraded fish habitat, etc. However, there are some encouraging signs of improvement, including the water quality of many of our streams in the southern portion of the watershed.

The good news is that Mason County Public Health (MCPH) has asked the Washington State Department of Ecology in collaboration with the US Environmental Protection Agency, to remove nine streams from the 303(d) list due to decreased fecal coliform levels and to reclassify these streams as "Category 1. Meets Tested Standards". Streams are initially listed under the 303(d) program when they fail to meet the state's water quality standards for bacteria levels, water temperature, or other parameters.

MCPH and the WRIA (Water Resource Inventory Area) 16/14b Planning Unit asked the WDOE to remove these streams during previous 303(d) assessments. The request was made because either WDOE did not have the data originally used to place some streams on the list, assessments were based on a single 1991 sample, or more recent data showed that they were meeting today's standards. Twelve streams were reassessed. Streams currently meeting the "extraordinary water quality standard" are: Lilliwaup, Twanoh Falls, Stimson, Twanoh, Little Mission, Happy Hollow, Holyoke, Shoofly, and Mulberg. (continue, see Streams on page 3)

### HCEC BOARD OF DIRECTORS

*Karen Best*

*Phil Best*

*Gary Cunningham, Vice President*

*Monica Harle*

*Alice Harris*

*Barbara Moore Lewis*

*Margee Lynch*

*Bill Matchett, President*

*Judy Matchett*

*Don Monise, Treasurer*

*Karen Monise*

*Don Seavy*

*Vern Rutter*

*Donna Simmons*

*Theresa Trotland, Secretary*

*Bob Wiltermood*

*Nicola Yarbrough, Editor*

**The Board of Directors meets the second Monday of each month. If you would like to attend, call Bill Matchett at (360) 830-4154.**

P.O. BOX 87, SEABECK, WA,  
98380



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

**Printed on 100% Recycled Paper**