## Merrill, Hannah

From: Lear, Cathy

**Sent:** Monday, August 15, 2011 10:05 AM

To: Merrill, Hannah

**Subject:** FW: Shoreline Inventory & Characterization Report

Hello,

Not sure if I have forwarded these already.

Cathy

360.417.2361

Be patient: your best ideas are probably years ahead of their time.

- Kim

Hightower

----Original Message----

From: Bob Vreeland

Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2011 7:36 AM

To: A. Shogren; doug.morrill@elwha.nsn.us; dfreed@wsu.edu; A. Stevenson

A. Schouten; Lear, Cathy; rjohnson@jamestowntribe.org; jimm@portofpa.com;

nwest@cityofpa.us; ja.ward@pnl.gov; Lyn Muench; ed.bowlby@noaa.gov; M. Paul

D. Clare

Cc: B. Vreeland

Subject: Shoreline Inventory & Characterization Report

## CMRC Members:

I have completed my review (but I don't have the time to put all my comments in this email before I leave to count marmots for the ONP) of the draft report and am finding it more of a challenge than I had hoped. If you have personal knowledge of one or more of the 18 marine reaches included in the report and/or of resources identified in the report (land/shoreline use, geological characteristics, marine vegetation, forage fish, salmonids, marine mammals, shellfish, waterfowl, public access), I urge you to look at the reach/s or resource issues within all reaches for accuracy, omissions, and errors.

With my limited knowledge of the 18 marine reaches, I am finding what I consider to be omissions that I believe are important to correct. I also have many questions about the accuracy of some/much data included. There are also, I believe, inconsistencies within the text of the report and between the text and maps included. The double sided "summaries" with the areal photo sometimes provide slightly different information than the report text. In many cases there is more detail in the "summary" than in the report text. In other cases, material in the text doesn't appear in the summary or is different than the summary. The water quality information included, seems to me, to be of no value. To say a stream is compromised for B-IBI, WQI, or temperature doesn't tell give me enough information on which I could base any regulations that would meet the "No net loss" criteria. I fear that Andrew Stevenson's somewhat "tongue in cheek" comment about a 400 pages of review comments may be closer to reality than we would like to think.

I have gone through the text portion of Chapter 4 Marine Reach Inventory and below detail my comments and questions by page # and line #. In some cases I have directed questions to specific CMRC members I believe may have knowledge of the issue I am questioning. I hope that what I have done will be of assistance to other CMRC members.

- Unfortunately I will not be at the next CMRC meeting to answer questions about my comments. I gave my marked up (tabbed) copy to David prior to the Aug. 15 meeting, so you can at least see all the areas I have questioned in the report. Perhaps my markup copy will answer some of your questions.
- 4.1 Reach 1: Diamond Point (text pgs. 4-1 to 4-4)
- Pg. 4-1, lines 26-36: Is this characterization of the marine vegetation, forage fish, salmonids, shorebirds & waterfowl, & marine mammals accurate & complete?
- Pg. 4-2, line 2: Does the CMRC have any water quality information for this Reach?
- Pg. 4-2, lines 3 & 4: Does anyone in the CMRC know why 6% of the shoreline in this reach is armored? I don't like phrases like "presumably to protect adjacent residences." In my opinion, a Inventory & Characterization Report shouldn't be "presuming" anything. It should state the reason for the armoring or make no "presumption" about the reason for the armoring.
- Pg. 4-2, lines 10 & 11: Does the CMRC have information to support/expand on the bulkheads and sand lance spawning and eelgrass? Should the Report be more specific about the location of the bulkhead segments in the areas that support these resources?
- Pg. 4-2, line 12: Line states "Approximately half of the shoreland area within the reach is heavily forested" and the Reach MR-1 areal photo/map included at the end of the MARINE REACH INVENTORY under the Onshore Vegetation heading states "50% of the shoreland area in reach is mapped as forest habitat." My view: "50%" is not "Approximately half," it is half. Nitpicky yes, but I believe the text of the report and any descriptions in maps need to agree exactly. Perhaps the difference here is the "heavily forested" verses "forest habitat?" Why make that distinction?
- Pg. 4-3, lines 1-7: Is this information on public access accurate/complete? Line 1 states "More than half of the land in shoreline jurisdiction in this reach is publicly owned." the Reach Summary (2nd paragraph) in the Reach MR-1 areal photo/map at the end of the chapter states "Approximately one-third of the reach is in public ownership...". I am confused by statements about the "shoreline" verses the "shoreland" verses the "reach." In this case does the "reach" include the "shoreline" and the "shoreland?" If I'm sometimes confused by this, will others also be confused? Does this confusion make it look like who ever did the description for the areal photo/map didn't review what was stated in the text of the report?
- Pg. 4-3, lines 19-23: Anyone have any new information on this public access potential?
- Pg. 4-4, lines 4-7: Arnold Schouten, any comment/additions to this waterfowl information?
- Reach 4.2: Sequim Bay (text pgs. 4-4 to 4-7)
- Pg. 4-5, lines 9-10: Where are the "unstable bluffs areas located in the western portion of Sequim Bay, bordering Highway 101." I just drove this yesterday and still can't picture where 101 "borders" any bluffs on the west side of Sequim Bay.
- Pg. 4-5, lines 18-25: Does the CMRC have any information to add on the eelgrass, forage fish, and salmon?
- Pg. 4-5, lines 35-38: Is the water quality information regarding Jimmycomelately Creek still accurate?

- Pg. 4-6, lines 24-36: Does anyone in the CMRC have anything to add to the Development potential and consequences info?
- Pg. 4-6 & 7: Same question as above for 4.2.3 Management Issues and Opportunities section.
- 4.3 Reach 3: Gibson Spit (pgs. 4-7 to 4.10)
- Pg. 4-7: Are the Baseline Conditions accurate and complete?
- Pg. 4-8, lines 9-13: Arnold Schouten, anything to add to the waterfowl/bird information?
- Pg. 4-8, lines 16-21: CMRC members, is marine vegetation, forage fish and salmon use accurate/complete?
- Pg. 4-8, lines 22-28: Does this armoring/structures match CMRC members knowledge base? Randy Johnson, are the "trail or boardwalk system crossing channels and other open water areas (lines 29-30) part of a trail system Graysmarsh?
- Pg. 4-9, lines 5 & 6: Is the Bell creek impaired water quality still accurate?
- Pg. 4-9, lines 12 & 13: Public access, Marlyn Nelson County Park.
- 4.4 Reach 4: Kulakala Point (pgs. 4-10 to 4-14)
- Pg. 4-11, lines 2-13: Are Baseline Conditions accurate/complete?
- Pg. 4-11, lines 24 & 25: Arnold Schouten, anything to add to the waterfowl/bird info?
- Pg. 4-11, lines 26-32: Do CMRC members have anything to add to marine veg., forage fish, salmonid use information? I have a problem with the way the Dungeness River is characterized here in lines 30 & 31, "...PORTIONS (emphasis mine) of the Dungeness River and the other streams within the reach provide habitat for a variety of fish species..." Why the use to the word "portions" here? I don't recall any other stream in any of the other 17 reaches being characterized this way.
- Pg. 4-12, lines 2-8: Jeff Ward, is the Dungeness Bay water quality information accurate/complete?
- Pg. 4-12, lines 18-22: Public access, anything to add?
- Pg. 4-12 & 13: Section 4.4.2, does anyone have anything to add to this section on Future Land Use and Effects?
- 4.5 Reach 5 Dungeness Spit (pgs. 4-14 to 4-15)
- Pg. 4-14, lines 12-15: Are the Baseline conditions complete?
- Pg. 4-14, lines 19-21: Arnold Schouten, anything to add to waterfowl/ bird info?
- Pg. 4-14, lines 22-28: Do CMRC members have anything to add to the marine veg., forage fish, marine mammal, salmonid info?
- Pg. 4-14 lines 29-32 & pg. 4-15, lines 8 & 12): Public access, anything to add?

- 4.6 Reach 6: Green Point (pgs. 4-15 to 4-19)
- The heading for this reach indicates that the reach is included on Appendix Maps 1a-6a, but the western portion of this reach is on Appendix Maps 1b-6b.
- Pg. 4-15, lines 16 & 17: Why is McDonald Creek a shoreline of the state but Siebert Creek is not? Does McDonald Creek really have a mean annual flow greater than 20 cfs and Siebert Creek have less than that?
- Pg. 4-15, lines 20-22: Nathan West, is this information regarding the City's draft SMP accurate/complete?
- Pg. 4-15, lines 24-34: It appears to me that the baseline conditions are not complete for this reach. I believe the western portion of this reach includes a section of the Discovery Trail east of the Port Angeles city limits. The shoreline to the north of the Trail is armored, some of which has failed in the past, and bluffs to the south of the Trail are subject to slides every winter. None of this is mentioned in the text. This may be a situation where the consultants are working with areal photographs which do not necessarily show the up to date and/or accurate conditions on the ground. This could be a problem throughout all 18 marine reaches.
- Pg. 4-17, lines 8-11: Arnold Schouten, anything to add to this waterfowl/bird info?
- Pg. 4-17, lines 12-17: Do CMRC members have anything to add to the marine veg., forage fish, salmonid info?
- Pg. 4-17, lines 18-20: Is the water quality information for Lees, Morse & McDonald Creeks still accurate.
- Pg. 4-18, lines 4-7: Public access, anything to add here?
- Pg. 4-18, lines 15-17: This is the only reach were "increased stormwater runoff" is mentioned as a potential effect of future land use. According to the Reach MR-6: Green Point summary sheet, this reach has 10% impervious surface. Other reaches have greater than 10% impervious surface, according to the summary sheets (Kulakala Point, Clallam Bay, Shipwreck Point & Rasmussen) but there is no mention in the text of the potential impact of increased impervious surface. Why is this?
- Pg. 4-18, lines 28-30: More public access, anything to add here.
- Pgs. 4-18 & 19, lines 32-38 & 1-3: CMRC members have anything to add to the Key management considerations for this reach?
- TO BE CONTINUED (if the CMRC so desires)