

From: [Kilbride, Kevin](#)
To: [Stenvall, Charlie](#)
Cc: [Flanders, Bridgette](#); [Seto, Nanette](#); [BrownScott, Jennifer](#); [Garrett, Alice](#)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] SHR2017-00011
Date: Thursday, January 16, 2020 8:20:33 AM
Attachments: [Ashe Hanabusa Response Letter.pdf](#)
[Fencing Project Final Report.pdf](#)
Importance: High

Hi, Charlie:

As we discussed, this situation is similar in a number of ways to the taro fencing pilot at Hanalei NWR (2013). We established an agreement with Oregon State Univ (Bruce Dugger) to conduct a study that was done in conjunction with the pilot to address specific questions about impacts. Ultimately, the 1 yr pilot ended and fencing was no longer allowed on the refuge after the Director issued the attached letter (it's suitable for framing in my opinion as it was a monumental decision on behalf of the resource). As described in the letter, the monitoring documented impacts of fencing on endangered waterbirds (see attached report) that played a prominent/key role in the Director's decision to not allow fencing of taro to continue on the refuge at the conclusion of the pilot.

Therefore, I would suggest an independent expert handle the "disturbance" monitoring to assess impacts for Phase 1 aquaculture pilot. Also, the on-going water quality monitoring should be evaluated for its ability to evaluate potential project-specific impacts of Phase 1 to water quality. Keep in mind the Improvement Act states maintaining adequate water quantity and water quality to achieve the Refuge System Mission and refuge purposes; any impacts to water quality on the project site would likely affect the refuge. For the report, it's my understanding DOH is currently conducting baywide water quality monitoring, but I would suggest a risk assessment-based monitoring approach specifically tailored for the project may be needed given the level of scrutiny and the need for high scientific rigor.

Kevin Kilbride
US Fish and Wildlife Service
I&M Coordinator
Columbia Pacific Northwest (R9)&Pacific Islands (R12)
Branch of Refuge Biology
911 NE 11th Avenue
Portland, OR 97232
(503) 231-6176 (Phone)
(503) 347-0292 (Cell)

On Mon, Jan 13, 2020 at 2:50 PM Stenvall, Charlie <charlie_stenvall@fws.gov> wrote:

The decision from the Hearing Examiner on the Jamestown S'Kallam oyster farm within Dungeness NWR has been issued. The specific decision can be found on pages 44 - 46. It isn't what we had hoped but assuming the Tribe can get the ACOE and WDNR permit as well as meet the other conditions, they will have the opportunity to farm five acres for five years within Dungeness NWR as a first phase. In the conditions, the Examiner states the Tribe must enter into a MOU with the Olympic Peninsula Audubon Society and USFWS to monitor the impacts of this action on the Refuge. We will have a small window in which, if there are impacts, be able to document and quantify them. Jennifer and Sue are going to need some help on what protocols will give us the data and information we need to evaluate that either prove or allay our concerns. I suspect there may be differences in what the Tribe would want to do for this level of monitoring and therefore help from Mig Birds and the Regional Refuge biology program will be invaluable. Jennifer is going to be reaching out to ACOE and WDNR and get a sense on how they see their processes going and if they are going to make the MOU a condition for their permit, should they decide to permit this

activity. This email is just a heads up that Jennifer will reach out once the timing and effort to develop an MOU are clear. Hopefully we can rally and assist them when the time comes.

Charlie

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **BrownScott, Jennifer** <jennifer_brownscott@fws.gov>

Date: Mon, Jan 13, 2020 at 8:48 AM

Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] SHR2017-00011

To: Stenvall, Charlie <charlie_stenvall@fws.gov>

FYI. Haven't had time to look at this in depth yet. But it appears that Phase I has been approved with conditions. One of the conditions looks like we are required by the County to enter into an MOU with the Tribe for monitoring and analysis of potential impacts (#9, pg 46). Any thoughts on who could assist us with creating a scientifically defensible disturbance protocol? Analysis of impacts from Phase I would be used to inform potential approval of Phase II.

It would seem to make sense to wait for the ACE decision before creating an MOU or working through the type of surveys and analysis that should be completed. Otherwise, we could be spending a lot of time without knowing if the use will gain final approval. However, the Tribe may want to start discussions right away.

Happy Monday!

-jennifer

Jennifer Brown-Scott
Refuge Manager
Washington Maritime NWRC
715 Holgerson Rd
Sequim, WA 98382
office: (360) 457-8451 ext.22
fax: (360) 457-9778

~~Dungeness NWR~Protection Island NWR~San Juan Islands NWR~~
~~Copalis NWR~Flattery Rocks NWR~Quillayute Needles NWR~~

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Breitbach, Tami** <TBreitbach@co.clallam.wa.us>

Date: Mon, Jan 13, 2020 at 8:10 AM

Subject: [EXTERNAL] SHR2017-00011

To: Breitbach, Tami <TBreitbach@co.clallam.wa.us>

Cc: Ballard, Greg <gballard@co.clallam.wa.us>

Please find attached the Notice of Decision, and Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Decision regarding the above-referenced proposal.

<<NOTICE OF DECISION - JAMESTOWN SHR2017-00011.docx>>

<<Clallam - Jamestown S'Klallam Oyster Farm SSDP-SCUP.pdf>>

Regards,

Tami Breitbach

Administrative Specialist II

Clallam County

Department of Community Development

223 East Fourth Street, Suite 5

Port Angeles, WA 98362

(360) 417-2277