## RESPONSE TO ISRP COMMENTS PROJECT ID #29046

The following are responses to the ISRP questions and comments of their project review on 2/05/02.

#### 1) Address project #29010

The Twin Creeks CRM blends well with the WDFW proposal # 29010 in that each project would benefit greatly from the other, #29046 would benefit through the funding of #29010 by:

- A) Providing a funding source for needed projects that are identified by the CRM.
- B) The CRM group would exchange base line data with WDFW and stay more informed on the life cycles of the species in question.
- C) Would be able to exhibit success through a landowner driven effort that would show the public and funding sources that salmon restoration can be accomplished with a cooperative effort and does not have to involve regulatory actions.

#### #29010 would benefit with the funding of 29046 by:

- A) Allowing WDFW to build upon a rapport and momentum developed by a landowner based group that is trying to solve some of the landowner problems associated with recovery actions.
- B) Allow a higher degree of trust and acceptance in landowners that are approached for future projects because contacts would be through a non-regulatory entity.

## 2) Request to provide a table clarifying the extent of dewatering in the lower 1.25 miles of Beaver CR.

This is a data gap and no table exists at this time. The gauges requested in this proposal would provide the needed information. The best estimate by local residents is that there is a .25 mile reach that is dewatered three years out of ten for two months of the year. (WRIA 48 Limiting Factors Analysis, page 119 paragraph 2).

#### 3) Comments regarding the mouth of Beaver CR as being part of a "losing reach".

After speaking on the telephone with Chris Konrad, USGS project manager in charge of the study in the Methow, he indicated that the losing reach that you are referring to starts at the mouth of Beaver CR and runs down to the mouth of Benson CR. He also indicated that the amount of loss was minimal, barely over the margin of error for the study. The margin of error is + or - 10 cfs and this reach looses 15 cfs between Beaver and Benson Creeks. The reach above Beaver CR., from the Airport to the mouth of Beaver CR is a gaining reach adding 30 cfs to the flow of the mainstem Methow.

# 4) Should proponents wait until the completion of proposal #29018 to better develop feasibility of maintaining flow?

No, delaying the exploration of options would only delay any possible implementation by a number of years. Having the options researched and available would expedite implementation once #29018 is completed and the most compatible option is selected.

#### 5) What is the relationship of the CRMP to other watershed assessment methods?

The CRM for Twin Creeks is working within the current 2514 process that is currently at work through the Methow Planning Unit and Okanogan County Water Resources Department. The gauges that are requested in this proposal are identified as needed in the Stream Flow Monitoring Plan for the Methow Basin, prepared by the Pacific Watershed Institute and Golder and Associates for the Methow Basin Planning Unit.

The CRM process differs from most other watershed assessments in that a CRM is landowner driven, consensus based, and designed for smaller watersheds. This process brings to the table the stakeholders, regulators and other interested parties and tries to solve identified resource problems before they become points of conflict or regulatory enforcement is needed. Ideally a CRM would cover resource issues form ridge top to ridge top of a basin where other assessments would stop at the riparian edge and not deal with upland issues.

### 6) Revisit the proposal objective and tasks section and give further information. Objective #1, Continue CRM Process

Task a) Outreach and Education

The CRM coordinator would be charged with public outreach to the landowners in the basin, acting as this initial contact on identified projects and working with the landowner as a intermediary as the projects moved through application, funding, permitting and implementation. Acting as a intermediary, the coordinator would be able to take the time required to answer the many technical and complex questions that come up when dealing with fish life cycles, biology, permitting and state and federal agencies that are involved with restoration projects.

Task b) Gather existing data and identify data gaps.

The CRM coordinator would gather and assimilate the data needed and requested by the involved landowners that are required to make informed decisions about resource issues. This task is directly related to task (a).

Task c) Install and maintain three stream gauges.

The CRM coordinator would act as contract representative in contracting the purchase, installation, and maintenance of the three stream gauges that are requested in the grant proposal. The need for, location of and monitoring protocol for the gauges is outlined in the STREAMFOW MONITORING PLAN FOR THE METHOW BASIN, prepared for the Methow Basin Planning Unit and Okanogan County Water Resources Department by Golder and Associates (particular information on pages 1,7,8 and 9), and the associated Technical Appendix (see section 2, Stream Gauging Plan).

Task d) Produce CRM plan by 2005

A draft plan would be available soon after funding is received, a CRM plan is a living document that is constantly visited and revised as information on the identified action items are received and digested, or other items of interest that need attention are brought to the table. Once all needed action items have been identified and sufficient information has gathered and reviewed on these items and a plan identified then the CRM group only meets once a year to review the progress of the action items. This stage should be reached and formal plan of action available by 2005.

### Objective 2: Coordinate with BOR to assess options to reestablish flow in Beaver CR.

Task a) Coordinator would work with BOR to assess various options for reestablishment of flow in the lower portion of Beaver CR. looking at storage, on farm efficiencies, conversion to wells, and river pump exchange. The need to have these options explored has been discussed in item # 4. The implementation of any options would depend on the outcome of other ongoing studies (#29018).

Task b) A misunderstanding has occurred between the request of the CRM group and the actual writing of the grant on this item. The stream habitat survey referred to is not needed as WDFW has already done so in 1999. This agreement with BOR is for engineering type survey work that may be needed in the lower 8 miles of the stream as identified in a project proposal. This is part of BORs mandate to supply engineering time for the next ten years toward water saving and restoration projects in the Methow.

The budgeted amount in the application spreadsheet will not change.

# Objective 3: Coordinate with USFS to protect and restore riparian habitat through livestock fencing.

Task a) Completion of the fencing requested in this request would complete the livestock exclusion fencing on the North and South Summit allotments on USFS land. This is a needed project as identified by the WRIA 48 Limiting factor analysis (page 121). This would be a early action item as materials and crew are on hand.

Task b) Materials and crew are on hand and ready.

#### Objective 4: Monitor changes in fish and habitat.

Tasks a through e) A pilot monitoring program will be established with input from the landowners, tribes and agencies that will satisfy all concerned. Established protocol recognized and approved by local resource agency technical staff will be used. It is not practical to spend time developing a monitoring plan for projects that are currently conceptual and may or may not receive funding and implementation.

### Attachments:

<u>Technical Appendix to Methow Basin Streamflow Monitoring Plan Technical Procedures And Specification</u>

Streamflow Monitoring Plan for the Methow Basin