



Foster Creek Conservation District

P.O. Box 428 • Waterville, WA 98858-0428 • Telephone 509-745-8362

Fax: 509-745-8758 • E-mail: fostercreek@wa.nacdnet.org

Dear Interested Stakeholder:

October 28, 2004

On September 23rd, 2004, the Douglas County Watershed Planning Association approved by consensus the submittal of the Moses Coulee and Foster Creek WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan to the Douglas, Okanogan, and Grant County Commissioners for their consideration. Enclosed please find the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Review for the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan circulated according to WAC 197-11-630.

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) was created to ensure that state and local agencies consider the likely environmental consequences of proposed actions during decision-making processes concerning such actions. As SEPA lead agency, the Foster Creek Conservation District issued a threshold determination of nonsignificance (DNS). A DNS was issued at this time because actions in the plan are recommendations not obligations. Thus the plan serves as guidance, not a description of planned on-the-ground activities that could cause an adverse environmental impact. During the first year of implementation, the planning unit will develop an implementation plan to further characterize the actions identified in the watershed plan, define coordination and oversight responsibilities, set priorities, and develop a timeline and funding sources. In the future, any specific projects prioritized for actual implementation will be reviewed through the SEPA process to identify any potential environmental impacts associated with that specific project.

To streamline environmental review associated with local approval of watershed plans, the Department of Ecology developed a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) "template". Completed July 2003, the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Watershed Planning under 90.82 RCW evaluates the impacts of, and identifies mitigation measures for, various types or classes of recommended actions that may be included in watershed plans. Early on, the Conservation District and Douglas County Watershed Planning Association (DCWPA) identified and adopted this existing Final EIS for Watershed Planning.

The **Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Watershed Planning**, Ecology Publication # 03-06-013, is available on the Department of Ecology website at:

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/biblio/0306013.html>

Hardcopies of the publication are available at:

Department of Ecology

Publications Distribution Center

P.O. Box 47600

Olympia, WA 98504-7600

E-mail: ecypub@ecy.wa.gov

Phone: (360) 407-7472

The enclosed WRIA 44/50 Addendum provides additional information on local plan actions that were not addressed in the Final EIS for Watershed Planning. These additional actions do not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives in the existing Final EIS or require additional SEPA review on the non-project level.

This review provides documentation of WRIA 44/50 Management Plan SEPA compliance for adoption of the Plan by the County Commissioners and for implementation of the Plan by the Douglas County Watershed Planning. The Commissioners will consider the SEPA review before consideration of approval and adoption of the Watershed Management Plan. In order to move forward with implementation, the county legislative authorities participating in the watershed planning process must approve the Plan. Please contact me if you have any questions, ideas, or concerns about watershed planning or the environmental review of the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan

Sincerely,



Marilynn Lynn
Watershed Manager
Foster Creek Conservation District

The **Final WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan** is available on the Foster Creek Conservation District website at:
www.fostercreek.net

Hardcopies of the WRIA 44/50 Plan are available at:
Foster Creek Conservation District
Attn: Kathleen Bartu, Natural Resource Technician
P.O. Box 428
103 N Baker
Waterville, WA 98858
E-mail: Kathleen-bartu@wa.nacdnet.org
Phone: (509) 745-8362 ext. 3.

**DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE
AND ADOPTION OF EXISTING
ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT
WITH ADDENDUM**

**For: Moses Coulee and Foster Creek Water Resource Inventory Area
(WRIA 44 & 50) Watershed Management Plan**

Description of current proposal:

In 1998, the Legislature passed the Watershed Planning Act (Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2514) to provide a framework for local citizens, interest groups, and government organizations to collaboratively identify and address water-related issues in each of the 62 Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs) of the state. In the fall of 1998, local and tribal governments convened to initiate the Douglas County Watershed Planning Association (DCWPA) in the Moses Coulee and Foster Creek Watersheds (WRIAs 44 & 50). Initiating governments included Douglas County, Grant County, Okanogan County, City of East Wenatchee, City of Bridgeport, Bridgeport Irrigation District #1, East Wenatchee Water District, and the Colville Confederated Tribes. A thirty-one member-planning unit met on a monthly basis from January 2000 to September 2004 to collaboratively identify and address water-related issues in a WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan.

The WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan addresses the required water quantity component of watershed planning, and all optional elements including water quality, habitat and instream flows. The Watershed Management Plan describes the how the Watershed Planning legislation was applied to WRIA 44/50 and defines water quantity, water quality, habitat, and instream flow goals, issues, and recommended actions. The watershed planning process can be categorized in four phases including organization of the planning unit, assessment of water resources, plan development, and plan implementation. At this time, actions in the plan are recommendations not obligations. Thus the plan serves as guidance, not a description of planned on-the-ground activities that could cause an adverse environmental impact. During the first year of implementation, the planning unit will develop an implementation plan to further characterize the actions identified in the watershed plan, define coordination and oversight responsibilities, set priorities, and develop a timeline and funding sources. In the future, any specific projects prioritized for actual implementation will be reviewed through the SEPA process to identify any potential environmental impacts associated with that specific project. Major streams in WRIA 44/50 include Foster Creek, Pine Canyon, Sand Canyon, Rock Island Creek, Douglas Creek, and McCartney Creek. Major lakes include Jameson and Grimes Lake. The Watershed Management Plan is based on the following technical studies:

- *WRIA 44/50 Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Limiting Factors Report*, March 2001
- *Final Phase 2 Basin Assessment*, April 2003
- *Foster Creek and Lower Moses Coulee Level 2 Hydrogeologic Assessment*, Nov. 2003
- *Instream Flow Study (Step C – Draft Flow Recommendations)*, February 2004
- *Fish Snorkel Surveys of Priority Streams (Step B- Field Implementation)*, August 2004
- *Water Storage Assessment and Feasibility Study*, August 2004
- *Water Quality Assessment Jameson and Grimes Lake*, September 2004

On September 23rd, 2004, the planning unit approved by consensus the submittal of the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan to the Douglas, Okanogan, and Grant County Commissioners for their consideration. The Commissioners will consider any public comment

before consideration of approval and adoption of the Watershed Management Plan. In order to move forward with implementation, the county legislative authorities participating in the watershed planning process must approve the Plan. A public hearing is required in each participating county prior to a joint county session to consider the approval of the Plan. Okanogan County, having less than 5% of the total territory within the management area, chose to opt out of under 2E2SHB 1336 of participating in the watershed planning and public hearing processes for the ESHB 2514 watershed planning effort in WRIA 44/50.

Proponent: Douglas County Watershed Planning Association

Location of current proposal:

WRIA 44/50, North Central Washington, Douglas and Grant Counties

Title of document being adopted:

Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Watershed Planning under 90.82 RCW with WRIA 44/50 Addendum (attached).

Date adopted document was prepared:

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under 90.82 RCW was completed on July 18, 2003. The WRIA44/50 Addendum was issued October 28, 2004.

Description of document (or portion) being adopted:

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Watershed Planning under 90.82 RCW addresses the development and implementation of watershed plans under the Watershed Planning Act, Chapter 90.82 RCW. The 2001 Washington State Legislature directed the Department of Ecology (Ecology) to develop a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) “template,” to streamline environmental review associated with local approval of watershed plans. Based on input from lead agencies for various watershed planning units around the state, it was concluded that the most appropriate form for the template would be a statewide environmental impact statement that could be adopted in whole or in part by SEPA lead agencies as part of local watershed plan approval processes.

This Final EIS describes the watershed planning process set forth in the Watershed Planning Act, as well as procedures for rule making that may be undertaken by state agencies to support implementation of watershed plans. It describes the existing framework of federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and programs that affect, or are related to management of watersheds. In addition, it evaluates the impacts of, and identifies mitigation measures for, various types or classes of recommended actions that may be included in watershed plans. These general recommendations were developed based on input from lead agencies for watershed plans and Ecology watershed leads working with planning units. General recommended actions are presented and evaluated for each of the four components of watershed planning including water quantity, instream flow, water quality, and habitat. A draft environmental impact statement was prepared and distributed on March 28, 2003 for a 45-day comment period. The document includes comments received by Ecology regarding the draft, as well as Ecology’s responses to the comments.

The WRIA 44/50 Addendum to the Final EIS provides documentation of SEPA compliance specific to the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan for adoption of the Plan by Douglas and Grant County Commissioners and implementation by the DCWPA.

If the document being adopted has been challenged (WAC 197-11-630), please describe:

Does not apply.

The document is available to be read at (place/time):

The *Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Watershed Planning*, Ecology Publication # 03-06-013, is available on the Department of Ecology website at:
<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/biblio/0306013.html>

Hardcopies of the publication are available at:
Department of Ecology
Publications Distribution Center
P.O. Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600
E-mail: ecypub@ecy.wa.gov
Phone: (360) 407-7472

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that it does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. This information is available to the public on request.

There is no comment period for this DNS.

X This DNS is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2); the lead agency will not act on the proposal for 14 days from the date below. Comments must be submitted by Nov. 12, 2004.

We have identified and adopted this document as being appropriate for this proposal after independent review. The document meets our environmental review needs for the current proposal and will accompany the proposal to the decision maker.

Name of agency adopting document : Foster Creek Conservation District

Contact person, if other than responsible official: **Phone:**

Responsible official: Marilyn Lynn

Position/title: Watershed Manager **Phone:** (509) 686-3501

Address: 103 N. Baker, P.O. Box 428, Waterville, WA 98858

Date: 10/28/04

Signature _____



WAC 197-11-960 Environmental checklist.**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST***Purpose of checklist:*

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21C RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases, you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal, write "do not know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply." IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer," and "affected geographic area," respectively.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable: Moses Coulee and Foster Creek Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA 44 & 50) Watershed Management Plan

2. Name of applicant: Douglas County Watershed Planning Association (DCWPA)

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person: Marilyn Lynn, Watershed Manager, Foster Creek Conservation District, 103 N Baker, Waterville, WA 98858 (509) 686-3501.

4. Date checklist prepared: October 12, 2004

5. Agency requesting checklist: Washington State Department of Ecology

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable): The WRIA 44/50 Watershed Plan is a guidance document for the future management of water resources. Once the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan is approved by the County Commissioners, the Douglas County Watershed Planning Association will initiate Phase 4 Implementation. During the first year of implementation, the planning unit will develop an implementation plan. The implementation plan will define coordination and oversight responsibilities, further develop the recommended actions, set priorities, and develop timelines and funding sources. Rule-making for instream flows will begin within six months of county adoption of the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain. As knowledge of watershed conditions grows from continued monitoring and additional studies, further actions may be recommended or existing action refined. During the first year of implementation, the planning unit will develop an implementation plan to define coordination and oversight responsibilities, further develop the recommended actions, set priorities, develop timelines and identify funding sources for the specific projects. Any site-specific projects prioritized for implementation in the future will be reviewed through the SEPA process once formal proposals are prepared. The only existing obligation identified in the watershed plan is to set instream flows. Rule-making for instream flows will begin within six months of county adoption of the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under 90.82 RCW, Washington State Department of Ecology

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

Does not apply.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

The WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan must be approved and adopted by the County Commissioners.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

The WRIA 44/50 Watershed Plan is a guidance document for the future management of water resources in the watersheds. The WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan addresses the required water quantity component of watershed planning, and all optional elements including water quality, habitat and instream flows. With the exception of instream flows, actions in the plan are recommendations not obligations. Plan recommendations will be further characterized in the implementation phase. Development of the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan is the culmination of a five year planning effort with significant input and commitment to monthly meetings, and plan review; including over 4,000 hours devoted by planning unit members, many of whom are local citizens giving their personal time. The WRIA 44/50 Watershed Plan contains the following major elements:

Executive Summary: Summarizes technical assessment findings and key water resource issues and actions.

Chapter 1: Defines the ESHB 2514 Watershed Planning Act

Chapter 2: Describes how the watershed planning legislation was applied in WRIA 44/50. Defines the planning area, participation, phases and scope of planning, mission and guiding principles, and the public review process.

Chapter 3: Explains how the DCWPA consensually defined water resource goals, issues, and actions.

Chapter 4: Defines water quantity goals, issues, and recommended actions.

Chapter 5: Defines water quality, habitat and instream flow goals, issues, and recommended actions. With the exception of instream flows, action items for water quantity, quality, and habitat are not specific obligations for agencies.

The Watershed Management Plan is based on the following technical studies:

- *WRIA 44/50 Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Limiting Factors Report*, March 2001
- *Final Phase 2 Basin Assessment*, April 2003
- *Foster Creek and Lower Moses Coulee Level 2 Hydrogeologic Assessment*, November 2003
- *Instream Flow Study (Step C – Draft Flow Recommendations)*, February 2004
- *Fish Snorkel Surveys of Priority Streams (Step B- Field Implementation)*, August 2004
- *Water Storage Assessment and Feasibility Study*, August 2004
- *Water Quality Assessment Jameson and Grimes Lake*, September 2004

On September 23rd, 2004, the planning unit approved by consensus submittal of the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan to the Douglas, Okanogan, and Grant County Commissioners for their consideration. Upon approval by County Commissioners, the DCWPA will begin implementation phase of the Watershed Management Plan. Passage of ESHB 1336, the Watershed Plan Implementation Bill, established a Phase 4 for watershed implementation and authorizes state funding to support plan implementation. Funding assistance is available for up to \$400,000 per

WRIA for a five-year period. A 10% local match is required. Members of the DCWPA have agreed to meet during the implementation phase to define coordination and oversight responsibilities and further develop the actions set forth in the Watershed Management Plan. Implementation requires the Department of Ecology to use the plan as the "... framework for making future water resources decisions" and to "rely upon the plan as the primary consideration in determining the public interest..."

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

The Moses Coulee Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA 44) and the Foster Creek Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA 50) are located in North Central Washington and include parts of Grant, Douglas, and Okanogan Counties as well as part of the Colville Confederated Tribes Reservation. WRIA 44/50 is part of a larger drainage, the Columbia River Basin. WRIA 44 encompasses approximately 729,934 acres. WRIA 50 covers approximately 577,882 acres. Okanogan County, having less than 5% of the total territory within the management area, chose to opt out of plan approval as authorized in 2E2SHB 1336. Upon advice from legal council, the Colville Confederated Tribes also chose to remove themselves from the planning process. Without the continued participation of Okanogan County and the Colville Confederated Tribes, the planning unit did not develop obligating actions for Okanogan County or the Tribes.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

1. Earth

- a. General description of the site (circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other**

The majority of WRIA 44/50 consists of broad rolling plateau, underlain by basalt and interspersed by intermittent drainages. The Columbia River cuts a deep gorge westward through WRIA 50 and then curves southward marking the western boundary of WRIA 44/50. In most places along the Columbia River there are a series of nearly level to gently sloping terraces. Long, steep slopes lead from these terraces to the upland plateau. Elevations range from approximately 800 feet at the Columbia River to 4,100 feet at Badger Mountain. The average elevation ranges between 2,000 and 3,000 feet mean sea level. In WRIA 44, periodic immense floods from the glacial Lake Missoula formed the dominating scablands and loess islands. A dominating geologic structure, the Moses Coulee in WRIA 44 is a deep, wide flat-bottomed valley between Badger Mountain and Beezley Hills. The Coulee gradually descends as it extends southwesterly through WRIA 44 to its end on the bank of the Columbia River. Steep side slopes rise about 600 feet from the valley floor before leveling off in the upper plateau. The valley bottom is a nearly level floodplain ranging from one-half to three-fourths of a mile wide. In WRIA 50, the dominating blanket of glacial till was deposited by the melting retreat of the Okanogan lobe of the Wisconsin Glacier.

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

Site-specific location characteristics of implementation activities will be reviewed on a project-specific basis. Potential environmental impacts associated with a particular action will be addressed through SEPA as projects are prioritized for implementation and funding becomes available.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.

In WRIA 44, the soils are typically deep loess and silts with generally poor drainage characteristics. The basalt upland plateau of WRIA 50 and the northern part of WRIA 44, consist of glacial till composed of clay, silt, sand, gravel, cobbles, and boulders. This includes extremely fine wind-blown soils up to 50 feet thick. The soil is deep and well drained. Well-drained sand and gravels dominate the shorelines of the Columbia River.

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

Site-specific location characteristics of implementation activities will be reviewed on a project-specific basis. Potential environmental impacts will be addressed through SEPA as projects are prioritized for implementation and funding becomes available.

e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

Does not apply.

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

Fine soils are susceptible to wind and water erosion throughout the WRIsAs.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

Does not apply.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

Site-specific implementation activities will be reviewed on a project-specific basis. Potential environmental impacts associated with a particular action will be addressed through SEPA as projects are prioritized for implementation and funding becomes available.”

2. Air**a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the**

project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

Does not apply.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

Does not apply.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

Does not apply.

3. Water

a. Surface:

1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

The two major drainage basins that handle the surface water runoff are the Moses Coulee and Foster Creek, both of which deposit directly into the Columbia River. Major streams in the WRIA 44 include Sand Canyon, Rock Island Creek, McCartney Creek, Pine Canyon, and Douglas Creek. Foster Creek is the major stream in WRIA 50. The streams consist of intermittent flows with perennial reaches sustained by a groundwater. High flows occur during the spring, where flows during the rest of the year can cease altogether. Major natural lakes in WRIA 44/50 include Jameson (332 surface area in acres) and Grimes (124 surface area in acres). Several smaller lakes (less than 100 acres) and seasonal “potholes” are scattered throughout the area.

2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

Recommended actions in the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan do suggest work in or adjacent to streams and lakes in the watersheds. However, these recommendations are not obligations, and this SEPA review is not intended to address site-specific implementation activities. When specific actions become detailed projects in the implementation phase and are prioritized for funding, they would require a project level SEPA review at that time. Recommended actions include the following types of projects: on-farm agriculture water conservation and irrigation efficiency efforts; continuation and expansion of riparian conservation practices, potential water storage projects; continued water quality and habitat condition monitoring for streams and lakes; installation, maintenance, and renovation of failing septic systems; upgrades of public bridges, culverts, roadways, and other infrastructure; installation of instream structures to increase water storage, bank stabilization, channel complexity, and erosion control; and construction of retention and infiltration ponds.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.**

Does not apply.

- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

Does not apply.

- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.**

Site-specific location characteristics of implementation activities will be reviewed on a project-specific basis. Potential environmental impacts associated with a particular action will be addressed through SEPA as projects are prioritized for implementation and funding becomes available.

- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.**

Does not apply.

b. Ground:

- 1) Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

Does not apply.

- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals. . . ; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.**

Does not apply.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.**

Does not apply.

- 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.**

Does not apply.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any:

The WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan recommends actions to encourage implementation of the Douglas County Surface and Stormwater Management Program for the East Wenatchee Area and to assess the expansion of surface and stormwater management planning to developed areas countywide.

4. Plants

a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:

- ✓ **deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other**
- ✓ **evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other**
- ✓ **shrubs**
- ✓ **grass**
- ✓ **pasture**
- ✓ **crop or grain**
- ✓ **wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other**
- ✓ **other types of vegetation**

The natural vegetation of WRIA 44 and 50 varies in response to temperature, moisture availability, and soil characteristics. Native shrub-steppe vegetation in open range areas is typical of semi-arid climate regions of the Columbia Basin including bunchgrass, sagebrush, and widely scattered bitterbrush. Close to the ground, biological or “cryptobiotic” soil crusts are fragile microfloral communities composed of bluegreen algae, bacteria, fungi, mosses, and lichens that stabilize the soil from wind and water erosion. Forest, consisting of scattered stands of Douglas fir and ponderosa pine, is limited by the arid climate to about 8,000 acres on Badger Mountain. Most natural drainage corridors currently consist of small copses and short galleries of riparian vegetation along both perennial and intermittent streams. Typical riparian species are waterbirch, aspen, hawthorn, willows, and wild roses. Small, intermittent streams and draws may naturally have little or no characteristic riparian vegetation. Instead, they consist of largely upland plant species, including big sagebrush, bitterbrush, rabbitbrush, and spiny hopsage. Along the Columbia River, high river water levels, groundwater, and irrigation overflow provide moisture levels sufficient to foster a dense, lush shrub-grass understory and stands of cottonwoods.

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

Site-specific implementation activities will be reviewed on a project-specific basis. Potential environmental impacts associated with a particular action will be addressed through SEPA as projects are prioritized for implementation and funding becomes available.

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

Threatened and endangered plant species that are known to occur in WRIA 44/50 include the Ute ladies tresses, gray crypthntha, Chelan rockmat, sticky phacelia, and Thompson’s clover.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

The WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan recommends an action to promote xeriscaping, low-water use landscaping, and to assess the feasibility to incorporate xeriscaping into Douglas County land use code as a landscaping standard.

5. Animals

a. Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, **other:** Varies throughout WRIA 44/50.

mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, **other:** Varies throughout WRIA 44/50.

fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, **other:** Varies throughout WRIA 44/50.

b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

Threatened and endangered animal species that are known to occur in WRIA 44/50 are: Birds- bald eagle, golden eagle, peregrine falcon, burrowing owl, greater sage grouse, sharp-tail grouse, loggerhed shrike, sage thrasher, sage sparrow, common loon, northern goshawk, sandhill crane, black tern, flammulated owl, pileated woodpecker, white-headed woodpecker, olive-sided fly catcher. Reptiles- striped whipsnake and northern sagebrush lizard. Amphibians- northern leopard frog. Mollusks- California floater. Mammals: white-tail jackrabbit, pygmy rabbit, Washington ground squirrel, Merriam's shrew, yuma myotis, fringed myotis, small-footed myotis, long-legged myotis, Townsend's big-eared bat, and the black-tailed jack rabbit. Fish- bull trout, steelhead trout, and spring Chinook, river lamprey and the westslope cutthroat trout.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

The Columbia River is a migration route for anadromous salmonid species to reach spawning grounds in higher tributaries. Riparian areas are important habitat of migratory neotropical birds.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

Recommended actions that would preserve or enhance wildlife include the continuation and expansion of conservation practices for protecting and restoring riparian and upland areas. Riparian area practices include activities such as plantings, bank stabilization, animal management, fencing, or alternative water sources. Upland practices include activities such as prescribed grazing, noxious weed control, critical area plantings, filter strips, conservation crop rotation, field borders, grass waterways, sediment ponds, or residue management. Other actions to improve wildlife habitat include providing education on value of local government critical fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas; establishing a countywide weed management committee; assisting landowners with wetland restoration; incorporating habitat planning into other comprehensive plans; supporting continued enrollment in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and other Farm Bill Programs; providing stable funding for monitoring compliance and enforcement of the Shoreline Management Act and Critical Areas Code; and upgrading public bridges, culverts, roadways, and other infrastructure. Additionally, the planning unit recommends Ecology begin rulemaking for Foster Creek, Douglas Creek, and Rock Island Creek to protect instream habitat within six months of County adoption of the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan.

6. Energy and natural resources

- a. **What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.**

Does not apply.

- b. **Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.**

Does not apply.

- c. **What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:**

Does not apply.

7. Environmental health

- a. **Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.**

Does not apply.

- 1) **Describe special emergency services that might be required.**

Does not apply.

- 2) **Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:**

Does not apply.

b. Noise

- 1) **What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?**

Does not apply.

- 2) **What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site**

Does not apply.

- 3) **Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:**

Does not apply.

8. Land and shoreline use

- a. **What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?**

In WRIA 44, 88% of the land base is in private ownership. In WRIA 50, 70% of the land base is in private ownership.

Approximately 45% of the land within the WRAs is used for dryland non-irrigated crop. Because of soil types and climate, the dominant dryland crop is winter wheat that is grown in a fallow rotation. Every other year a particular piece of ground sits idle in order to increase the moisture and mineral content of the soil. Thirty-three percent of total cropland acres have been taken out of production and enrolled into the Federal Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). In 2004, a total of 186,145 acres have been enrolled in the program.

Approximately 49% of the land within the WRAs is rangeland used primarily for beef cattle production. Because of soil types and climate, a portion of the land on the plateau is not suitable for dry land crop production, but it does provide area for rangeland grazing. The largest concentrations of these areas are typically located at the fringes of the plateau, immediately adjacent to the basalt breaks and in the northeast portion of the County.

Less than 5% percent of the cropland in the WRAs is irrigated agriculture, and is primarily used for the production of hard and soft fruit and forage crops. The irrigated agriculture lands are located along the Columbia River corridor, adjacent upland areas, and in the Palisades area of the Moses Coulee. Most of the remaining land area is characterized by shrub steppe and forest vegetation.

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

The history of the WRIA 44/ 50 has been intricately tied to a diverse range of agricultural activities. The plateau areas were the first to be settled in the late 1800's, with dryland grain crops and livestock grazing. After the development of the irrigation systems along the Columbia River in the early decades of the 1900's, particularly in the Wenatchee Valley, irrigated orchard agriculture was an added incentive to bring people into the area. Today the principal economic activity and predominant land use remain in agricultural production including dryland grain crops, rangeland livestock grazing, and irrigated orchard farming

c. Describe any structures on the site.

Does not apply.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

Does not apply.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

Varies throughout WRIA 44/50. See Douglas County and Grant County websites for zoning and Comprehensive Plan Maps and Documents at <http://www.douglascountywa.net/departments/tls/> and <http://www.co.grant.wa.us/planning/index.htm> .

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

Varies throughout WRIA 44/50.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

The Shoreline Master Program environmental designations vary throughout WRIA 44/50. The Shoreline Master Program applies to all lands adjacent to the Columbia River, the Moses Coulee from the mouth of Douglas Creek (T 23 N., R 23 E Sec 36) downstream to mouth of the Moses Coulee, and to all lakes over 20 acres.

See Douglas County and Grant County websites for zoning and Comprehensive Plan Maps and Documents at <http://www.douglascountywa.net/departments/tls/> and <http://www.co.grant.wa.us/planning/index.htm> .

h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

Site-specific location characteristics of implementation activities will be reviewed on a project-specific basis. Potential environmental impacts associated with a particular action will be addressed through SEPA as projects are prioritized for implementation and funding becomes available.

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

The total population in WRIA 44 is approximately 23,879 people. There are five incorporated communities in WRIA 44/ 50 located on the plateau or along the banks of the Columbia River. In WRIA 44, there are three incorporated communities, East Wenatchee and Rock Island positioned along the Columbia River and Waterville situated on the plateau. In addition to these incorporated cities and towns, there are concentrations of population in historical settlement areas. These settlement areas in WRIA 44 include the communities of Withrow and Douglas located on the plateau, Orondo situated on the Columbia River and the Palisades settlement area located approximately 10 miles up the Moses Coulee from Highway 28. The total population in WRIA 50 is approximately 7,703 people. WRIA 50 includes the incorporated communities of Bridgeport and Mansfield as well as a portion of the Town of Coulee Dam.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

Does not apply.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

Does not apply.

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

According to the Watershed Planning Act, the planning unit may recommend changes in certain cases but must stay within the current local, state, and federal regulations. To ensure consistency of activities, the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan will be integrated with related concurrent planning processes, such as salmon recovery. Actions in the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan recommended using the plan in future updates of the Shoreline Master Program, critical areas ordinances, and other land use comprehensive plans. Additionally, representatives from local, state, and federal government serve on the planning unit to ensure processes are compatible.

9. Housing

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

Does not apply.

- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.**

Does not apply.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:**

Does not apply.

10. Aesthetics

- a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?**

Does not apply.

- d. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?**

Does not apply.

- e. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:**

Does not apply.

11. Light and glare

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?**

Does not apply.

- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?**

Does not apply.

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?**

Does not apply.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:**

Does not apply.

12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?**

Recreational developments are generally occurring along the Columbia River corridor from Trinidad in the south to Bridgeport in the north and in the Badger Mountain Area. Recreational activities include a host of differing passive and active uses ranging from recreational subdivisions, to improved park developments, boating opportunities, racing, camping, hiking, water skiing, and golf. Other recreational activities that occur throughout the watersheds are hunting, fishing, boating, and wildlife/bird watching.

- b. **Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.**

Does not apply.

- c. **Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:**

Does not apply.

13. Historic and cultural preservation

- a. **Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.**

Site-specific location characteristics of implementation activities will be reviewed on a project-specific basis. Potential environmental impacts associated with a particular action will be addressed through SEPA as projects are prioritized for implementation and funding becomes available.

- b. **Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.**

Site-specific location characteristics of implementation activities will be reviewed on a project-specific basis. Potential environmental impacts associated with a particular action will be addressed through SEPA as projects are prioritized for implementation and funding becomes available.

- c. **Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:**

Does not apply.

14. Transportation

- a. **Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.**

The transportation system throughout WRIA 44/50 consists primarily of a network of roads serving a diverse range of uses. The system is integrated with the Federal and State road system that serves all of the different areas of the watersheds.

- b. **Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

Does not apply.

- c. **How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?**

Does not apply.

- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).**

Does not apply.

- e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.**

Does not apply.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.**

Does not apply.

- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:**

Does not apply.

15. Public services

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.**

Does not apply.

- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.**

Does not apply.

16. Utilities

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.**

Does not apply.

- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.**

Does not apply.

C. SIGNATURE

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: 

Date Submitted: 10/28/04

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS

(do not use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment. When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

Site-specific implementation activities will be reviewed on a project-specific basis. Potential environmental impacts associated with a particular action will be addressed through SEPA as projects are prioritized for implementation and funding becomes available.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

Does not apply.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

The WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan proposes actions to improve water quantity, water quality, and habitat. Recommended plan actions include encouraging restoration and enhancement of riparian and upland plant species, which would provide improved wildlife habitat. Recommended plan actions include water quality improvements and setting minimum instream flow to protect fish and other biotic species.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

All actions in the plan are intended to protect or improve water or water related resources.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

Does not apply.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

Does not apply.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

Recommended actions in the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan are to encourage conservation practices for water resources including riparian, upland, and wetland restoration or enhancement. These actions would have a positive benefit to all of the above listed features.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

All actions in the plan are intended to protect or improve water or water related resources.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

Actions contained in the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Plan encourage conservation practices to improve water quantity, water quality, habitat and instream flows throughout the watersheds. Actions recommended are to encourage protection of water resources are compatible with existing plans.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

Site-specific implementation activities will be reviewed on a project-specific basis. Potential environmental impacts associated with a particular action will be addressed through SEPA as projects are prioritized for implementation and funding becomes available.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

Does not apply.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

Does not apply.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

According to the ESHB 2514 Watershed Planning Act, actions in the plan may not conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements. Actions may only suggest changes to existing regulations.

**ADDENDUM
TO
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)
FOR WATERSHED PLANNING UNDER 90.82 RCW
Washington State Department of Ecology
FOR THE
Moses Coulee and Foster Creek Watersheds
WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan**

Project Title

Moses Coulee and Foster Creek Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA 44/50) Watershed Management Plan

Project Description

In 1998, the Legislature passed the Watershed Planning Act (ESHB 2514) to provide a framework for local citizens, interest groups, and government organizations to collaboratively identify and address water-related issues in each of the 62 Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs) of the state.

In the fall of 1998, local and tribal governments convened to initiate the Douglas County Watershed Planning Association (DCWPA) in the Moses Coulee and Foster Creek Watersheds (WRIA 44 & 50). Although watershed planning is not state-mandated, if initiated, the scope of planning must include the water quantity component to "...address water quantity in the management area by undertaking an assessment of water supply and use in the management area and developing strategies for future use". The WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan addresses the required water quantity component of watershed planning, and all optional elements including water quality, habitat, and instream flows. The Watershed Management Plan describes how the legislation was applied and defines water quantity, water quality, habitat, and instream flow goals, issues,

and recommended actions in WRIA 44/50. Actions in the plan are recommendations not obligations. Major streams in WRIA 44/50 include Foster Creek, Pine Canyon, Sand Canyon, Rock Island Creek, Douglas Creek, and McCartney Creek. Major lakes include Jameson and Grimes Lake.

The watershed planning process can be categorized in four phases including organization of the planning unit, assessment of water resources, plan development, and plan implementation. On September 23rd, 2004, the planning unit approved by consensus the submittal of the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan the Douglas, Okanogan, and Grant County Commissioners for their consideration. Only after approval and adoption by the County Commissioners can the DCWPA initiate Phase 4 Implementation of the Watershed Plan.

Project Location

WRIA 44/50, North Central Washington, Douglas and Grant County

Proponent

Douglas County Watershed Planning Association (DCWPA)

Lead Agency

Foster Creek Conservation District

Responsible Official/ Contact Person

Marilynn Lynn, Watershed Manager
Foster Creek Conservation District
103 N. Baker
P.O. Box 428
Waterville, WA 98858
(509) 686-3501

Date of Addendum Issue

October 26, 2004

State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)

SEPA was enacted by the Washington State Legislature to ensure that state and local agencies consider the likely environmental consequences of proposed actions during decision-making processes concerning such actions. The SEPA rules require agencies to identify and evaluate probable impacts of the proposed action, reasonable alternatives to the proposed action, and mitigation measures before committing to a particular course of action. The SEPA process is intended to provide information to agencies, applicants, and the public to encourage the development of environmentally sound proposals.

Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Watershed Planning

The 2001 Washington State Legislature directed the Department of Ecology to develop a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) "template," to streamline environmental review associated with local approval of the watershed plans. Based on input from lead agencies for various watershed planning units around the state, it was concluded that the most appropriate

form for the template, would be a statewide non-project environmental impact statement that could be adopted in whole or in part by SEPA lead agencies as part of local watershed plan approval processes. SEPA non-project actions include rules, ordinances, regulations, comprehensive plans and zoning codes, capital budgets, and road and highway plans.

Completed July 2003, the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Watershed Planning under 90.82 RCW evaluates the impacts of, and identifies mitigation measures for, various types or classes of recommended actions that may be included in watershed plans. Actions with any probable significant adverse environmental impacts that could be included in local watershed plans are considered as SEPA "alternatives".

Final Environmental Impact Statement for Watershed Planning under Chapter 90.82 RCW

Ecology Publication # 03-06-013

The report is available on the Department of Ecology website at: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/biblio/0306013.html>

For additional copies of the publication, please contact:
Department of Ecology
Publications Distribution Center
P.O. Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600
E-mail: ecypub@ecy.wa.gov
Phone: (360) 407-7472

WRIA 44/50 Watershed Plan SEPA Determination

As SEPA lead agency, the Foster Creek Conservation District issued a threshold determination of Nonsignificance (DNS). A DNS was issued because actions contained in the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan are recommendations not obligations. Some recommended actions will not cause significant adverse environmental impact. Some recommended actions could have potential adverse environmental impact and would require additional SEPA review on the project level in the future. During the first year of implementation, the planning unit will develop an implementation plan. The implementation plan will define coordination and oversight responsibilities, further develop the recommended actions, set priorities, and develop a timeline to ensure the plan is implemented in the future.

Early on, the Conservation District and Douglas County Watershed Planning Association (DCWPA) identified and adopted the existing Final EIS for Watershed Planning under 90.82 RCW. Recommended actions that are addressed in the Final EIS for Watershed Planning have been studied and reviewed for potential significant adverse environmental impact and presented for public review. However, not all WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan recommended local actions are addressed under the statewide Final EIS for Watershed Planning. After completion of the environmental checklist, it was determined these additional actions are not likely to cause an adverse environmental impact that has not been addressed in Final EIS for Watershed

Planning or require additional SEPA review on the non-project level.

According to SEPA, an addendum can provide additional information on plan actions that do not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives in the existing Final EIS.

This WRIA 44/50 Addendum provides documentation of WRIA 44/50 Management Plan SEPA compliance for adoption of the Plan by the Douglas and Grant County Commissioners and for implementation of the by the DCWPA.

WRIA 44/50 Watershed Plan SEPA Compliance

The majority of actions within the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan are addressed under alternatives listed in the Final EIS for Watershed Planning under RCW 90.82. Additional WRIA 44/50 Plan actions that are not addressed under the Final EIS for Watershed Planning can be grouped in several categories of project type including research; collaboration; continuation of existing programs; further project development; other SEPA process; or guiding actions. These categorical activities should not have a probable significant adverse environmental impact.

Final EIS for Watershed Planning Alternatives

The Final EIS for Watershed Planning under RCW 90.82 addresses significant adverse environmental impacts of “alternatives” and possible mitigation measures. WRIA 44/50 Plan actions addressed under the Final EIS alternatives comply with SEPA and do

not need further analysis on the non-project level.

The following list includes a summary of those Final EIS “alternatives” that apply to actions in the WRIA 44/50 Watershed Plan. A full description of alternatives, impacts, and mitigation measures can be found in Chapter 5. Alternatives and Chapter 6. Impacts and Mitigation Measures (access information above).

Water Quantity Alternatives

- WP 1. Develop and implement municipal conservation programs including demand management and operational efficiency measures.
- WP 2. Develop and implement agricultural water conservation and irrigation efficiency.
- WP 3. Develop and implement on- farm agricultural water conservation and irrigation efficiency.
- WP 4. Develop and implement industrial conservation measures.
 - WP 6. Promote greywater segregation and use in accordance with the Department of Health standards.
- WP 8. Request Ecology to transfer existing water rights for out-of-stream beneficial uses to instream beneficial uses through the Trust Water Right Program.
- WP 15. Request Ecology to evaluate some set or subset of existing water rights within a basin or subbasin to identify those subject to relinquishment.
- WP 17. Where adequate public water supplies are available, extend public water system service into areas served by exempt wells and require any new development to connect to such public water supplies.

- WP 19. Construct and operate new on-channel storage facilities.
- WP 20. Raise and operate existing on-channel storage facilities.
- WP 21. Construct and operate new off-channel storage facilities.
- WP 24. Construct and operate artificial recharge/aquifer storage projects.

Instream Flow Alternatives

- WP 26. Request Ecology to set instream flows by administrative rule.

Water Quantity Alternatives

- WP 28. Request local governments or sewer utilities to construct and operate water reclamation and reuse facilities.
- WP 33. Request conservation districts or irrigation districts to assist in achieving reductions in nonpoint pollution and/or to implement Total Maximum Daily Loads established for specific federal 303 (d) listed water bodies.
- WP 34. Request conservation districts to modify individual farm plans as necessary to reduce or prevent nonpoint pollution and erosion.
- WP 36. Develop and implement a water quality public education program. Similar public education programs could be developed for other aspects of watershed planning such as water conservation or habitat protection.
- WP 38. Request local governments to modify Growth Management Act comprehensive plans and other land use plans to help reduce the potential for nonpoint pollution.
- WP 39. Request local governments to amend shoreline master programs to help reduce the potential for nonpoint pollution.

WP 40. Request local governments to modify local regulations such as critical areas ordinances, stormwater regulations, and on-site sewage regulations to help reduce the potential for nonpoint pollution.

acquire land and/or conservation easements for purposes of protecting habitat.

Additional 44/50 Watershed Management Plan Actions

As lead agency, the Foster Creek Conservation District determined the additional actions outside of the Final EIS for Watershed Planning could be grouped within several categories described as follows.

Habitat Alternatives

WP 42. Implement habitat improvement projects involving construction or placement of instream structures.

WP 45. Request applicable agencies to remove or replace bridges, culverts, roadways, and other infrastructure as necessary to eliminate or reduce their impacts as fish passage obstructions and/or channel constrictions.

WP 47. Implement habitat improvement projects involving out-of-stream riparian restoration or enhancement such as replanting or bank stabilization projects.

WP 49. Request local governments to amend or modify Growth Management Act comprehensive plans or other land use plans, shoreline master programs, and/or critical areas ordinances to protect habitat or control floodplain development.

WP 51. Request local governments to integrate habitat improvement planning into flood hazard reduction plans.

WP 52. Request conservation districts and irrigation districts to assist in achieving protection of habitat including, as appropriate, establishment and maintenance of riparian buffers and control of erosion and sedimentation.

WP 53. Request local, state, and federal governments, conservation districts, and private entities to

Research: This includes continuation of monitoring, new studies, and feasibility assessments for expansion in current services and policies.

Collaboration: Includes the formation of a committee to further address and provide guidance on the issue.

Continue Existing Programs: Refers to offering continued support for maintenance of existing programs.

Further Project Development: This includes planning concepts that need to be further explored and defined in Phase 4 Implementation. It is too early in the planning stage to make a SEPA determination.

Other SEPA Processes: This includes review, revision, or expansion of existing programs/policies that require their own SEPA review during consideration and adoption.

Guiding Action: These actions are overriding principles to consider, but do not have direct tangible impacts at this planning stage.

After close analysis of each of these categorical activities, it was determined these activities would not pose a likely significant adverse impact to the environment.

WRIA 44/50 Watershed Plan SEPA Conclusion

The following table lists each action in the WRIA 44/ 50 Watershed Management Plan. For each action it includes the number of the Final EIS for Watershed Planning alternative or the category of activity not likely to pose a significant adverse environmental impact.

WRIA 44/50 Watershed Management Plan Actions	SEPA Compliance
Water Quantity	
Action 1. Fill in data gaps on existing water rights, claims, and use in the Moses Coulee, Lower McCartney Creek, and Douglas Creek subbasins of WRIA 44.	Research
Action 2. Support legislation to improve irrigation water management in Washington State.	Further Project Development
Action 3. Increase connection of agriculture and rural concerns to land use planning at the local and state level.	Alternatives WP 38, 39, 40, 49, 50, 51.
Action 4. Promote on-farm agriculture water conservation and irrigation efficiency efforts such as replacing open laterals and trenches with closed pipe systems; replacing non-pressurized irrigation systems with pressurized sprinkler systems or drip irrigation systems; using soil moisture sensors to prevent over-watering; and constructing on-farm ponds to capture and reuse tailwater.	Alternative WP 3.
Action 5. Develop and encourage implementation of agricultural water conservation and irrigation efficiency efforts through regional or irrigation district infrastructure improvements such as lining canals, replacing open canals and ditches with closed pipe systems, or installing pump-back stations to capture tail water for reuse.	Alternative WP 2.
Action 6. Promote a voluntary surface and ground water rights relinquishment program in WRIs 44 & 50.	Alternative WP 15.
Action 7. Promote xeriscaping, low-water use landscaping. Assess feasibility to incorporate xeriscaping into Douglas County land use code as a landscaping standard.	Alternative WP 1.
Action 8. Continue municipal conservation programs to: 1.) encourage the individual water consumer to conserve, and 2.) promote operational efficiency measures for public water systems that minimize losses of water during routine flushing of mains and conserve water by detecting and repairing leaks and testing and repairing meters.	Alternative WP 1.
Action 9. Ensure that the watershed plan is consistent with planned future use of existing water rights for municipal water supplies.	Alternative WP 1.
Action 10. Educate domestic water users to conserve water.	Alternative WP 1.
Action 11. In areas that are experiencing growth in exempt well use, perform a localized water balance by determining the current water availability, current water use, and future water availability.	Research
Action 12. In areas of moderate to high-density rural development, determine as feasible if localized water level lowering in wells or springs is due to increased exempt well use or drought conditions.	Research
Action 13. Research alternative ways to supply water. Assess	Alternative

feasibility to create new water systems or extend public water systems. Coordinate actions with the Chelan-Douglas Health District and the Washington State Department of Health.	WP 17.
Action 14. Research positive incentives and revisions to land use policy development regulations to direct new residential and industrial development to areas where groundwater is available or areas connected to a public water system. Possible development regulations could include requiring minimum lot size in areas of exempt well use or clustered development.	Further Project Development
Action 15. Promote greywater segregation. Wastewater segregation involves the in-house separation of domestic sewage stream into two fractions: toilet wastes and kitchen sink wastes, referred to as blackwater; and dishwater, clothes washer, and bath/shower wastes referred to as greywater. Treated greywater can be used for landscape irrigation and toilet flushing to conserve potable water supplies. Treatment of greywater is achieved through the installation and operation of specialized on-site sewage system. Provide information on system design to homebuilders, real estate companies, and homeowners.	Alternative WP 6.
Action 16. Encourage industrial conservation measures and modifications to the following types of practices as appropriate: heating and cooling, product washing and processing, cleaning and maintenance, wastewater disposal, and landscaping. Encourage industries to participate in conservation programs such as the Department of Ecology's Technical Resources for Engineering Efficiency (TREE) Program.	Alternative WP 4.
Action 17. Encourage continuation and expansion of conservation practices for protecting and restoring riparian areas such as plantings to establish a mature riparian corridor where feasible, bank stabilization, animal management, fencing, or alternative water sources.	Alternatives WP 47, 52.
Action 18. Encourage continuation and expansion of conservation practices in uplands (rangelands/cultivated) such as prescribed grazing, noxious weed control, critical area plantings, filter strips, conservation crop rotation, field borders, grass waterways, sediment ponds, or residue management.	Alternatives WP 3, 33, 34, 52.
Action 19. Pursue potential water storage projects in WRIs 44 & 50 for in-channel and off-channel sediment and erosion control, aquifer storage, bank storage, groundwater recharge, flood control, and habitat restoration or enhancement. Potential recommendations have been identified by the Pacific Groundwater Group based upon the findings from the <i>WRIA44/50 Storage Assessment and Feasibility Study, August 2004</i> . These recommendations are in need of further analysis during the implementation phase.	Alternatives WP 19, 21, 24.
Action 20. Consider impacts of global climate variability and change on water resources in WRIs 44 & 50. Climate is a key driver in determining when, where, and how much water is available in Washington State. Small changes affecting the Pacific Northwest climate system can have significant impacts on regional water supplies, including those in the WRIs 44 & 50.	Guiding Actions
Action 21. Develop and assess recommendations for water use	Further Project

proposals on the Columbia River such as the Columbia River Initiative (CRI).	Development
Action 22. Set instream flows. Refer to Section 5.3 Instream Flow Recommendations.	Alternative WP 26.
Action 23. Encourage use of a Trust Water Rights Program to preserve water rights that are temporarily not being used. Inside WRIAs 44 & 50, surface water is used for irrigation in the Moses Coulee and for livestock watering throughout the watersheds.	Alternative WP 8.
Action 24. Provide education on value of local government critical area designations. Critical areas are wetlands, areas with a critical recharging effect on aquifers used for potable water, frequently flooded areas, geologically hazardous area, or fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas.	Alternative WP 36.
Action 25. Develop an integrated county road maintenance plan that addresses erosion and sedimentation, weed management, and positions the county for diverse funding sources.	Other SEPA
Action 26. Provide education on invasive and noxious weed management to private landowners.	Alternative WP 36.
Action 27. Support enforcement of invasive and noxious weed management on fields enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP).	Continue Existing Programs
Action 28. Stress to public and private landowners the need to budget for invasive and noxious weed management. This includes promoting invasive weed control efforts along recreation trails.	Alternative WP 36.
Action 29. Continue and expand weed survey and mapping to accurately identify and delineate land with populations of invasive or noxious weeds.	Research
Action 30. Establish county-wide weed management committee to provide advice to landowners.	Collaboration
Water Quality	
Action 31. For development activities that clear vegetation, encourage the adoption of performance standards to control erosion and sedimentation and prevent the establishment of weeds.	Other SEPA
Action 32. Design and implement a scope of work for continued monitoring of water quality conditions to establish long-term data on ground and surface water quality for WRIAs 44 & 50.	Research
Action 33. Work with health authorities to provide technical assistance to the public to install and maintain properly designed septic systems and other fluid disposal systems; identify and renovate failing septic systems; and to encourage testing and pumping of septic systems to prevent pollution. Educate recreational vehicle users and other members of the public about the importance of dumping holding tanks at approved dumping stations. In areas that are unsuitable for on-site sewage systems and cannot connect to a central sewer system, promote safe alternative waste management designs such as composting or incinerating toilets.	Alternative WP 36.
Action 34. Ensure nutrients are applied so no significant runoff or subsurface flow containing nutrients or other contaminants occur beyond field boundaries. Encourage agricultural soil and/ or plant tissue	Alternative WP 36.

testing to determine agronomic need for nutrient addition.	
Action 35. Develop a water quality public education program intended to prevent or reduce nonpoint pollution. Educate non-agriculture pesticide users to apply pesticides following the label instructions and pertinent local, state, and federal regulations so groundwater and surface water standards are not violated. Pesticides are applied in appropriate forms and rates and during times so no significant contamination occurs below the root zone or transport beyond the edge of the field. Pesticides are stored, handled, and disposed of to minimize risk of accidental spill or leakage.	Alternative WP 36.
Action 36. Develop a water quality assistance program intended to prevent or reduce nonpoint pollution.	Alternative WP 33.
Action 37. Encourage continuation and expansion of conservation practices on individual farms to reduce or prevent nonpoint pollution. On dry cropland, such practices may include contour buffer strips, cover crops, or nutrient management. On rangelands practices could include animal management, fencing or alternative watering facilities. In irrigated farmland, this may include practices such as filter strips, windbreak establishment, or nutrient management.	Alternative WP 34.
Action 38. In future water system upgrades, assess feasibility to construct and operate water reclamation and reuse facilities.	Alternative WP 28.
Action 39. Promote wellhead protection programs.	Alternative WP 36.
Action 40. Develop a monitoring program and water balance for the Jameson and Grimes Lake area that evaluates potential negative impacts to lake water quality and sets forth implementation measures.	Research
Action 41. Create county wide sampling plan for contamination including heavy metals, chloride, and fecal coliform bacteria. If high levels of coliform bacteria are found, identify coliform type to determine source.	Research
Action 42. Assure that land use plans and development standards protect ground and surface water quality. Slated for revision in 2011, request earlier update of the Douglas County Shoreline Master Program to reduce the potential for no point pollution reaching the Columbia River. Incorporate all water resource concerns into the Critical Areas Ordinance update in 2005.	Alternatives WP 38, 39, 40.
Action 43. Encourage public and private landowners to assess roadways and stabilize areas where sediment could be transported offsite.	Alternative WP 36.
Habitat	
Action 44. Assess capacity to enhance riparian areas between water bodies and private, county, and state roadways.	Research
Action 45. Work with private and public landowners to share cost, design, and implement projects that will protect or restore riparian vegetation, increase water quality, and enhance habitat.	Alternative WP 47.
Action 46. Assist landowners with voluntary maintenance, enhancement, restoration, or creation of wetlands.	Alternatives WP 3, 33, 34, 52.
Action 47. Support continued enrollment for Douglas County in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and other Farm Bill Programs.	Continue Existing Programs

Action 48. Support conservation easements and other land conservation practices in riparian areas for purposes of protecting habitat that allow compatible multiple use.	Alternatives WP 53.
Action 49. Develop a county program to identify areas for off-site mitigation.	Other SEPA
Action 50. Incorporate habitat protection and floodplain development controls into Growth Management Act comprehensive plans or other land use plans, shoreline master programs, and/or critical areas ordinances.	Alternative WP 49.
Action 51. Integrate habitat improvement planning into flood hazard management plans.	Alternative WP 51.
Action 52. Provide a stable base of funding for monitoring compliance and enforcement with the Shoreline Management Act and Critical Areas Code.	Continue Existing Programs
Action 53. Upgrade public bridges, culverts, roadways, and other infrastructure as necessary to eliminate or reduce their impacts, especially during flood events, upon people and fish.	Alternative WP 45.
Action 54. Balance water storage and channel flushing flows. Channel flushing flows are important to clear excess sediment from streams.	Guiding Actions
Action 55. Encourage installation of checkdams, compatible with habitat needs, to increase groundwater recharge and ultimately surface flow. Checkdams are small earthen or rock barriers placed across streams or that capture water as it flows downstream. The pressure created by the impounded water helps to improve infiltration and raise the local groundwater table.	Alternatives WP 19, 20.
Action 56. Encourage implementation of the <i>Douglas County Surface and Stormwater Management Program</i> for the East Wenatchee Area.	Other SEPA
Action 57. Assess the expansion of surface and stormwater management planning to developed areas countywide.	Research
Action 58. Implement in-channel projects that address geologic processes such as deep-seated slope failure, toe erosion, or landslides. Includes continued work to minimize channel headcuts, stabilize banks, and vegetate gullies in the Foster Creek watershed.	Alternatives WP 42, 47.
Action 59. Assess and propose recommendations to address erosion and sedimentation conditions in the Moses Coulee.	Research
Action 60. Encourage maintenance of drainage ditches, culverts, and other drainage structures to prevent clogging with debris and sediments.	Alternatives WP 36.
Action 61. Encourage construction of retention and infiltration ponds that capture runoff from roads, development, farms, and irrigation return flows.	Alternatives WP 3, 33, 34, 52.
Action 62. In Foster Creek, implement habitat improvement projects to aid in restoration involving construction or placement of instream structures, such as cross vanes, weirs, large woody debris, or side channels. Use beavers as a restoration tool.	Alternative WP 42.
Action 63. Design and implement scope of work for continued monitoring of habitat conditions.	Research