

# APPENDIX A - WRIA 35 SEPA Review

## 1.0 Introduction

The WRIA 35 Planning Unit is proposing to approve the Watershed Management Plan for WRIA 35. Approval of the Plan constitutes an action under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and therefore a SEPA environmental review must be conducted prior to approval of the Plan.

On July 18, 2003, the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) produced the Environmental Impact Statement for Watershed Planning (statewide EIS) under Chapter 90.82 RCW. The statewide EIS was produced by Ecology at the request of the 2001 State Legislature to serve as a “template” for environmental review under SEPA for local approval of watershed plans. The intent was for Ecology to develop a statewide EIS that could be adopted in whole or in part by SEPA lead agencies as part of local watershed plan approval processes.

This Appendix provides information in support of the Planning Unit adopting the statewide EIS as part of the SEPA review of the WRIA 35 Watershed Management Plan. The Appendix briefly describes the Proposed Action (e.g., the WRIA 35 Watershed Management Plan) and provides an assessment of the adequacy of the statewide EIS to address the environmental issues associated with the actions related to implementation of the Plan. This Appendix includes:

- A description of the WRIA 35 Watershed Management Plan, including the initiating governments and other stakeholders, the planning process, regulatory background, and supporting technical documents.
- A summary of the key elements of the affected environment within WRIA 35.
- A brief description of the statewide EIS proposed herein for adoption and a comparison of the actions proposed within the WRIA 35 Plan with the actions evaluated within the statewide EIS.

Based on a review of the statewide EIS and the proposed WRIA 35 Watershed Management Plan, the Planning Unit in coordination with Asotin, Columbia, Garfield, and Whitman Counties have concluded that the statewide EIS adequately addresses the environmental impacts of the actions proposed within the WRIA 35 Watershed Management Plan.

## 2.0 Description of Proposal

The proposal addressed herein is the adoption of the WRIA 35 Watershed Management Plan by the WRIA 35 Planning Unit. The Plan identifies management challenges and actions for improving water resource management and recommends implementation plans for five specific Implementation Areas. A copy of the Plan and additional supporting information is available at [www.asotinpod.org/msww/](http://www.asotinpod.org/msww/).

The Plan was developed at the request of several initiating local governments: Asotin, Garfield, Columbia and Whitman counties, the City of Clarkston, and the Asotin PUD. The Asotin PUD was selected by the initiating governments as the lead agency for watershed planning. A Planning Unit was assembled to oversee plan development. Planning Unit membership included a broad representation of interests in the Middle Snake River Watersheds, and included:

Private landowners and land managers	Asotin County Department of Emergency Management
City of Clarkston	Asotin County PUD
City of Pomeroy	Port of Clarkston
City of Starbuck	Washington State University Cooperative Extension
Asotin County	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Garfield County	Washington Department of Ecology
Columbia County	Snake River Salmon Recovery Board
Whitman County	Tri-State Steelheaders
Palouse Conservation District	Asotin County Sportsman's Association
Asotin County Conservation District	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
Whitman Conservation District	Nez Perce Tribe
Columbia Conservation District	
Pomeroy Conservation District	

## 2.1 Project Location

The Middle Snake River Watershed (WRIA 35) occupies 2,250 square miles in southeastern Washington along the Idaho border to the east and Oregon border to the south, and the Palouse Watershed (WRIA 34) to the north, and the Walla Walla Watershed (WRIA 32) to the west. Exhibit A-1 shows the regional location of the WRIA 35. WRIA 35 encompasses portions of Asotin, Whitman, Garfield, and Columbia Counties within Washington. It should be noted that a portion of the Middle Snake River Watershed (i.e., most of the Grande Ronde subbasin) extends outside of Washington and into Oregon.

## 2.2 Needs and Objectives

The overall objective of this watershed plan is to ensure that the wide range of human and wildlife demands are met. Watershed demands in the WRIA 35 Watershed Plan are primarily focused on irrigation, agriculture, municipal drinking water, and fish habitat. WRIA 35 residents, commercial businesses, and industrial users require water to meet their everyday needs, and these needs are growing as the population grows. Aquatic species (particularly Endangered Species Act [ESA] listed species) also make demands on water resources in the WRIA, and these demands are becoming more pronounced as increased human population

begins to compete with ESA fish needs. Water resources also serve to meet Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) treaty fishing rights on the Tucannon and Nez Perce Tribe's treaty fishing rights on Asotin Creek and Tucannon River. Finally, the area's rivers, streams offer recreational opportunities and natural beauty for citizens and visitors.

Given a limited resource and a range of needs for water, it has historically been difficult for citizens, businesses and public agencies to make water-resource management decisions. Water resource management has grown more challenging as new rules and regulations have come into effect, such as the Clean Water Act (CWA) and ESA, and as the area seeks to ensure that its agriculture-based economy can compete in worldwide commodity markets.

The purpose of the WRIA 35 Watershed Management Plan is to provide an approach that contributes to improved decision-making with regard to the Basin's water resources.

Implementation area and basin-wide planning objectives were developed based on area-specific water supply, water quality, instream flow and fish habitat characteristics. Planning objectives developed by the Planning Unit provided the basis for the basin-wide and implementation areas-specific objectives.

Watershed actions were identified in two phases. First, a general description of potential management actions was prepared with an explanation of applicability and potential benefits. The second phase was to apply management tools to specific implementation areas, based upon the applicability of the objectives. Basin-wide actions were developed, as well as actions for the five implementation areas, with input from the Planning Unit and other interested parties.

## **2.3 Environmental Overview**

The Planning Unit has been charged by State law (RCW 90.82.070) to estimate the surface and groundwater available for future appropriation, taking into account existing or proposed minimum instream flows. The Planning Unit is further charged to identify strategies for increasing water supplies in the watershed to meet both instream needs for fish and out of stream water demands for agriculture, population and economic growth. Water supply planning objectives for irrigation, rural areas and urban areas (primarily municipal supply) are outlined in Section 5 and 6 of the Plan.

Water quality includes both surface and groundwater quality. Surface and groundwater quality planning objectives are outlined in Sections 5 and 6, and actions are described in Section 6 of the Plan. The surface water quality objectives and implementation actions are preliminary as Ecology is in the process of developing a TMDL for several water bodies in WRIA 35. Establishment of additional TMDLs and associated water quality management plans will not occur prior to watershed plan adoption. The Planning Unit requests Ecology continue to work closely with members of the Planning Unit during its process.

The habitat component of the watershed plan is primarily focused on aquatic habitat for steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*), spring Chinook (Tucannon) and Snake River fall Chinook (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), which are listed under

the federal Endangered Species Act. It is recognized that actions to improve habitat conditions for these species can provide benefits to other aquatic and terrestrial species as well.

Instream flows are to be managed to meet flow needs for fish, balanced with out of stream demands. Instream flow planning objectives and actions are described in Section 6 of the Plan. Specific details on the instream flow management actions are included in Appendix C.

## **2.4 Regulatory Framework**

In 1998, the Washington State Legislature passed the Watershed Management Act (WMA) (Chapter 90.82 RCW; ESHB 2514) to provide a framework for citizens, interest groups, and government organizations to join together to develop a management plan for water resources in each of the major watersheds within Washington. The WMA enables, but does not require, local groups called “planning units” to form for the purpose of conducting watershed planning.

## **2.5 Public Participation**

Public participation in the development of the watershed management plan has been encouraged through an extensive public outreach effort, including public mailings, meetings, workshops, and a website. The Planning Unit sought additional public input on objectives and action plans by conducting workshops in each implementation area. The preliminary action plans for individual implementation areas were presented at each workshop, along with relevant components of the basin-wide action plan for review and comment. A summary of these meetings and comments received are provided in Section 7 of the watershed plan. This summary serves as a response to comments for the SEPA process, in addition to those comments addressed within the adopted environmental documentation.

## **2.6 Related Studies and Coordination**

### **2.6.1 Documentation**

The following primary documents have been developed to support the WRIA 35 Plan and may be found on-line at [www.asotinpod.org/msww/index.html](http://www.asotinpod.org/msww/index.html):

- **Level 1 Technical Assessment** (January 2005)
  - Grande Ronde Appendix (August 2005)
- **Water Quality Assessment (Level 2)**
  - Pataha Creek Fecal Coliform – Compliance with Water Quality Standards (March 2005)
  - Asotin Creek Fecal Coliform – Assessment of Existing Data (June 2005)
  - Tucannon Temperature Conditions (March 2005)
  - Tucannon Temperature Assessment, Middle Snake Watershed WRIA 35 (May 2005)
  - Tucannon River – Comparison of Water Temperature and Elevation (May 2005)

- **Instream Flow Assessment (Level 2)**
  - Stream Flow Management Framework (May 2005)
  - Minimum Instream Flow Framework (May 2005)
  - Proposal for Administrative Closures (June 2005)
  - Proposed Flow Enhancement Targets for WRIA 35 Streams (June 2005)
- **Multipurpose Storage Assessment (Level 2)**
  - Water Storage and Availability Needs Assessment (March 2005)
  - Entitled Wetland Storage Sites and Screening Criteria
  - Three Recommended Wetland Project Locations Identified for Assessment and Evaluation (June 2005)
  - Hydrologic Assessment of the Tucannon River, Pataha Creek, and Asotin Creek Drainages (April 2005)

## **2.6.2 Coordination with Other Planning Efforts**

During preparation of the technical studies and the watershed management plan, watershed planning work was coordinated and integrated with other planning efforts. These planning efforts included:

### ***Salmon Recovery Act***

The Washington State Legislature passed the Salmon Recovery Act (RCW 70.46; ESHB 2496) during the same session as the WMA. The Salmon Recovery Act (SRA) specifies a process for prioritizing habitat restoration projects in a “habitat projects list” for each region of the State. It requires a “critical pathways methodology” for development of the habitat projects list. One component of this methodology is a “limiting factors analysis” addressing habitat conditions for salmon in each region. The State Conservation Commission is responsible for developing the limiting factors analysis for each WRIA.

The SRA is directly linked with the WMA that requires “where habitat restoration activities are being developed under [the SRA], such activities shall be relied on as the primary non-regulatory habitat component for fish habitat.”

The WRIA 35 Limiting Factors Analysis was published by the State Conservation Commission in March 2002. In addition, the Lower Snake River Salmon Recovery Board has been organized and has developed the Snake River Salmon Recovery Plan (the Snake River Basin, which includes WRIA 35). Watershed planning efforts are being closely coordinated with salmon recovery efforts. The recovery strategy and associated actions will be the habitat component of the watershed plan along with the subbasin plans (see below). This habitat assessment will be supported by SRA activities and will ultimately be integrated into the WRIA 35 watershed plan. By maintaining close ties, the development of State and federal recovery plans will be

anticipated, tracked, and integrated into the watershed planning process in the assessment, plan development and plan implementation stages.

### ***Subbasin Planning Efforts***

The 2514 Watershed Planning effort will integrate portions of the Bonneville Power Administration/Northwest Power Planning Council's (NPPC) Subbasin Planning initiative. The Subbasin Plans include hypotheses, objectives and strategies that have been identified for specific priority geographic restoration areas to improve habitat conditions for salmonid lifestages. Management strategies address stream, riparian and upland practices in both urban and rural settings within the priority restoration areas. Draft subbasin plans have been completed in May 2004 for each the geographic areas encompassing WRIA 35, with final plans expected in early 2005. Development of the subbasin plans have been supported by the WRIA 35 Planning Unit, and the strategies will serve as the primary list of strategies to be applied to improve habitat conditions throughout the watershed along with strategies and actions in the regional salmon recovery plan (see above).

Table A-1 lists a variety of programs at the local, tribal, State, and federal level that are relevant to watershed planning. The table also summarizes potential relationships between watershed planning and related programs. In some cases, programs may be viewed as a direct input to watershed planning, such as the parameters established by county or city land use planning documents. In other cases, existing programs may constrain available options for watershed management, or provide valuable data sources. In the long-term, planning units may wish to consider how implementation of the watershed plan can dovetail with other planning activities that are funded as part of routine government operations.

*Table A-1  
Relationship of Existing Programs to Watershed Planning*

Gov't. Level	Program	Relationship to Watershed Planning			
		Data Availability	Constraint on Mgmt Options	Potential Funding Source	Implementation Tool
Local	County-wide Planning Policies				X
	Comprehensive Plans	X			X
	Coordinated Water System Plans	X			X
	Drinking Water Source Protection Plans			X	X
	Shoreline Master Plans				X
	Salmon Recovery Plans/Documents	X	X		X
	Nonpoint Source Control Plans	X		X	X
	Stormwater Plans	X		X	X
	Onsite Septic System Inventory	X			
	Critical Areas Ordinance				X
	Water System Plans	X			X
	Water Conservation Plans				X
	Wastewater Plan	X		X	X
	Irrigation District Plan			X	X
	Groundwater Management Plans	X			X
Tribal	Fishing Rights		X		
	Reserved Water Rights		X		
	Hatchery Plans				X
	Local Gov't. Planning Functions	(See Local)			X
State	Water Rights Records	X	X		
	Instream Flow Regulations/Studies	X	X		
	Salmon Recovery Plans	X	X	X	X
	Wastewater Permit Life Cycle System	X	X		X
	TMDL Studies/Water Quality Plans	X	X		X
	WQMA Needs Assessment	X			
	Designated Use Regulations	X			X
	Water Quality Program	X		X	X
	Drinking Water Grants/Loans			X	X
	Water Quality Grants/Loans			X	X

<i>Table 1-2 Continued...</i>					
Gov't. Level	Program	Relationship to Watershed Planning			
		Data Availability	Constraint on Mgmt Options	Potential Funding Source	Implementation Tool
<b>State (cont.)</b>	Forest Practices Watershed Analysis	X	X		
	Limiting Factors Analysis (2496)	X	X		
	Hatchery Plans				X
	DOT Fish Passage Grant Program	X	X	X	X
	Water Resources Program	X		X	X
<b>Regional/ Federal</b> BPA/NPPC NOAA Fisheries USFWS USBR ACOE FERC	ESA Listings/ Documentation	X	X		
	Irrigation Projects	X	X		
	Flood Control	X	X	X	X
	Wetlands		X		
	Hydropower	X	X		
	Subbasin Planning	X			X



### **3. Affected Environment**

This section offers a brief description of the affected environment of the Middle Snake Watershed it relates to the proposal. Further detail on these topics is available in WRIA 35 Watershed Plan (HDR 2006), as well as the Level 1 Assessment (EES 2002).

#### **3.1 Geography and Physiographic Conditions**

Diamond Peak, located in the headwaters of the Tucannon River, is the highest point in the area with an elevation of 6,380 feet, while the confluence of the Snake and Tucannon Rivers is the lowest point at approximately 540 feet. The Cities of Clarkston, Asotin, Pomeroy, and Starbuck are the only major incorporated urban areas within WRIA 35.

WRIA 35 was divided into five subbasins (termed “Implementation Areas”), each based on prominent surface water features: Asotin Creek, Middle Snake River, Pataha Creek, Tucannon River, and Grande Ronde as shown in Exhibit A-1. These implementation areas were also defined in this manner because they are generally consistent with the subbasins delineated under subbasin plans prepared under the Bonneville Power Association/Northwest Power Planning Council (Columbia Conservation District, 2004; Asotin County Conservation District, 2004) and the Salmon Recovery Programs (Snake River Salmon Recovery Board, 2006).

The Middle Snake Watershed is semi-arid and is largely influenced by the Cascade Mountains to the west, the Pacific Ocean, and the prevailing westerly winds. Regional climate depends greatly on elevation and varies from warm and semiarid in the northern lowlands to cool and relatively wet at higher elevations in the Blue Mountains.

Natural vegetation in the Middle Snake River watershed is dominated by prairie and canyon grasslands and shrub steppe vegetation in the lower elevations. Higher elevations near the Blue Mountains are primarily forested.

#### **3.2 Population, Land Use, and Land Ownership**

The total population of Asotin County in 2000 was 20,551. Of this total 19,256 lived in the cities of Asotin or Clarkston and surrounding areas. No major population centers are present in the Whitman County portion of the WRIA. The city of Pomeroy was the most populated area in Garfield County with 1,517 residents. The largest town in the Columbia County portion of the WRIA was Starbuck with a population of 130 in year 2000. Private land comprises 1,711 square miles (76%) of the WRIA, while the federal government manages 436 square miles (19%), and the state of Washington manages 103 square miles (~5%). Population projections conducted in this Level 1 assessment, estimate population to be ~33,400 in WRIA 32.

Based on the 1992 land cover data, the predominant land covers within WRIA 35 are agriculture land cover totaling more than 475,000 acres (33 percent) of the watershed; pasture and grassland that covers almost 300,000 acres (21 percent); and scrubland which covers slightly more than 400,000 acres (28 percent) of the watershed. The majority of forestland is in the Umatilla

National Forest and is managed by the USFS for multiple uses including timber management, livestock grazing, outdoor recreation, mining, and water management. The state of Washington and non-industrial private forestland owners manage the remaining forestland. The amount of developed land within WRIA 35 is minimal with less than 10,000 acres (1 percent) of the watershed.

Agriculture in the basin and surrounding region is dominated by non-irrigated farming in the uplands, irrigated farming in the lower valleys, and cattle ranching. The primary agricultural activities in WRIA 35 include wheat and barley and small grains/alfalfa with summer fallow every two to three years.

### 3.3 Surface Water Resources

Historical gauged stream flow data exists throughout the WRIA. However, few of these stations are still in use, and some of the locations may not be appropriate for the emerging management priorities of the basin. The two factors determining the usefulness of stream flow data include its location and its period of record. From information collected under the Level 1 Assessment, priority streams have been identified for streamflow management and potentially setting instream flow levels (see Exhibit A-2). Several new gauges have recently been installed by Ecology and Washington State University, but the periods of record are short. The mainstems generally have adequate data for estimating stream flows, but many of the tributaries either have no gauges or new gauges have a very short period of record.

There is a need to further examine the stream flow data in assessing the baseflow component from ground water returns, as well as to potentially identify gaining and losing reaches within the major basins in the WRIA. Further resolution of the ground and surface water interaction will greatly enhance the knowledge base surrounding the overall water balance in each implementation area.

No formal minimum instream flows have been set in WRIA 35 by State rule. However, surface water source limitations (SWSL) closing or defining low flow limits have been established in several streams. Instream flow studies have been conducted for Tucannon River, Asotin Creek, SF Asotin Creek and Charlie Creek. The out-of-stream and instream demands, instream flow studies, SWSLs and gauging information described above provide a starting point for *identifying* priority areas for establishing minimum instream flows in the Basin.

Agricultural (irrigation) use is the most prominent in the basin<sup>1</sup> but there is no readily available metered data for this type of use. Most of the agricultural use is derived from surface water sources. The largest single use is associated with irrigation and industrial/municipal use by areas served by the Asotin County Public Utility District, which utilizes ground water sources to meet these demands. Based on the water projection estimates through the planning period (2025), total demand in the basin is expected to be ~18,300 acre-feet per year, which includes both surface and ground water use. This is based on limited population growth and the assumption that irrigation use will not change significantly from current usage.

---

<sup>1</sup> There are also large commercial/industrial and municipal uses in the Clarkston area based on water rights.

Based on the available surface water quality data and natural low flows, temperature and sediment are the primary issues affecting habitat. Specifically, elevated temperatures and sediment loadings in Pataha, Tucannon, and the Snake River have been identified. Water quality deficiencies in the watershed may also affect drinking water supply and impact public recreational uses. Fecal coliform has been identified as a concern in Asotin and Pataha Creeks, requiring TMDLs and clean-up plans. Data on temperature is available from various water quality monitoring stations throughout the WRIA, while data on other surface water quality parameters such as chemical pollution, sediment, dissolved oxygen levels, etc. is primarily available from Ecology monitoring stations and consequently is very limited in scope. Specifically, the availability of toxics data is most limited in the basin.

With the exception of monitoring data from city production wells, most of the ground water quality data is regional in nature. Information reviewed in this Level 1 Assessment is based on knowledge of ground water quality of the Columbia River Basalt aquifers. Consequently, plans should be put into place to seek additional data sources and identify critical points of interest where actual field sampling efforts may be needed.

### **3.4 Groundwater Resources**

The principal hydrogeologic units are part of the Columbia River Basalt Group (CRBG), which underlie the entire area. Overlying these basalt units are diverse unconsolidated sediments. The most common is wind-deposited loess. Most of these sediments are present throughout the watershed in limited thickness and do not provide significant water-bearing or producing capacities. The most recent conceptualization as described in Whiteman et al. (1994) define the hydrologic framework, wherein the major basalt and sediment stratigraphy groups correspond with the hydrologic units: the Saddle Mountains Unit, Wanapum Unit, and Grande Ronde Unit, Saddle Mountains-Wanapum interbed, and Wanapam-Grande Ronde interbed.

Ground water in the basalt aquifers generally flows from the higher elevation recharge areas in the Blue Mountains toward the main surface water bodies, discharging toward the Snake River and Grande Ronde River. The primary tributaries such as the Tucannon River and Asotin Creek do not appear to control the regional flow patterns in the basalt aquifers, but baseflows (ground water discharge) to these tributaries are a significant portion of the total stream flows, which indicate that shallow ground water is affected by the smaller tributaries on a local level. Baseflow is shown to be a significant portion of the total stream flow year-round due to the hydrology and hydrogeology in WRIA 35. Ground water discharge to streams is significant in the basin, ranging from approximately 30 percent in the winter months to over 90 percent of stream flow in the summer.

### **3.5 Aquatic Habitat and Fish Distribution**

#### **ASOTIN CREEK SUBBASIN**

The assessment of habitat conditions is derived from the Asotin Creek Sub-basin Plan, which assessed aquatic habitats for steelhead and salmon with the Ecosystem Diagnostic and Treatment (EDT) model. The EDT model was applied to Asotin Creek and Tenmile Creek; the results from

Tenmile Creek were applied to Couse Creek. Based on the EDT analysis, the Sub-basin Plan identified areas that currently have high production and should be protected (High Protection Value) and areas with the greatest potential for restoring life stages critical to increasing production (High Restoration Value), as shown presented in the Asotin Creek Subbasin Plan.

The areas with the highest restoration value in the Asotin Sub-basin are: Upper Asotin (Headgate Dam to Forks), Lower George Creek, Lower North Fork Asotin Creek, Charley Creek, and Lower South Fork Asotin Creek. Within these priority areas, the most negatively impacted life stages were identified for steelhead and spring Chinook. In each of these areas, the key environmental factors that contribute to losses in focal species performance, i.e. limiting factors, were also identified. Key limiting factors for these areas are shown in Table A-2 for steelhead and spring Chinook. Flow was identified as a primary limiting factor only in the Lower George Creek.

Geographic Area	Aquatic Habitat Attributes							
	Large Woody Debris	Confinement	Riparian Function	Sediment	Key Habitat (pools)	Temperature	Flow	Bedscour
Upper Asotin Creek	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Lower George Creek	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Lower North Fork Asotin Creek	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Charley Creek	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
Lower South Fork Asotin Creek	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		

\*Source: Asotin Subbasin Plan

Priority protection geographic areas for steelhead and salmon include all geographic areas identified for restoration plus the Upper North Fork Asotin Creek, Upper South Fork Asotin Creek, Upper George Creek, North Fork Asotin Tributaries, and the Headwater (upper ends of George Creek, Charley Creek, North Fork Asotin Creek, and South Fork Asotin Creek).

The Subbasin Plan identifies temperature as being the most limiting factor in the sub-basin for bull trout, and concludes that protecting the upper reaches from degradation is the key to modifying or maintaining suitable temperatures for bull trout in the Asotin.

**MIDDLE SNAKE RIVER SUBBASIN**

The Middle Snake subbasin encompasses the Snake River, and the lands that drain into it, from Shoshone Falls to Hells Canyon Dam. Major tributaries include Malheur, Owyhee, Boise, Payette, Weiser, Powder, Burnt, and Bruneau rivers. The Middle Snake subbasin covers

approximately 8.3 million acres and includes 367 miles of the mainstem Snake River and numerous small tributaries.

Over 1,400 stream miles—including 10 reservoirs, 12 Snake River segments, 2 springs, and 95 tributary segments—have been classified as water quality limited in the subbasin under § 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (Some waterbodies are subject to differing criteria of multiple states). Nearly the entire length of the mainstem Snake River in the subbasin is listed as water quality impaired. The major water quality issues in the Snake River develop from a variety of point and nonpoint sources include excessive sediment loading, elevated temperatures, reduced flows, reduced dissolved oxygen, excessive aquatic plant growth, and nutrient enrichment. Pesticide presence is also a substantial concern in the upper portions of the subbasin.

The assessment of habitat conditions for the Middle Snake River sub-basin is derived from the Lower Snake Sub-basin Plan, which assessed aquatic habitats for steelhead and salmon with the Ecosystem Diagnostic and Treatment (EDT) model from the mouth of the Snake River to the confluence with the Clearwater River. The EDT model was applied to Deadman Creek, Almota Creek, Alpowa Creek, and Penawawa Creek. Based on the EDT analysis, the Sub-basin Plan identified areas that currently have high production and should be protected (High Protection Value) and areas with the greatest potential for restoring life stages critical to increasing production (High Restoration Value), as presented in the Lower Snake River Subbasin Plan.

The SRSRP and subbasin plan has identified the following fish species as focal species within the Middle Snake Implementation Area.

Snake River steelhead	<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>
Spring and Summer Chinook	<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>
Bull trout	<i>Salvelinus confluentus</i>

The areas with the highest restoration value in the Middle Snake River Sub-basin are: Almota Creek, Deadman Creek, Alpowa Creek, and Penawawa Creek. Within these priority areas, the most negatively impacted life stages were identified for steelhead. In each of these areas, the key environmental factors that contribute to losses in focal species performance, i.e. limiting factors, were also identified (see Table A-3). Key limiting factors for steelhead included the following: sediment, large woody debris, key habitat (pools) riparian function, stream confinement, summer water temperature, bedscour and flow.

**Table A-3**  
**Key Limiting Habitat Attributes in Priority Restoration Geographic Areas\***  
**Middle Snake River Sub-basin**

Geographic Area	Aquatic Habitat Attributes							
	Large Woody Debris	Confinement	Riparian Function	Sediment	Key Habitat (pools)	Temperature	Flow	Bedscour
Almota Creek	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Deadman Creek	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Alpowa Creek	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Penawawa Creek	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

\*Source: Middle Snake River Subbasin Plan

Priority protection geographic areas for steelhead include all geographic areas identified for restoration, including:

- Almota Creek – from the mouth up the mainstem to the forks, and then up the North Branch.
- Deadman Creek – starting at Ping Gulch and continuing up to the forks and up South Fork Deadman to the steelhead access limit.
- Alpowa Creek – reach to be determined
- Penawawa Creek – reach to be determined.

#### **TUCANNON SUBBASIN (INCLUDING PATAHA SUBBASIN)**

The Tucannon Subbasin encompasses 503 square miles in Garfield and Columbia counties drained by the Tucannon River and its tributaries. Pataha Creek is the Tucannon's major tributary and has been identified as a major contributor of sediment to the Tucannon River. Several reaches of the Tucannon River have been found to exceed the state water quality standards for temperature and have been included on Ecology's 303(d) list of impaired waters.

EDT analysis in coordination with results from related assessment and planning documents (Limiting Factors Analysis, Tucannon Subbasin Summary, Tucannon Model Watershed Plan, etc.) identified the Tucannon River summer steelhead and spring/fall Chinook salmon having high production and should be protected (High Protection Value) and areas with the greatest potential for restoring life stages critical to increasing production (High Restoration Value).

The areas with the highest restoration value in the Tucannon Subbasin are: Tucannon River from Pataha-Marengo, Tucannon River from Marengo-Tumalum, Tucannon River from Tumalum-Hatchery, Tucannon River from Hatchery-Little Tucannon, and Mountain Tucannon. Within

these priority areas, the most negatively impacted life stages were identified for steelhead and spring Chinook. In each of these areas, the key environmental factors that contribute to losses in focal species performance, i.e. limiting factors, were also identified. Key limiting factors for steelhead and spring/fall Chinook included the following: sediment, large woody debris, key habitat (pools), riparian function, stream confinement, summer water temperature, and flow.

### **GRANDE RONDE SUBBASIN**

The lower Grande Ronde River was identified in the plan as “from the mouth to river mile 12”. This area was classified by EDT as a priority for restoration due to habitat limiting factors for steelhead and Chinook such as reduced habitat diversity, high sediment loads, high temperatures, and reduced habitat quantity. Other habitat limitations were listed as low summer flows, pathogens, competition with hatchery fish, and predation.

A relative absence of woody debris in this reach has caused the lack of habitat quantity and habitat diversity.

In the tributaries of the lower Grande Ronde River, the primary limiting factor affecting fish survival was sediment, which impacts the egg incubation life history stage of salmonids. Temperature, pathogens, and habitat quantity may also limit fish survival in these tributaries. Reduced habitat quantity is indicative of reduced channel wetted widths resulting from hydromodification/road construction.

Tributary reaches are the likely source of most identified sediment impacts in the Grande Ronde.

### ***Lower Joseph Creek***

The lower portion of Joseph Creek was identified in the plan as “from the mouth to river mile 3”. This area was classified by EDT as a priority for restoration due to habitat limiting factors for steelhead and Chinook such as habitat quantity and sediment. Other habitat limitations were listed as temperature, habitat diversity, and pathogens.

The limited habitat quantity for juvenile rearing is indicative of reduced channel wetted widths, due to hydromodification associated with road construction. Incubation life history stages were impacted by the reduction in availability of suitable gravels. Pathogens present a potential of whirling disease in the subbasin, however there is no indication that whirling disease is currently impacting fish populations. Flow is not a typical limiting factor in this area.

Through EDT, the five highest priority restoration areas in the Grande Ronde subbasin were identified. Of these five areas, the lower Grande Ronde, lower Grande Ronde tributaries, and lower Joseph Creek were included as high priorities for restoration as shown in Table A-4.

**Table A-4  
High Priority Restoration Reaches Identified by EDT**

<b>Geographic Area</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Primary Limiting Factors</b>
Lower Grande Ronde Mainstem	Mouth to River Mile 12	Habitat Quantity Habitat Diversity
Lower Grande Ronde Tributaries	Mouth to River Mile 12	Habitat Quantity Sediment
Lower Joseph Creek	Mouth to River Mile 3	Habitat Quantity Sediment

Source: Grande Ronde Subbasin Plan, 2004.

## **4 Statewide Environmental Impact Statement for Watershed Planning**

This section briefly describes the statewide EIS being adopted, and provides an assessment of the adequacy of the statewide EIS to address the environmental issues associated with the actions related to implementation of the WRIA 35 Watershed Management Plan.

### **4.1 Overview of Statewide EIS**

The Environmental Impact Statement for Watershed Planning under Chapter 90.82 RCW (statewide EIS) was produced July 18, 2003, by the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology). Ecology produced the statewide EIS at the request of the 2001 State Legislature to serve as a “template” for environmental review under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) for local approval of watershed plans. The intent was to develop a statewide EIS that could be adopted in whole or in part by SEPA lead agencies as part of local watershed plan approval processes.

The Statewide EIS describes the watershed planning process set forth in the Watershed Planning Act. It describes the existing framework of federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and programs that affect, or are related to management of watersheds. It also evaluates the impacts of, and identifies mitigation measures for, various types or classes of recommended actions that may be included in watershed plans. These generic recommended actions include both non-project and project actions, and were developed based on input from lead agencies for watershed plans and Ecology watershed leads working with planning units. Generic 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 “no action” alternative for each of the four components is also analyzed. A draft EIS was distributed on March 28, 2003 for a 45 day comment period. The final EIS includes comments received regarding the draft, as well as Ecology’s responses to comments, and is dated July 18, 2003. The complete EIS is available on Ecology’s website, at <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/biblio/0306013.html>.

### **4.2 Review of Statewide EIS**

An evaluation of the statewide EIS was conducted to ensure that the document was appropriate for the SEPA review and approval of the WRIA 35 Watershed Management Plan. The Plan



contains both broad planning objectives and strategies (non-project actions) and specific recommendations (project actions); some of these actions are basin-wide and some are specific to implementation areas. Actions (both non-project and project actions) proposed within the Plan are evaluated against the generic actions evaluated within the statewide EIS to determine:

- 1) Whether the generic actions analyzed by the statewide EIS encompass the proposed WRIA 35 actions (non-project and project); and
- 2) Whether the identification and review of environmental issues related to the generic actions described in the statewide EIS is adequate for the needs of a SEPA review.

A side-by-side comparison of the recommended actions within the WRIA 35 Plan and the generic actions evaluated by the statewide EIS, broken out by implementation area, is presented in the following tables:

Table 6-1 Asotin Creek Implementation Area

Table 6-2 Middle Snake River Implementation Area

Table 6-3 Pataha Creek Implementation Area

Table 6-4 Tucannon River Implementation Area

Table 6-5 Grande Ronde Implementation Area

The following assumptions and considerations were used in comparing the actions within the WRIA 35 Plan and the statewide EIS:

- Actions listed in the statewide EIS are listed in the tables by their number within Chapter 6 of the statewide EIS; Chapter 6 of the statewide EIS provides the analyses of environmental impacts and potential mitigation measures for the actions.
- It is assumed that the statewide EIS provides an adequate review of potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures for the actions assessed within it, and that no further review of the potential environmental impact of those actions is necessary.
- An action from the WRIA 35 Plan may be comparable to one or more statewide EIS actions. Only those statewide EIS actions that provide the most direct comparison are listed.
- If there is no statewide EIS action that compares to the action described in the WRIA 35 Plan, “no action” is entered in the comparison tables.
- Some of the “actions” identified in the WRIA 35 Plan are actually recommendations for further study, data gathering, or planning and/or coordination between agencies, and do not constitute an action requiring review under SEPA. These are indicated with a “Not applicable, action not determined” finding under the determination of the adequacy of the SEPA review.

As shown in the side-by-side comparison provided in tables A-6 to A-10 the actions recommended within the WRIA 35 Plan are comparable to the actions reviewed within the statewide EIS. In all cases where the statewide EIS did not provide a comparable action to the WRIA 35 Plan recommendation, it was determined that the Plan recommendation was not a true “action” as defined by SEPA, and no environmental review was required. The statewide EIS is therefore determined to provide an adequate review of the potential environmental impacts of the actions recommended within the WRIA 35 Watershed Management Plan.

**Table A-6  
Asotin Creek Implementation Area Actions**

WRIA 35 Action No.	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
<b>Water Quantity Management</b>						
1	AC1	Individual irrigators (throughout area)	ACCD	Improve irrigation efficiencies, including conveyance and application methods.	6.2 Develop and Implement Agricultural Conservation And Irrigation Efficiency	Adequate
2	AC1	Individual irrigators (throughout area)	ACCD	Upgrade diversions to include meters where needed	6.14 Increase Enforcement Against Illegal Water Use 6.18 Install and Operate Water Quantity Monitoring Devices	Adequate
3	AC1	Owners/operators of Non-exempt wells throughout area	Ecology	Upgrade wells to include meters where needed	6.14 Increase Enforcement Against Illegal Water Use 6.18 Install and Operate Water Quantity Monitoring Devices	Adequate
4	AC2	Asotin Creek	USGS, Ecology, Asotin PUD, and USFS	Continue instream flow monitoring through permanent and seasonal gauges on Asotin Creek.	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
5	AC4	City of Asotin	City of Asotin	Characterize ground water conditions to determine if an additional withdrawal from ground water are sustainable	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
6	AC4	City of Asotin	City of Asotin	Seek additional water rights to develop additional water supply from ground water to provide future needs of City of Asotin, if study determines withdrawals are sustainable	6.10 Allocate Additional Ground Or Surface Water	Adequate
<b>Water Quality Management</b>						

**Table A-6  
Asotin Creek Implementation Area Actions**

WRIA 35 Action No.	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
7	AC5	Asotin Creek, Tenmile Creek, Couse Creek	Ecology, DOH, County Health, ACCD, Asotin County and USFS	Identify sources and implement the following strategies to reduce fecal coliform levels on Asotin Creek: 1. 2. upgrade or connect septic to sewer 3. explore opportunities for regionalization of wastewater treatment plant 4. connect fringe rural areas to urban sewer systems	6.34 Modify Farm Plans To Prevent Nonpoint Pollution	Adequate
8	AC5 AC15	Asotin Creek		Implement the following strategies to reduce TSS levels at the mouth of Asotin Creek: 1. direct seed 2. upland management BMPs 3. riparian improvement 4. CRP 5. grassed waterways 6. sediment basins 7. weed control 8. grazing management 9. cross fencing 10. alternative water sources 11. manure management (livestock operations)	6.34 Modify Farm Plans To Prevent Nonpoint Pollution 6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects 6.50 Control Sources Of Sediment	Adequate
9	AC7	Lower George Creek, Upper Asotin Creek, and Lower S Fork Asotin Creek	WDFW/ACCD/Nez Perce Tribe, and USFS	Implement strategies to reduce water temperatures:	6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects	Adequate

**Table A-6  
Asotin Creek Implementation Area Actions**

WRIA 35 Action No.	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
10	AC16	Drainage facilities on rural roads	Asotin and Garfield Counties	Implement the following strategies to improve stormwater management and treatment and increase groundwater infiltration: 1. sediment basins 2. infiltration trenches 3. swales/wetlands 4. rural/urban drainage ditch upgrades	6.5 Construct And Operate Water Reclamation And Reuse Facilities 6.24 Construct And Operate Artificial Recharge Storage Projects	Adequate
11	AC6	Entire IA	Asotin and Garfield Counties	Identify and designate aquifer recharge areas	6.24 Construct And Operate Artificial Recharge Storage Projects	Adequate
12	AC6	Entire IA	Asotin and Garfield Counties	Protect known aquifer recharge areas through critical area ordinances	6.35 Implement Water Quality Plans More Fully 6.38 Modify GMA Comprehensive Plans To Reduce Nonpoint Pollution 6.40 Modify Local Regulations To Reduce Nonpoint Pollution	Adequate
13	AC17	Entire IA	NRCS, WSU Cooperative Extension Ecology	Work with individual landowners to review pesticide and fertilizer use; and to implement the following best management practices to limit water quality impacts: 1. restore riparian areas 2. urban/rural education 3. conservation tillage	6.34 Modify Farm Plans To Prevent Nonpoint Pollution 6.36 Implement Water Quality Public Education Program	Adequate

**Table A-6  
Asotin Creek Implementation Area Actions**

WRIA 35 Action No.	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
14	AC17	Entire IA	ACCD, PCD, NRCS, WDFW, USFS, and WSU Coop Extension	Establish and promote the following BMPs for erosion control for pasture and rangeland, cropland, and forest land: 1. maintain existing CRP acres (including exploring alternative funding) 2. conservation tillage 3. grass waterways 4. buffers 5. strip cropping 6. improve riparian grazing management	6.34 Modify Farm Plans To Prevent Nonpoint Pollution 6.36 Implement Water Quality Public Education Program	Adequate
15	AC 14	Anatone	ACCD, Ecology	Design and construct sewer collection and treatment facility for Anatone.	By 2010	Adequate
<b>Aquatic Habitat Enhancement</b>						

**Table A-6  
Asotin Creek Implementation Area Actions**

WRIA 35 Action No.	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
16	AC8	Almota Creek (mouth to Little Almota Creek, Little Almota Creek to Second Little Almota Creek, Second Little Almota Creek to unnamed right bank tributary, unnamed right bank tributary to fork), North Branch of Almota Creek: mouth to access limit, Tenmile Creek (mouth to seasonally dewatered area, dewatered area to Middle Branch.	WDFW/ACCD/Nez Perce Tribe	Implement passive restoration projects, including Conservation Reserve Expanded Program riparian buffers, conservation easements, and, where appropriate, upland projects designed to reduce sediment delivery and increase filtration	6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects 6.50 Control Sources Of Sediment 6.53 Acquire Property Or Conservation Easements To Protect Habitat	Adequate
17	AC9	Upper North Fork of Asotin Creek; Upper South Fork of Asotin Creek; Upper George Creek; Asotin Creek Headwaters areas in George Creek, Charlie Creek, North Fork and South Fork; Asotin Creek; North Fork of Asotin Creek tributaries: South Fork of North Fork Asotin Creek and Middle Branch.	WDFW/ACCD/Nez Perce Tribe and USFS	Implement aquatic habitat protection plans, including list of prioritized projects 1. enhancement restoration 2. protection and restoration of Asotin Creek 3. Asotin County fish screens 4. riparian buffers 5. upland sediment reduction 6. large woody debris placement 7. road decommissioning/realignment	6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects 6.50 Control Sources Of Sediment 6.53 Acquire Property Or Conservation Easements To Protect Habitat	Adequate

**Table A-6  
Asotin Creek Implementation Area Actions**

WRIA 35 Action No.	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
18	AC10	See project description	WDFW/ACCD/Nez Pierce Tribe and USFS	Remove/modify the following fish passage obstructions:	6.45 Replace Roadway Structures To Improve Fish Passage 6.46 Construct Fish Passage Facilities	Adequate
				Headgate Dam, Asotin Creek, river mile 9.1		
				Trent Grade culvert, George Creek, river mile 18.8		
				Asotin Road culvert, Charley Creek, river mile 0.2		
				Mill Creek Road culvert, Mill Creek, river mile 2.9		
Pond Dam, Tenmile Creek, river mile 15.3						
19	AC10	Entire IA	WDFW/ACCD/Nez Perce Tribe	Conduct inventory and analysis of other fish passage barriers, and prioritize for removal	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
20	AC10	Lower Asotin Creek, Middle Asotin Creek, Upper Asotin Creek, Lower George Creek, and Charley Creek	WDFW/ACCD/Nez Perce Tribe	Evaluate fish screens on water diversions for adequacy. Replace inadequate screens as necessary.	6.46 Construct Fish Passage Facilities	Adequate
21	AC7	Lower George Creek Upper Asotin Creek Lower South Fork Asotin Creek	Ecology, WDFW/ACCD/Nez Perce Tribe and USFS	Restore areas of degraded riparian vegetation on private and public land through activities such as CREP and CRP participation and site-specific BMPs (e.g. placement of large woody debris, long-term recruitment from riparian planting, restricting livestock access, etc.) with an early emphasis on the most degraded areas.	6.42 Implement Instream Habitat Improvement Projects 6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects	Adequate
22	AC9	Upper reaches/headwater areas	USFS, ACCD, PCD, NPT, CDs	Work with private and public landowners to maintain and enhance pristine and other areas of the headwaters by applying BMPs:	6.36 Implement Water Quality Public Education Program	Adequate

**Regulatory Actions**

**Table A-6  
Asotin Creek Implementation Area Actions**

WRIA 35 Action No.	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
23	AC3, AC6	Asotin Creek	WDFW and Ecology	Establish minimum instream flows for Asotin Creek. <b>See Appendix C.</b>	6.26 Set Instream Flows	Not applicable, specific action not determined
24	AC3	North Fork Asotin Creek, South Fork Asotin Creek (including Lick Creek) and Charley Creek	Ecology	Establish year-round stream closures in North Fork Asotin Creek, South Fork Asotin Creek (including Lick Creek) and Charley Creek (from WDFW property boundary to headwaters). <b>See Appendix C.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
25	AC9	Entire IA	Asotin and Garfield Counties, WDFW, USFS	Implement/enforce federal, state and local land use regulations to protect critical areas and pristine areas of the implementation area.	6.35 Implement Water Quality Plans More Fully	Adequate
26	AC9	Entire IA	Asotin and Garfield Counties, WDFW, USFS	Review and update, as needed, best-available-science-based riparian buffer zones and critical areas regulations.	6.38 Modify GMA Comprehensive Plans To Reduce Nonpoint Pollution 6.40 Modify Local Regulations To Reduce Nonpoint Pollution	Adequate
27	AC1, AC2, AC6	Entire IA	Ecology	Establish rule for use of groundwater in the gravel aquifer and basalt aquifers, specifically for the development of rural ("Exempt") wells. <b>See Appendix D.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
<b>Miscellaneous Studies</b>						
28	AC4	Entire IA	City of Asotin, Ecology	Conduct detailed hydrogeology study to understand basalt and alluvial ground water resources and identify sustainable levels of ground water withdrawals to meet City of Asotin needs. <b>See Appendix D.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
29	AC12	Entire IA	WDFW, CDs	Identify stream fords that could be eliminated by installing bridges or culverts. Pursue project funding	6.45 Replace Roadway Structures To Improve Fish Passage	Adequate



**Table A-6**  
**Asotin Creek Implementation Area Actions**

WRIA 35 Action No.	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
30	AC1, AC2, AC6	Entire IA	Ecology	Monitor groundwater levels in basalt aquifer to assess potential impacts of additional groundwater use, primarily with rural (“exempt”) wells. <b>See Appendix D.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
31	AC3	Charley Creek, George Creek, Pintler Creek and Tenmile Creek	Ecology	Conduct instream flow studies and develop instream flow recommendations for Charley, George, Pintler and Tenmile Creeks. <b>See Appendix C.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined

**Table A-7  
Middle Snake River Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
<b>Water Quantity Management</b>						
1	MS1	Alkali Flat Creek, Alpowa Creek, Deadman Creek, Meadow Gulch Creek, Penawawa Creek, South Meadow Creek, Wawawai Creek	USGS, Ecology, and Asotin PUD	Continue instream flow monitoring through permanent and seasonal gauges.	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
2	MS8	City of Clarkston and urban area	Asotin PUD	Characterize ground water conditions to determine if an additional withdrawals from ground water are sustainable	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
3	MS8	Entire IA	USGS, Ecology	Characterize basalt groundwater sources, availability and sustainability near Snake River and below, where basalt is connected to Snake River	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
4	MS8	Entire IA	USGS, Ecology	Sole source aquifer study	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
5	MS8	Entire IA	Ecology, irrigators	Characterize ground water conditions to determine if additional withdrawals to replace some of the existing surface water withdrawals for irrigation is possible and sustainable	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
6	MS8	Entire IA	Ecology, irrigators	Seek additional water rights to develop additional water supply from ground water to replace surface water withdrawals for irrigation if study determines withdrawal is sustainable	6.10 Allocate Additional Ground Or Surface Water	Not applicable, specific action not determined
<b>Water Quality Management</b>						
7	MS2	Alpowa Creek	Ecology, CD	Investigate sources and implement appropriate strategies to reduce fecal coliform levels on Alpowa Creek.	6.34 Modify Farm Plans To Prevent Nonpoint Pollution 6.32 Expedite TMDL Implementation	Adequate

**Table A-7  
Middle Snake River Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
8	MS1	Entire IA	Ecology	Continue water quality monitoring through permanent and seasonal gauges for temperature, fecal coliform, dissolved oxygen, sediment and TSS.	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
9	MS9	Drainage facilities on state rural roads	Asotin and Garfield Counties, WSDOT	Implement the following strategies to improve stormwater management and treatment and increase groundwater infiltration: 1. Implement rural road BMPs 2. Shaping/ grading 3. mowing vs. spraying	No EIS Action, but individual actions by various agencies would require individual SEPA reviews	Not applicable, specific action not determined
10	MS10	Entire IA	Asotin and Garfield Counties	Identify and designate aquifer recharge areas	6.24 Construct And Operate Artificial Recharge Storage Projects	Adequate
11	MS10 MS4	Entire IA, City of Clarkston	Asotin and Garfield Counties	Protect known aquifer recharge areas through critical area ordinances	6.35 Implement Water Quality Plans More Fully 6.38 Modify GMA Comprehensive Plans To Reduce Nonpoint Pollution 6.40 Modify Local Regulations TO Reduce Nonpoint Pollution	Adequate
12	MS13	Entire IA	WSU Cooperative Extension, Ecology	Work with individual landowners to review pesticide and fertilizer use; and to implement the following best management practices to limit water quality impacts: 1. restore riparian areas 2. urban/rural education programs 3. conservation tillage 4. urban runoff planning	6.34 Modify Farm Plans To Prevent Nonpoint Pollution 6.36 Implement Water Quality Public Education Program	Adequate

**Table A-7  
Middle Snake River Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
13	MS13	Entire IA, with early emphasis on Steptoe Creek	Asotin and Garfield Counties, NRCS, WDFW, USFS, and WSU Coop Extension	Establish and promote the following BMPs for erosion control for pasture and rangeland, cropland, and forest land: 1. noxious weed control 2. maintain existing CRP 3. conservation tillage 4. grass waterways 5. buffers 6. strip cropping 7. improve riparian grazing management	6.34 Modify Farm Plans To Prevent Nonpoint Pollution 6.36 Implement Water Quality Public Education Program	Adequate
<b>Aquatic Habitat Enhancement</b>						
14	MS4	Deadman /Meadow Creek, Penawawa Creek, and Alkali Flat Creek.	WDFW, CDs and Tribes	Implement aquatic habitat protection plans, including list of prioritized projects	6.42 Implement Instream Habitat Improvement Projects 6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects	Adequate
15	MS3	Deadman, Ping Creed to Lynn Gulch Creek; Deadman, Lynn Gulch to forks; and South Fork Deadman, mouth to access limit.	WDFW, CDs, Tribes	Implement passive restoration projects, including Conservation Reserve Expanded Program riparian buffers, conservation easements, land acquisition, and, where appropriate, upland projects designed to reduce sediment delivery and increase filtration	6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects 6.50 Control Sources Of Sediment 6.53 Acquire Property Or Conservation Easements To Protect Habitat	Adequate
16	MS5	Entire IA	WDFW and CD	Remove/modify the following fish passage obstructions: Headcut, Almota Creek, river mile 1.1 Lynn Gulch culvert, Deadman Creek, river mile 0.4 Perched culvert, Wawawai Creek, river mile 0.1 Sediment deposition in delta, Steptoe Creek, river mile 0.0	6.45 Replace Roadway Structures To Improve Fish Passage 6.46 Construct Fish Passage Facilities	Adequate

**Table A-7  
Middle Snake River Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
				1 <sup>st</sup> road crossing culvert, Steptoe Creek, river mile 0.2		
				2 <sup>nd</sup> road crossing culvert, Steptoe Creek, river mile 0.8		
				Headcut falls, Alkali Flat Creek, river mile 7.0		
17	MS12	Entire IA	WDFW and CDs	Conduct inventory and analysis of other fish passage barriers, and prioritize for removal	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
18	MS5	Deadman Creek	WDFW and CDs	Evaluate fish screens on water diversions for adequacy. Replace inadequate screens as necessary.	6.46 Construct Fish Passage Facilities	Adequate
19	MS11	Deadman Creek Steptoe Creek Wawawai Creek	Ecology, WDFW, CDs, and NRCS	Restore areas of degraded riparian vegetation on private and public land through activities such as CREP, CRP participation and site-specific BMPs (e.g. placement of large woody debris, long-term recruitment from riparian planting, restricting livestock access, etc.) with an early emphasis on the most degraded areas.	6.42 Implement Instream Habitat Improvement Projects 6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects	Adequate
<b>Regulatory Actions</b>						
20	MS4	Entire IA	Asotin, Garfield and Whitman Counties, WDFW	Implement/enforce federal, state and local land use regulations to protect critical areas and pristine areas of the implementation area.	6.35 Implement Water Quality Plans More Fully	Adequate
21	MS4	Entire IA	Asotin, Garfield, Columbia and Whitman Counties, WDFW	Review and update, as needed, best-available-science-based riparian buffer zones and critical areas regulations.	6.38 Modify GMA Comprehensive Plans To Reduce Nonpoint Pollution 6.40 Modify Local Regulations TO Reduce Nonpoint Pollution	Adequate
22	MS1, MS6	Entire IA	Ecology	Establish rule for use of groundwater in the gravel aquifer and basalt aquifers, specifically for the development of rural ("Exempt") wells. <b>See Appendix D.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
<b>Miscellaneous Studies</b>						

**Table A-7  
Middle Snake River Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
23	MS1, MS6	Entire IA	Ecology	Conduct detailed hydrogeology study to understand basalt and alluvial ground water resources and identify sustainable levels of ground water withdrawals to meet rural development needs and assess impacts to streamflows. <b>See Appendix D.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
24	MS2 MS3	Entire IA	WDFW, Asotin, Whitman, Garfield and Columbia Counties	Identify specific stream fords that could be eliminated by installing bridges or culverts. Pursue project funding.	6.45 Replace Roadway Structures To Improve Fish Passage	Adequate
25	MS1, MS6	Entire IA	Ecology	Monitor groundwater levels in basalt aquifer to assess potential impacts of additional groundwater use, primarily with rural ("exempt") wells. <b>See Appendix D.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
26	MS1, MS12	Alpowa Creek and Almota Creek	Ecology	Conduct instream flow studies and develop instream flow recommendations for Alpowa Creek and Almota Creek. <b>See Appendix C.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined

**Table A-8  
Pataha Creek Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
<b>Water Quantity Management</b>						
1	PC1	Pataha Creek	USGS and Ecology	Continue/expand instream flow monitoring through permanent and seasonal gauges on Pataha Creek.	6.18 Install and Operate Water Quantity Monitoring Devices	Adequate
2	PC2	City of Pomeroy	City of Pomeroy, Ecology	Characterize ground water conditions to determine if an additional withdrawals from ground water are sustainable	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
3	PC2	City of Pomeroy	City of Pomeroy, Ecology	Develop additional water supply from ground water to provide future needs of City of Pomeroy if study determines withdrawals are sustainable	6.10 Allocate Additional Ground Or Surface Water	Adequate
4	PC2	Pataha IA	Ecology, irrigators, PCD, CCD	Characterize ground water conditions to determine if additional withdrawals to replace some of the existing surface water withdrawals for irrigation is possible and sustainable	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
5	PC7	Pataha IA	Ecology, irrigators, PCD, CCD	Seek additional water rights to develop additional water supply from ground water to replace surface water withdrawals for irrigation if study determines withdrawal is sustainable	6.10 Allocate Additional Ground Or Surface Water	Adequate
6	PC8	Entire IA	Irrigators, PCD, CCD, WDFW, Ecology	Identify opportunities for irrigation efficiency	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
7	PC6	Lower Pataha	WDFW, PCD, CCD, Ecology	Implement pilot project to encourage beaver activity for multi-purpose storage through dams, wetlands and water retention	6.20 Raise And Operate Existing On-Channel Storage Facilities 6.21 Construct And Operate New Off-Channel Storage Facilities 6.22 Raise And Operate Existing Off-Channel Storage Facilities	Adequate
<b>Water Quality Management</b>						

**Table A-8  
Pataha Creek Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
8	PC6	Pataha IA	Ecology, PCD, CCD, Garfield County	Implement the following strategies to reduce fecal coliform levels in Pataha Creek.. 1. identify failing septic systems 2. restore riparian buffers 3. manage grazing in riparian	6.32 Expedite TMDL Implementation	Adequate
9	PC3	Lower & middle Pataha Creek	Ecology, PCD, CCD, individual landowners	Implement the following strategies to reduce TSS levels in Pataha Creek by reducing the sediment load entering the creek: 1. CRP 2. conservation tillage 3. grass waterways 4. road decommissioning 5. buffers 6. strip cropping	6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects 6.50 Control Sources Of Sediment 6.34 Modify Farm Plans To Prevent Nonpoint Pollution	Adequate
10	PC3	Lower & middle Pataha Creek	Ecology, PCD, CCD	Implement the following strategies to reduce water temperatures: 1. riparian enhancement	6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects	Adequate
11	PC9	Entire IA	Ecology and Garfield County	Protect known aquifer recharge areas through critical area ordinances; include areas necessary to protect City of Pomeroy's water source (spring).	6.35 Implement Water Quality Plans More Fully 6.38 Modify GMA Comprehensive Plans To Reduce Nonpoint Pollution 6.40 Modify Local Regulations To Reduce Nonpoint Pollution	Adequate
12	PC10	Entire IA	WSU Cooperative Extension, Ecology, NRCS	Work with individual landowners to review pesticide and fertilizer use; and to implement best management practices to limit water quality impacts: 1. restore riparian areas 2. urban/rural education 3. conservation tillage	6.34 Modify Farm Plans To Prevent Nonpoint Pollution 6.36 Implement Water Quality Public Education Program	Adequate



**Table A-8  
Pataha Creek Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
13	PC10	Entire IA	PCD, CCD, NRCS, WDFW, USFS, and WSU Coop Extension	Establish and promote the following BMPs for erosion control for pasture and rangeland, cropland, and forest land: 1. conservation tillage 2. grass waterways 3. buffers 4. strip cropping 5. improve riparian grazing	6.34 Modify Farm Plans To Prevent Nonpoint Pollution 6.36 Implement Water Quality Public Education Program	Adequate
<b>Aquatic Habitat Enhancement</b>						
14	PC5	Entire IA	WDFW and CDs	Conduct inventory and analysis of fish passage barriers, and prioritize for removal	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
15	PC5	Pataha Creek	WDFW and CDs	Evaluate fish screens on water diversions for adequacy. Replace inadequate screens as necessary.	6.46 Construct Fish Passage Facilities	Adequate
16	PC4 PC11	Entire IA	USFS, WDFW, Ecology and CDs	Restore areas of degraded riparian vegetation on private and public land through activities such as CREP, CRP participation and site-specific BMPs (e.g. placement of large woody debris, long-term recruitment from riparian planting, restricting livestock access, etc.) with an early emphasis on the most degraded areas:	6.42 Implement INstream habitat Improvement Projects 6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects	Adequate
17	PC11	Entire IA	WDFW and CDs	Restore areas of degraded riparian vegetation on private and public land through conservation easements with an early emphasis on the most degraded areas:	6.53 Acquire Property Or Conservation Easements To Protect Habitat	Adequate
18	PC10	Entire IA	USFS, Garfield County	Work with private and public landowners to use best management practices to maintain and enhance pristine and other areas of the headwaters by applying BMPs.	6.36 Implement Water Quality Public Education Program	Adequate
19	PC5	See project descriptions	PCD, CCD, WSDOT,	Remove/modify fish passage obstructions	6.45 Replace Roadway Structures To Improve Fish	Adequate

**Table A-8  
Pataha Creek Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
			Garfield County, City of Pomeroy	Highway 261 Culvert at Delaney, Pataha Creek, river mile 1.3 Dodge Bridge, Pataha Creek, river mile 10.8 20 <sup>th</sup> St Sewer Line (City of Pomeroy), Pataha Creek, river mile 25.7 Rock Shelf, Pataha Creek, river mile 35.2 Old Bihmaier Dam, Bihmaier Gulch Creek, river mile 1.1 Steven's Ridge Culvert, Pataha Creek, river mile 43.8 Dry Pataha Dam, Dry Pataha Creek, river mile 0.4	6.46 Construct Fish Passage Facilities	
<b>Regulatory Actions</b>						
20	PC9	Entire IA	Garfield County, WDFW, USFS	Update, implement/enforce federal, state and local land use regulations to protect critical areas and pristine areas of the implementation area.	6.35 Implement Water Quality Plans More Fully 6.38 Modify GMA Comprehensive Plans To Reduce Nonpoint Pollution 6.40 Modify Local Regulations To Reduce Nonpoint Pollution	Adequate
21	PC7	Entire IA	Ecology	Establish rule for use of groundwater in the gravel aquifer and basalt aquifers, specifically for the development of rural ("Exempt") wells. <b>See Appendix D.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
<b>Miscellaneous Studies</b>						
22		Lower Pataha	Garfield County, Ecology	Conduct detailed hydrogeology study to understand basalt and alluvial ground water resources and identify sustainable levels of ground water withdrawals to meet needs. <b>See Appendix D.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined

**Table A-8  
Pataha Creek Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
23	PC1, PC7	Entire IA	Ecology	Monitor groundwater levels in basalt aquifer to assess potential impacts of additional groundwater use, primarily with rural (“exempt”) wells. <b>See Appendix D.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
24	PC4	Entire IA	WDFW and CD	Identify specific stream fords that could be eliminated by installing bridges or culverts. Pursue funding:	6.45 Replace Roadway Structures To Improve Fish Passage	Adequate
25	PC1	Garfield County	Ecology	Identify number of water users and amount of water involved with 1913 Garfield County Adjudication	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
26	PC12	Pomeroy	Garfield County	Review permitting and managed growth practices in lieu of future water needs, public health, and post-fire redevelopment activities (including identification of non-permitted diversions and discharges; permitted structures; growth management issues; water supply and public health issues)	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
27	PC1	Pataha Creek	Ecology	Conduct instream flow studies and develop instream flow recommendations for Pataha Creek. <b>See Appendix C.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined

**Table A-9  
Tucannon River Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
<b>Water Quantity Management</b>						
1	TR2	Tucannon River	USGS and Ecology	Implement instream flow monitoring through permanent and seasonal gauges on Tucannon River.	6.18 Install and Operate Water Quantity Monitoring Devices	
2	TR12	Entire IA	Ecology, irrigators,	Characterize ground water conditions to determine if additional withdrawals from ground water (up to 3629 afy) is sustainable	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
3	TR13	Entire IA	Ecology, irrigators,	Replace surface water withdrawals for agricultural irrigation with ground water sources if study determines withdrawal is sustainable and practicable; source substitution could be implemented during low flow periods or permanently where feasible.	6.10 Allocate Additional Ground Or Surface Water	Adequate
4	TR12	Entire IA	Columbia County, Ecology	Conduct detailed hydrogeology study to understand basalt and alluvial ground water resources and identify sustainable levels of ground water withdrawals that could potentially replace surface water diversions.	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
5	TR13	Entire IA	Ecology, WDFW	Identify wetland storage projects	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
6	TR17	Entire IA	Ecology, CCD	Explore opportunities for water right leases and/or acquisitions through the WDOE Trust Water Program and/or water banking.	6.15 Identify Water Rights Subject To Relinquishment	Not applicable, specific action not determined

**Table A-9  
Tucannon River Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
<b>Water Quality Management</b>						
7	TR14	Tucannon River	CCD, Ecology	Conduct a study to current condition and sources of water quality including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determining if the inputs of the Pataha River are impacting water quality in the Tucannon River.</li> <li>Identifying sources of fecal coliform</li> <li>Determining the natural temperature ranges for the Tucannon River</li> <li>Collecting data in accordance with Ecology standards for use in developing state-required TMDLs</li> </ul>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
8	TR5	Tucannon River	Ecology, Columbia County	Implement the following strategies to reduce fecal coliform levels at mouth of Tucannon River: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>septic system repair and/or upgrade</li> <li>livestock BMPs</li> <li>regulation of point sources</li> <li></li> </ol>	6.32 Expedite TMDL Implementation  6.34 Modify Farm Plans TO Prevent Nonpoint Pollution	Adequate
9	TR5	Tucannon River Uplands	Ecology, Columbia County, individual landowners, CCD	Implement the following strategies to reduce TSS levels by reducing the sediment load entering the River: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>conservation tillage</li> <li>grassed waterways</li> <li>sediment basins improve riparian function</li> <li></li> <li>reduce erosion from public and private roads (via maintenance or non-dirt materials)</li> </ol>	6.34 Modify Farm Plans To Prevent Nonpoint Pollution  6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects  6.50 Control Sources Of Sediment	Adequate
10	TR5	Entire IA	CD, NRCS	Identify opportunities for funding for landowners to reduce sediment from private roads	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined

**Table A-9  
Tucannon River Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
11	TR15	Tucannon River	Ecology, Columbia County	Continue ongoing strategies to reduce water temperatures: 1. restore riparian areas	6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects	
12	TR15		WSU Cooperative Extension, Ecology, WADOT	Work with individual landowners to review pesticide and fertilizer use; and to implement the following best management practices to limit water quality impacts: 1. non-chemical weed control practices (mowing, etc) of ditches and ROWs 2. restore riparian areas 3. urban/rural education 4. conservation tillage	6.34 Modify Farm Plans To Prevent Nonpoint Pollution 6.36 Implement Water Quality Public Education Program	Adequate
13	TR15	Entire IA	Columbia County, NRCS, WDFW, USFS, and WSU Coop Extension	Establish and promote the following BMPs for erosion control for pasture and rangeland, cropland, and forest land: 1. creation and maintenance of county ROW buffers 2. agricultural BMPs to buffer agricultural feeds next to roadways 3. conservation tillage 4. grass waterways, buffers and strip cropping	6.34 Modify Farm Plans To Prevent Nonpoint Pollution 6.36 Implement Water Quality Public Education Program 6.40 Modify Local Regulations To Reduce Nonpoint Pollution	Adequate
<b>Aquatic Habitat Enhancement</b>						
14	TR16		WDFW, USFS	Prioritize funds for post-fire restoration (School Fire) on public lands	No Action	Adequate

**Table A-9  
Tucannon River Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
15	TR8, TR9	Tucannon River reaches including Pataha-Marengo, Marengo-Tumalum, <i>Tumalum-Hatchery</i> , <i>Hatchery-Little Tucannon</i> [designated priority projects in the Salmon Recovery Plan, after the 2005 School Fire], and the Mountain Tucannon (Tucannon River, Little Tucannon River to Bear Creek access limit)	WDFW, USFS, CCD, Tribes, and County Weed Board	Implement aquatic habitat protection and restoration plans; including the following priority projects: 1. sediment reduction 2. enhancement of habitat in riparian zones 3. control noxious weeds 4. planting native vegetation 5. Hartssock Creek retention pond 6. School Fire riparian recovery 7. Tucannon Steelhead Captive Brood Program 8. Tucannon Spring Chinook Hatchery Supplementation	6.42 Implement Instream Habitat Improvement Projects 6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects	Adequate
16	TR10	Entire IA	Ecology, WDFW, USDA, WSCC, and CCD	Restore areas of degraded riparian vegetation on private and public land through ongoing activities such as CREP and CRP participation and site-specific BMPs (e.g. placement of large woody debris, long-term recruitment from riparian planting, restricting livestock access, etc.) with an early emphasis on the most degraded areas.	6.42 Implement Instream Habitat Improvement Projects 6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects	Adequate
17	TR10	Entire IA	WSCC, and CCD	Develop a pilot project to restore areas of degraded riparian vegetation on private and public land through conservation easements with an early emphasis on the most degraded areas and provide education/outreach on the potential use of easements as a watershed tool	6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects 6.53 Acquire Property Or Conservation Easements To Protect Habitat	Adequate

**Table A-9  
Tucannon River Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
18	TR9	Entire IA	USFS, Columbia County	Work with public land and wildlife management agencies to maintain and enhance pristine and other areas of the headwaters, with specific focus on the post-School Fire recovery area, by applying BMPs:	6.36 Implement Water Quality Public Education Program	Adequate
19	TR11	Entire IA	WDFW, Conservation District, and City of Starbuck	Remove fish passage obstructions, including: Tucannon River, Starbuck Dam (RM 5.5) [improve function of existing ladder] Tucannon River, Irrigation Weir (RM 13.5) Tucannon River, Hatchery Dam (RM 38.4) Tucannon River, Curl Lake Weir (RM 43)	6.45 Replace Roadway Structures To Improve Fish Passage  6.46 Construct Fish Passage Facilities	Adequate
20	TR3	Tucannon River, Marengo-Tumalum	WDFW and Conservation District	Continue to provide surface water diversions with effective fish screens and identify if additional screens are needed with the subbasin	6.46 Construct Fish Passage Facilities	Adequate
<b>Regulatory Actions</b>						
21	TR3	Tucannon River	Ecology	Establish minimum instream flows for Tucannon River at Lower Tucannon River and Marengo gauge sites. <b>See Appendix C.</b>	6.26 Set Instream Flows	Not applicable, specific action not determined
22	TR17	Entire IA	Columbia County, WDFW, USFS	Implement/enforce federal, state and local land use regulations to protect critical areas and pristine areas of the implementation area.	6.35 Implement Water Quality Plans More Fully	Adequate
23	TR18	Entire IA	Planning Unit	Recommend to the state legislature to accommodate water spreading by existing water right holders	NA	NA



**Table A-9  
Tucannon River Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
24	TR18	Entire IA	Planning Unit	Recommend to the state legislature to change water right statutes to allow maintenance of original appropriation date for surface water diversions that are transferred to ground water	NA	NA
25	TR1, TR4	Entire IA	Ecology	Establish rule for use of groundwater in the gravel aquifer and basalt aquifers, specifically for the development of rural ("Exempt") wells. <b>See Appendix D.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
<b>Miscellaneous Studies</b>						
26	TR8	Entire IA Tributaries to the Tucannon River	WDFW, CCD and Columbia County	Identify specific stream fords that could be eliminated by installing bridges or culverts. Pursue project funding.	6.45 Replace Roadway Structures To Improve Fish Passage	Adequate
27	TR12	Entire IA	Columbia County, Ecology	Conduct detailed hydrogeology study to understand basalt and alluvial ground water resources and identify sustainable levels of ground water withdrawals to meet needs. <b>See Appendix D.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
28	TR1, TR2, TR12	Entire IA	Columbia County, Ecology	Monitor groundwater levels in basalt aquifer to assess potential impacts of additional groundwater use, primarily with rural ("exempt") wells. <b>See Appendix D.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined

**Table A-10  
Grande Ronde Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
<b>Water Quantity Management</b>						
1	GR3	Rattlesnake Creek Cottonwood Creek Cougar Creek Menatchee Creek Crooked Creek Butte Creek North Fork Wenaha River	USGS, Ecology	Installation of additional instream flow gauges with focus on perennial streams with potential fish habitat.	6.18 Install and Operate Water Quantity Monitoring Devices	Adequate
2	GR8	USGS 13334000 USGS 13333000 Ecology 35G060	USGS, Ecology	Continued instream flow monitoring at seasonal and permanent gauging locations.	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
3	GR3	Area-wide	WDFW, ACCD, Nez Perce	Modify surface water diversions to meet NOAA fish passage standards where necessary	6.46 Construct Fish Passage Facilities	Adequate
4	GR1	Area-wide	Ecology	Continue installing water use meters to surface water and groundwater diversions	6.14 Increase Enforcement Against Illegal Water Use  6.18 Install and Operate Water Quantity Monitoring Devices	Adequate
5	GR2	Grande Ronde mainstem Joseph Creek	Irrigators, ACCD, DOE and Ecology	Ensure adequate water supply for irrigation by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Upgrading low efficiency systems</li> <li>2. Changes in irrigation timing</li> <li>3. Storage for periods of low availability</li> </ol>	6.2 Develop And Implement Agricultural Conservation And Irrigation Efficiency  6.24 Construct And Operate Artificial Recharge Storage Projects	Adequate
<b>Water Quality Management</b>						

**Table A-10  
Grande Ronde Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
6	GR8	Rattlesnake Creek Cottonwood Creek Cougar Creek Menatchee Creek Crooked Creek Butte Creek North Fork Wenaha River Joseph Creek Lower Grande Ronde River	USFS, Ecology, ACCD, NPT	Implement a regular water quality monitoring program that will identify contributions to high instream temperatures, fecal coliform and sediment delivery from tributaries	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
7	GR3	USGS 13334000 Ecology 35C070	USGS, Ecology	Continued water quality monitoring at existing locations.	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
8	GR6	Rattlesnake Creek Cottonwood Creek Cougar Creek Menatchee Creek Crooked Creek Butte Creek North Fork Wenaha River Joseph Creek Lower Grande Ronde River	ACCD, USFS, Landowners	Implement the following actions to reduce suspended sediments from tributary streams: 1. no-till 2. grass waterways 3. buffers and strip cropping	6.34 Modify Farm Plans To Prevent Nonpoint Pollution 6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects 6.50 Control Sources Of Sediment	Adequate
9	GR9	Grande Ronde River	ACCD, Landowners, Ecology, Asotin County, NPT	Implement the following actions to reduce fecal coliform levels on the Grande Ronde: 1. manure management 2. riparian enhancement 3. riparian grazing management	6.34 Modify Farm Plans To Prevent Nonpoint Pollution	Adequate
<b>Aquatic Habitat Enhancement</b>						

**Table A-10  
Grande Ronde Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
10	GR9 GR4	Rattlesnake Creek Cottonwood Creek Cougar Creek Menatchee Creek Crooked Creek Butte Creek North Fork Wenaha River Joseph Creek Lower Grande Ronde River	ACCD, Landowners, Ecology, NPT, USFWS	Implement actions to reduce instream temperatures within Grande Ronde mainstem and tributaries:	6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects	Adequate
11	GR6, GR5	Area-wide	WDFW, USFWS, ACCD, NPT	Develop aquatic habitat restoration plans.	6.42 Implement Instream Habitat Improvement Projects  6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects	Adequate
12	GR6	ESA Stream that are CREP Eligible	ACCD	Restore areas of degraded riparian area through CREP or permanent conservation easements	6.47 Implement Out-Of-Stream Habitat Improvement Projects  6.53 Acquire Property Or Conservation Easements To Protect Habitat	Adequate
13	GR6	Area-wide	WDFW, ACCD, NPT, USFWS	Address barriers to fish passage such as;  1. Improperly screened diversions 2. Inadequate culvert modifications	6.45 Replace Roadway Structures To Improve Fish Passage 6.46 Construct Fish Passage Facilities	Adequate
14	GR6	Rattlesnake Creek Cottonwood Creek Cougar Creek Menatchee Creek Crooked Creek	ACCD	Improve degraded channel conditions where necessary	6.42 Implement Instream Habitat Improvement Projects	Adequate

**Regulatory Actions**

**Table A-10  
Grande Ronde Implementation Area Actions**

Action (non-prioritized)	Supported Objectives	Location	Lead Agency	Description	Corresponding Statewide EIS Action	Adequacy for SEPA Review
15	GR8	Entire IA	Ecology	Establish rule for use of groundwater in the gravel aquifer and basalt aquifers, specifically for the development of rural ("Exempt") wells. <b>See Appendix D.</b>	6.26 Set Instream Flows	Not applicable, specific action not determined
<b>Miscellaneous Studies</b>						
16	GR8	Grande Ronde mainstem and tributary riparian zones	Planning Unit Asotin County	Develop a more complete knowledge of land uses that impact water quality, water quantity, and aquatic habitat	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
17	GR8	Entire IA	Ecology	Conduct detailed hydrogeology study to understand basalt and alluvial ground water resources and identify sustainable levels of ground water withdrawals to meet needs. <b>See Appendix D.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
18	GR3, GR8	Entire IA	Ecology	Monitor groundwater levels in basalt aquifer to assess potential impacts of additional groundwater use, primarily with rural ("exempt") wells. <b>See Appendix D.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined
19	GR7	Joseph Creek	Ecology	Conduct instream flow studies and develop instream flow recommendations for Joseph Creek. <b>See Appendix C.</b>	No Action	Not applicable, specific action not determined

