# Icicle Creek Water Resource Management Strategy

# **FINAL** Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement









Grant No. WROCR-VER1-ChCoNR-00002

January 2019 Ecology Publication No: 18-12-016





January 3, 2019

### **RE:** Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Icicle Creek Water Resource Management Strategy, Chelan County, Washington

Dear Interested Parties, Jurisdictions, Tribes and Agencies:

Enclosed for your review is the **Final** Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the Icicle Creek Water Resource Management Strategy (Icicle Strategy), prepared jointly by Chelan County and Washington State Department of Ecology. The objective of the Icicle Strategy is to improve instream flows, improve the sustainability of Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, protect tribal and non-tribal fish harvest, improve domestic supply, improve agricultural reliability, enhance Icicle Creek habitat, and comply with State and Federal Law, including the Wilderness Acts within the Icicle Creek Subbasin, Chelan County, Washington.

This PEIS was prepared in compliance with Washington's State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), Chapter 43.21C RCW and the SEPA Rules Chapter 197-11 WAC. In 2016, Chelan County and Washington State Department of Ecology issued a determination of significance on February 9, 2016 and formally initiated the SEPA scoping process. An open house was held in April 2016, with a 90-day SEPA scoping comment period that concluded May 11, 2016. Following scoping, several alternatives were developed in response to comments received. This PEIS evaluates five action alternatives to improve water management in Icicle Creek, as well as a No-action Alternative. The following table outlines the various alternatives analyzed in the PEIS.

A draft of this document was issued on May 31, 2018, which was followed by a 60-day comment period that closed on July 30, 2018. The intent of the Draft PEIS was to provide an opportunity for the public, tribes, agencies, stakeholders, and other parties to review likely impacts of implementing the Icicle Strategy at the programmatic level and provide comments on the document. The co-leads appreciate the time and attention that commenters committed to reviewing the Draft PEIS.

A total of 9,981 comments were submitted via email, letter, comment form, or court reporter on the Draft PEIS. Of these, 8,825 were considered. Comments not considered included comments

submitted before or after the comment period, duplicate comments (identical comment from the same commenter was only counted once), and emails from the co-leads with "test" included in the subject line. In total, there were 203 late/early comments, 943 duplicate comments, and 10 "test" comments not considered. Draft PEIS comments and responses are available in Appendix A of the Final PEIS. Some small revisions were made to the document based on comments received. Following the comprehensive scoping and public comment for the PEIS, Ecology and Chelan County have selected Alterative 1 as the Preferred Alternative.

The Final PEIS is available for viewing on the Internet at:

https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1812016.html

And

http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/pages/icicle-work-group?parent=Planning

This Final PEIS is being issued under WAC 197-11-460 and completes the programmatic SEPA review. This document will be used to inform Chelan County, Ecology, and the Icicle Work Group as work continues on the Icicle Strategy to ensure the guiding principles and goals of the program are met.

Sincerely,

from letto

G. Thomas Tebb, L.H.g., L.E.G. Director, Office of Columbia River Washington State Department of Ecology 1250 West Alder Street Union Gap, WA 98903-0009

Enclosure: Icicle Strategy Final PEIS

Mike Kaputa Director, Natural Resource Department Chelan County 411 Washington Street, Suite 201 Wenatchee, WA 98801

Icicle Strategy PEIS	Alternatives Table
----------------------	--------------------

Projects	Proposed Alternatives						
FIOJECIS	No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5	
			Conservat	ion			
IPID Irrigation Efficiencies	0	•	•	•	•		
COIC Irrigation Efficiencies (Piping)	•	•	٠	•	٠	٠	
Domestic Conservation Efficiencies	0	•	•	•	•	•	
LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements	•	•	٠	•	٠	٠	
			Pump Excha	ange			
IPID Dryden Pump Exchange	0	0	•	•			
Full IPID Pump Station						٠	
COIC Irrigation Efficiencies (Pump Exchange)	•	•	•	•	•	•	
		Mod	ification/Restoration	of Existing Storage			
Alpine Lakes Reservoir Optimization, Modernization and Automation	0	٠			٠	٠	
Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration	ge Restoration O		۲	0	•	•	
			New Stora	age			
Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement					٠		
Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement					۲		
Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement					•		
			Habitat/Fisheries In	nprovements			
Tribal Fishery Protection	0	•	•	•	٠	•	
Habitat Protection and Enhancement	0	•	•	•	•	•	
Fish Passage	•	•	•	•	•	•	
Fish Screening	•	•	•	•	•	٠	
Legislative/Administrative Tools							
Water Markets		•	•	•	•	•	
Instream Flow Rule Amendment	0	•	•	•	•	•	
OCPI legislative fix from instream flow impacts				•			

O Represents projects that might proceed if funding becomes available. However, under the No-action Alternative, project beneficiaries may be different and project timelines are unknown.

• Represents projects that are likely to occur as described, but could be replaced by another project that fulfills the same guiding principles if a design, funding, or permitting fatal flaw is identified.

# Fact Sheet

#### **Project Title**

Icicle Creek Water Resource Management Strategy (Icicle Strategy)

#### **Brief Description of Proposal**

Chelan County (County) and the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) prepared this Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) to evaluate the Icicle Strategy alternatives designed to meet Guiding Principles (improve instream flows, improve the sustainability of Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, protect tribal and non-tribal fish harvest, improve domestic supply, improve agricultural reliability, enhance Icicle Creek habitat, and comply with State and Federal Law, including the Wilderness Acts) within the Icicle Creek Subbasin, Chelan County, Washington. This Final PEIS was prepared in compliance with the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). The County and Ecology are acting as co-lead agencies.

The SEPA non-project action is the adoption of a program called the Icicle Strategy. The strategy is a program of integrated, long-term, water resource management and habitat restoration actions. The PEIS evaluates how combinations of actions could function together to meet the Icicle Creek Guiding Principles. The PEIS includes five action alternatives, which are characterized by different combinations of water management and habitat restoration elements that cumulatively would meet all of the Guiding Principles. In addition, a No-action Alternative is included, which is intended to represent the most-likely water supply future that is expected in the absence of implementing an action alternative. Under the No-action Alternative, actions to improve instream and out-of-stream water supplies would continue to a lesser extent or for a different beneficiary than in the action alternatives. Additionally, implementation would be conducted by individual project proponents rather than as part of an integrated management strategy, on unknown timelines, and in a piecemeal fashion.

#### Contacts

G. Thomas Tebb, SEPA Responsible Official Director, Office of Columbia River Washington State Department of Ecology 1250 West Alder Street, Union Gap, WA 98903-0009 (509) 574-3989 thomas.tebb@ecy.wa.gov

Mike Kaputa, SEPA Responsible Official Director, Natural Resource Department Chelan County 411 Washington Street, Suite 201, Wenatchee, WA 98801 (509) 670-6935 mike.kaputa@co.chelan.wa.us

#### Permits, Licenses, and Approvals Required

Implementation of the Icicle Strategy would require compliance with regulations and plans at federal, state, and local levels. To implement the action alternatives or their elements, the lead agencies and project proponents would need to comply with applicable laws, regulations, and Executive Orders. This proposal is a non-project action, and the specific details of some projects that would be pursued under the Icicle Strategy are not yet known, so it is not possible to present a complete list of permits, licenses, and approvals that could be required for the components of the strategy. However, potential requirements identified to date include the following:

- State Environmental Policy Act
- National Environmental Policy Act
- Clean Water Act Section 404
- USFS Special Use Permit
- USFS Minimum Tools Analysis
- Endangered Species Act
- Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
- National Historic Preservation Act
- Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act
- FEMA Flood Rise Analysis
- CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification
- FCC Licensing
- Ecology Dam Construction Permit/Review
- Ecology Water Right Permit
- Ecology Sand and Gravel Permit
- Governor's Executive Order 05-05, Archeology and Cultural Resources
- WDNR Burn Permit
- WDFW Hydraulic Project Permit Approval
- WDNR Aquatic Use Authorization
- Ecology NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit
- EPA NDPES Discharge Permit for Operations
- Chelan County Shoreline Substantial Development Permit/Conditional Use Permit
- Chelan County Fill and Grade Permit
- Chelan County Building Permit

#### Authors and Contributors

A list of the individuals from the County, Ecology and consulting firms who participated in the EIS evaluation is provided in Chapter 7.

#### Date of Draft Environmental Impact Statement Issuance

May 31, 2018

#### **Comment Deadline for Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

July 30, 2018

#### **Public Hearing**

The co-leads conducted a public hearing to receive comments on the DPEIS in combination with an informational open house. The public hearing and open house were held at Leavenworth Festhalle, 1001 Front Street, Leavenworth, WA on June 27, 2018 from 4pm to 8pm.

#### **Date of Final Environmental Impact Statement**

January 3, 2019

#### **Timing of Additional Environmental Review**

The purpose of this Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) is to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of implementing a comprehensive water resource management plan in the Icicle Creek Subbasin, with the Guiding Principles as the water management objectives. In accordance with State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), the proposal includes preparation of a PEIS (this document) to identify potential environmental impacts, mitigation strategies, and a preferred alternative.

The alternatives identified as potentially meeting the Guiding Principles are generally not at a projectlevel environmental review because many projects are still in the planning phase. In accordance with Chapter 197-11-704 WAC, this PEIS evaluates non-project actions such as policies, plans, and programs at a programmatic level. However, where project level information is available, the co-lead agencies for this PEIS have attempted to include it. This does not obviate the need for individual actions that are carried forward requiring specific project-level environmental review. Notably, the PEIS will serve as the basis for future project-level environmental review that may be required and NEPA review that would be required for projects that receive federal funding or permitting.

Following the issuance of this final PEIS document some projects and actions could be advanced and ready for additional environmental review or project implementation in Spring 2019, while others may not advance to implementation for several years.

#### **Document Availability**

The Final PEIS for the Icicle Strategy is available online:

https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1812016.html

And

http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/pages/icicle-work-group?parent=Planning

Print copies or e-copies of the document may be obtained at the following locations:

Washington State Department of Ecology Central Regional Office 1250 West Alder Street, Union Gap, WA 98903-0009 Or

Chelan County Natural Resource Department 411 Washington Street, Suite 201, Wenatchee, WA 98801

Or by contacting Chelan County's Water Resource Manager, Mary Jo Sanborn, at (509) 667-6532 or <u>maryjo.sanborn@co.chelan.wa.us</u>.

Print copies of the Final EIS may require payment of a fee (copying costs plus allowed mailing cost).

To ask about the availability of this document in a format for the visually impaired, call the Office of Columbia River at 509-454-4241. Persons with hearing loss can call 711 for Washington Relay Service. Persons with a speech disability can call 877-833-6341.

#### **Location of Background Materials**

Background materials on the Icicle Strategy are available online at: <u>http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/pages/icicle-work-group?parent=Planning</u>

# Contents

List of Tables	xxxiii
List of Figures	xxxvi
List of Appendices	xliii
List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	xliv

### **Executive Summary**

Introduction	ES-1
Purpose and Need for Action	ES-1
The lcicle Strategy and Guiding Principles	ES-3
Identification of Preferred Alternative	ES-4
Alternatives	ES-5
No-action Alternative	ES-6
Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)	ES-9
Alternative 2	ES-11
Alternative 3	ES-12
Alternative 4	ES-13
Alternative 5	ES-14
Impacts to Resources	ES-15
Overall Impacts and Benefits of the lcicle Strategy	ES-15
Short-Term	ES-15
Long-Term	ES-29
Environmental Commitments	ES-31
Earth, Surface Water, Water Quality, Shorelines,	
and Fish	ES-31
Aesthetics, Recreation, and Wilderness	ES-31
Land-Use	ES-32
Climate Change	ES-32
Cultural Resources	ES-32
Consultation and Coordination	ES-32
Public Involvement	ES-32
Draft PEIS Comment Period	ES-33
Agency Consultation and Coordination	ES-33

# Chapter 1.0 – INTRODUCTION

1.1	Prog	Programmatic SEPA Review1-1		
1.1.1 Docu		Document Organization1-1		
1.2	Purp	bose and Need for Action1-2		
1.3	lcicl	e Creek Subbasin Background and History 1-5		
1.	3.1	Location and Setting1-5		
1.	3.2	Project Area1-5		
	1.3.2	2.1 Alpine Lakes Area1-5		
	1.3.2	2.2 Icicle Creek 1-7		
	1.3.2	2.3 Wenatchee River Corridor1-7		
1.	3.3	History of Water Management1-7		
1.4	The	Icicle Work Group 1-9		
1.4	4.1	Icicle Work Group Authority1-10		
	1.4.	1.1 Watershed Planning1-10		
	1.4.	1.2 OCR's Authority1-11		
1.5	The	Icicle Strategy and Guiding Principles 1-11		
1.	5.1	Refining Guiding Principles and Developing Metrics1-12		
	1.5.	1.1 Improve Instream Flow1-13		
	1.5.	1.2 Improve Sustainability of LNFH1-18		
	1.5.	1.3 Protect Treaty/Non-treaty Harvest1-18		
	1.5.	1.4 Improve Domestic Supply1-20		
	1.5.	1.5 Improve Agricultural Reliability1-20		
	1.5.	1.6 Enhance Icicle Creek Habitat1-21		
	1.5.	1.7 Comply with State and Federal Law, and Wilderness Acts		
1.	5.2	Final Guiding Principles1-22		
	1.5.2	2.1 Improve Instream Flow1-22		
	1.5.2	2.2 Improve Sustainability of LNFH1-23		
	1.5.2	2.3 Protect Treaty/Non-treaty Harvest1-23		
	1.5.2	2.4 Improve Domestic Supply1-23		
	1.5.2	2.5 Improve Agricultural Reliability1-23		
	1.5.2	2.6 Enhance Icicle Creek Habitat1-23		
	1.5.2	2.7 Comply with State and Federal Law, and Wilderness Acts		
1.	5.3	Current Water Resources Conditions in the Icicle Subbasin1-24		

1.6	Pri	or Inve	stigations and Activities in the Icicle Basin1-25
1	.6.1	Water	rshed Plan 1-25
1	1.6.2 Biolog		gical Opinion 1-26
1	.6.3	Habita	at, Passage and Instream Flow Studies1-27
	1.	6.3.1	Icicle Water Temperatures (All Reaches) 1-27
	1.	6.3.2	Instream Flow Study and Report for Icicle Creek (Reach 1) 1-27
	1.	6.3.3	Icicle Creek Boulder Field Fish Passage Assessment (Reach 2) 1-28
	1.	6.3.4	Icicle Creek Target Flows (Reach 3) 1-28
	1.	6.3.5	Icicle Creek Fish Passage Evaluation for the Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery (Reach 4)
	1.	6.3.6	Lower Icicle Creek Reach Assessment (Reach 5) 1-29
1	.6.4	Clima	te Change 1-30
	1.	6.4.1	USFS Report 1-30
	1.	6.4.2	Columbia River Basin Long-term Supply and Demand
			Forecast Report 1-30
	1.	6.4.3	Icicle Creek Watershed Council 1-31
	1.	6.4.4	UW Climate Impacts Group Icicle Creek Study 1-31
1	.6.5	Water	r Storage 1-32
	1.	6.5.1	Water Storage Report, Wenatchee River Basin
	1.	6.5.2	Needs and Alternatives Analysis 1-32
1	.6.6	IPID P	Pump Exchange
1.7	Fis	h Reco	very Efforts1-34
1.8	Lit	igation	Related to Water Management in the Icicle Creek
	Su	bbasin	
1.9	Οv	rview	of SEPA Process1-38
1	.9.1	SEPA	Scoping 1-39
1	.9.2	SEPA	PEIS 1-39
1	.9.3	Next	Steps in the Environmental Review Process
	1.	9.3.1	Project Level Environmental Review
	1.	9.3.2	NEPA Requirements and Integration 1-40
	1.	9.3.3	Summary Timeline of All Environmental Review
	1.	9.3.4	Future Opportunities for Public Input 1-41
1.1(	) Re	lated P	ermits, Actions, and Laws1-42
1	.10.1	Endar	ngered Species Act 1-42
1	.10.2	Magn	uson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act 1-42

	1.10.3	Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act	1-43
	1.10.4	Clean Water Act	1-43
	1.10	0.4.1 Section 401, Water Quality Certification	1-43
	1.10	0.4.2 Section 402, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System	1-43
	1.10	0.4.3 Section 404 Permit Program	1-43
	1.10.5	National Historic Preservation Act	1-44
	1.10.6	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act	1-44
	1.10.7	National Archaeological Resources Protection Act	1-44
	1.10.8	Executive Order 13007: Indian Sacred Sites	1-44
	1.10.9	Executive Order 11988: Floodplain Management	1-44
	1.10.10	Executive Order 11990: Protection of Wetlands	1-44
	1.10.11	Executive Order 12898: Environmental Justice	1-45
	1.10.12	Wilderness Act	1-45
	1.10.13	U.S. Forest Service Special Use Permit	1-45
	1.10.14	Governor's Executive Order 05-05	1-45
	1.10.15	Washington State Archaeological Protection	1-45
	1.10.16	Hydraulic Project Approval	1-46
	1.10.17	Washington State Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Use Authorization	1-46
	1.10.18	Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application	1-46
	1.10.19	Reservoir Storage Permit	1-46
	1.10.20	Dam Construction Permit	1-47
	1.10.21	Water Right Permit	1-47
	1.10.22	County Shorelines Management Act Permit (Shoreline Substantial Development or Conditional Use Permit)	1-47
	1.10.23	Critical Areas Review	1-48
	1.10.24	Building, Fill, and Grading Permits	1-48
	1.10.25	Water System Plan Update	1-48
	1.10.26	Instream Flow Rule Amendment	1-48
	1.10.27	Construction Stormwater General Permit and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan	1-49
1.	11 Doci	uments Adopted under SEPA 1	I-49

# Chapter 2.0 – ALTERNATIVES

2.1		Desc	ription of Programmatic Proposal2	?-1
	2.1.1		Icicle Strategy Overview	2-1
	2.1	.2	Identification of Preferred Alternative	<u>2-3</u>
2.2	2	Deve	lopment and Analysis of Alternatives2	2-3
	2.2	.1	Identification of Alternatives through SEPA Scoping	2-8
2.3	3	Sum	mary of Alternatives2-	10
	2.3	.1	No-action Narrative Description2-	12
	2.3	.2	Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative) Narrative Description	16
	2.3	.3	Alternative 2 Narrative Description 2-	24
	2.3	.4	Alternative 3 Narrative Description 2-	30
	2.3	.5	Alternative 4 Narrative Description 2-	-36
	2.3	.6	Alternative 5 Narrative Description 2-	42
	2.3	.7	Previous Studies for Developing the Alternatives 2-	48
2.4	ŀ	No A	ction Alternative2-4	48
2.5	5	Alter	native 1 (Preferred Alternative)2-	50
	2.5	.1	Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization and Automation 2-	51
	2.5	.2	IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project2-	64
	2.5	.3	COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project	67
	2.5	.4	Domestic Conservation	70
	2.5	.5	Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration 2-	72
	2.5	.6	Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement2-	75
	2.5	.7	Habitat Protection and Enhancement2-	79
	2.5	.8	Instream Flow Rule Amendment 2-	86
	2.5	.9	Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements Project	-87
		2.5.9	9.1 Circular Tanks	-91
	2.5	.10	Fish Passage2-	92
	2.5	.11	Fish Screen Compliance	96
	2.5	.12	Water Markets	·98
	2.5	.13	Costs and Benefits for Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative) 2-	99
	2.5	.14	Timeline	01

2.6	6 Alter	native 2	2-101
	2.6.1	IPID Dryden Pump Exchange	2-101
	2.6.2	IPID Irrigation Efficiencies	2-105
	2.6.3	COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange	2-105
	2.6.4	Domestic Conservation	2-105
	2.6.5	Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration	2-105
	2.6.6	Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement	2-105
	2.6.7	Habitat Protection and Enhancement	2-105
	2.6.8	Instream Flow Rule Amendment	2-106
	2.6.9	Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements	2-106
	2.6.10	Fish Passage	2-106
	2.6.11	Fish Screen Compliance	2-106
	2.6.12	Water Markets	2-106
	2.6.13	Costs and Benefits for Alternative 2	2-106
	0 0 1 1	Timolino	0.400
	2.6.14		2-108
2.7	2.6.14 / Alter	native 3	2-108
2.7	2.6.14 / Alter 2.7.1	native 3 IPID Dryden Pump Exchange	2-108 2-108 2-109
2.7	2.6.14 Alter 2.7.1 2.7.2	Inneime native 3 IPID Dryden Pump Exchange IPID Irrigation Efficiencies	2-108 2-108 2-109 2-109
2.7	2.6.14 Alter 2.7.1 2.7.2 2.7.3	Inneime native 3 IPID Dryden Pump Exchange IPID Irrigation Efficiencies COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange	2-108 2-108 2-109 2-109 2-109
2.7	2.6.14 Alter 2.7.1 2.7.2 2.7.3 2.7.4	Innelline native 3 IPID Dryden Pump Exchange IPID Irrigation Efficiencies COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Domestic Conservation	2-108 2-108 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109
2.7	2.6.14 Alter 2.7.1 2.7.2 2.7.3 2.7.4 2.7.5	Innelline Inative 3 IPID Dryden Pump Exchange IPID Irrigation Efficiencies COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Domestic Conservation Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement	2-108 2-108 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109
2.7	2.6.14 Alter 2.7.1 2.7.2 2.7.3 2.7.4 2.7.5 2.7.6	Interine native 3 IPID Dryden Pump Exchange IPID Irrigation Efficiencies COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Domestic Conservation Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Habitat Protection and Enhancement	2-108 2-108 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109
2.7	2.6.14 Alter 2.7.1 2.7.2 2.7.3 2.7.4 2.7.5 2.7.6 2.7.7	Interine native 3 IPID Dryden Pump Exchange IPID Irrigation Efficiencies COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Domestic Conservation Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Habitat Protection and Enhancement Instream Flow Rule Amendment	2-108 2-108 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109
2.7	2.6.14 Alter 2.7.1 2.7.2 2.7.3 2.7.4 2.7.5 2.7.6 2.7.6 2.7.7 2.7.8	Inneline Inative 3 IPID Dryden Pump Exchange IPID Irrigation Efficiencies COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Domestic Conservation Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Habitat Protection and Enhancement Instream Flow Rule Amendment Leavenworth national Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water O Improvements	2-108 2-108 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 Duality 2-109
2.7	2.6.14 Alter 2.7.1 2.7.2 2.7.3 2.7.4 2.7.5 2.7.6 2.7.6 2.7.7 2.7.8 2.7.8	Internet in a time internet interne	2-108 2-108 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 Duality 2-109 
2.7	2.6.14 Alter 2.7.1 2.7.2 2.7.3 2.7.4 2.7.5 2.7.6 2.7.6 2.7.7 2.7.8 2.7.8 2.7.9 2.7.10	Internet in a time in a ti	2-108 2-108 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 Quality 2-109 2-109 
2.7	2.6.14 Alter 2.7.1 2.7.2 2.7.3 2.7.4 2.7.5 2.7.6 2.7.7 2.7.8 2.7.9 2.7.9 2.7.10 2.7.11	<ul> <li>Interine</li> <li>native 3</li> <li>IPID Dryden Pump Exchange</li> <li>IPID Irrigation Efficiencies</li> <li>COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange</li> <li>Domestic Conservation</li> <li>Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement</li> <li>Habitat Protection and Enhancement</li> <li>Instream Flow Rule Amendment</li> <li>Leavenworth national Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water O</li> <li>Improvements</li> <li>Fish Passage</li> <li>Fish Screen Compliance</li> <li>Water Markets</li> </ul>	2-108 2-108 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109
2.7	2.6.14 Alter 2.7.1 2.7.2 2.7.3 2.7.4 2.7.5 2.7.6 2.7.6 2.7.7 2.7.8 2.7.9 2.7.10 2.7.10 2.7.11 2.7.12	Interine native 3 IPID Dryden Pump Exchange IPID Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Domestic Conservation Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Habitat Protection and Enhancement Instream Flow Rule Amendment Leavenworth national Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water O Improvements Fish Passage Fish Screen Compliance Water Markets Legislative Change to OCPI	2-108 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109
2.7	2.6.14 Alter 2.7.1 2.7.2 2.7.3 2.7.4 2.7.5 2.7.6 2.7.7 2.7.8 2.7.9 2.7.9 2.7.10 2.7.10 2.7.11 2.7.12 2.7.13	Internet in a second se	2-108 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-109 2-110

2.8	Alter	native 42-112
	2.8.1	Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization and Automation 2-112
	2.8.2	Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement 2-112
	2.8.3	Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement
	2.8.4	Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement 2-116
	2.8.5	IPID Irrigation Efficiencies2-119
	2.8.6	COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange
	2.8.7	Domestic Conservation
	2.8.8	Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement
	2.8.9	Habitat Protection and Enhancement
	2.8.10	Instream Flow Rule Amendment 2-121
	2.8.11	Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements
	2.8.12	Fish Passage 2-121
	2.8.13	Fish Screen Compliance 2-121
	2.8.14	Water Markets 2-121
	2.8.15	Costs and Benefits for Alternative 4 2-121
	2.8.16	Timeline
2.9	Alter	native 52-123
	2.9.1	IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project
	2.9.2	Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization and Automation 2-127
	2.9.3	COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange
	2.9.4	Domestic Conservation
	2.9.5	Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration 2-127
	2.9.6	Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement
	2.9.7	Habitat Protection and Enhancement 2-127
	2.9.8	Instream Flow Rule Amendment 2-127
	2.9.9	Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements
	2.9.10	Fish Passage 2-127
	2.9.11	Fish Screen Compliance
	2.9.12	Water Markets 2-127

2	.9.13	Costs and Benefits for Alternative 5	2-128
2	.9.14	Timeline	2-128
2.10	Pairi	ng and Phasing	. 2-129
2.11	Alter	rnatives Eliminated from Further Study	. 2-130
2	.11.1	Reservoir Removal	2-130
2	.11.2	Water Right Relinquishment	2-131
2	.11.3	Removing Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery	2-131

# Chapter 3.0 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3.1	Ir	ntrod	uction	. 3-1
3.2	E	arth.		. 3-1
	3.2.1	F	legional Geology	3-1
		3.2.1.	1 Major Geologic Units	3-4
	3.2.2		Geologic Structures	3-4
	3.2.3	: 5	oils	3-4
	3.2.4	· F	legional Geological Hazards	3-5
		3.2.4.	1 Seismic Hazards	3-5
		3.2.4.	2 Mass Wasting	3-5
		3.2.4.	3 Erosion	3-5
	3.2.5	, A	Npine Lakes	3-6
		3.2.5.	1 Geology and Physiography	3-6
		3.2.5.	2 Soils	3-6
		3.2.5.	3 Geologic Hazards	3-6
	3.2.6	i le	cicle Creek Corridor	3-7
		3.2.6.	1 Geology and Physiography	3-7
		3.2.6.	2 Soils	3-7
		3.2.6.	3 Geologic Hazards	3-7
	3.2.7	v v	Venatchee River Corridor	3-7
		3.2.7.	1 Geology and Physiography	3-7
		3.2.7.	2 Soils	3-8
		3.2.7.	3 Geologic Hazards	3-8

3.3 Su	rface Water Resources	3-8
3.3.1	Alpine Lakes	3-9
3.3.2	Icicle Creek Corridor	3-10
З.	3.2.1 Icicle Creek Tributaries	3-10
З.	3.2.2 Icicle Creek Mainstem	3-11
З.	3.2.3 Reach 1	3-12
З.	3.2.4 Reach 2	3-12
З.	3.2.5 Reach 3	3-14
З.	3.2.6 Reach 4	3-14
З.	3.2.7 Reach 5	3-15
3.3.3	Wenatchee River Corridor	3-15
З.	3.3.1 Overall Water Budget	3-15
3.4 Gro	oundwater Resources	3-19
3.4.1	Hydrogeologic Setting	3-20
3.4.2	Groundwater Occurrence and Movement	3-21
З.	4.2.1 Alpine Lakes	3-21
З.	4.2.2 Icicle Creek Corridor	3-21
З.	4.2.3 Wenatchee River Corridor	3-23
3.4.3	Groundwater Uses	3-23
3.5 Wa	ater Quality	3-24
3.5.1	Regulatory Setting	3-25
3.5.2	Surface Water Quality	3-26
З.	5.2.1 Alpine Lakes	3-29
З.	5.2.2 Icicle Creek Corridor	3-31
З.	5.2.3 Wenatchee River Corridor	3-33
3.5.3	Groundwater Quality	3-35
3.6 Wa	ater Use	3-35
3.6.1	Water Rights	3-35
З.	6.1.1 Regulatory Framework	3-35
З.	6.1.2 Alpine Lakes Water Rights	3-37
З.	6.1.3 Icicle Creek Diversion Rights	3-39

	3.6.1.4	Wenatchee River Watershed Instream Resources Protection Program
	3.6.1.5	Wenatchee Valley Water Rights
	3.6.2 Wa	ater Resource Infrastructure
	3.6.2.1	Storage Reservoirs
	3.6.2.2	Diversion Infrastructure
3.7	7 Fish	
	3.7.1 Alp	pine Lakes
	3.7.1.1	Habitat Conditions
	3.7.2 Icio	cle Creek Corridor
	3.7.2.1	Anadromous Fish
	3.7.2.2	Resident Fish
	3.7.2.3	Habitat Conditions
	3.7.2.4	Fish Passage Barriers
	3.7.2.5	Tribal Fishing
	3.7.3 We	enatchee River Corridor
	3.7.3.1	Anadromous Fish
	3.7.3.2	Resident Fish
	3.7.3.3	Habitat Conditions
	3.7.3.4	Barriers to Passage
	3.7.4 Aq	uatic Invertebrates
3.8	3 Vegetat	ion
	3.8.1 Alp	pine Lakes3-68
	3.8.2 Icio	cle Creek3-71
	3.8.2.1	Vegetation
	3.8.2.2	Icicle Creek Boulder Field
	3.8.2.3	Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery
	3.8.2.4	Confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River
	3.8.3 We	enatchee River Corridor
3.9	9 Wildlife	
	3.9.1 Alp	pine Lakes3-73
	3.9.1.1	Amphibians and Reptiles

3.9.	1.2 Mammals	3-74
3.9.	1.3 Birds	3-74
3.9.2	Icicle Creek	3-75
3.9	2.1 Icicle Creek Boulder Field	3-75
3.9	2.2 Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery	3-75
3.9	2.3 Confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River	3-75
3.9.3	Wenatchee River Corridor	3-76
3.10 Thre	atened and Endangered Species	3-76
3.10.1	Federal Threatened and Endangered Plant Species	3-77
3.10.2	Federal Threatened and Endangered Wildlife Species	3-79
3.10.3	Federal Threatened and Endangered Fish Species	3-79
3.10.4	WDFW Priority Habitats and Species	3-82
3.10	0.4.1 Biodiversity Areas	3-84
3.10	0.4.2 Corridors	3-84
3.10	0.4.3 Riparian	3-84
3.10	0.4.4 Freshwater Wetlands	3-84
3.10	0.4.5 Instream	3-85
3.10	0.4.6 Old Growth/Mature Forest	3-85
3.10	0.4.7 Snags and Logs	3-85
3.10	0.4.8 Caves	3-85
3.10	0.4.9 Cliffs	3-86
3.10	0.4.10 Talus	3-86
3.11 Aest	hetics	3-86
3.11.1	Alpine Lakes	3-87
3.11.2	Icicle Creek Corridor	3-92
3.11.3	Wenatchee River Corridor	3-94
3.12 Air C	ົນality	3-96
3.12.1	Regulatory Setting	3-96
3.12.2	Current Air Quality Environment	3-97
3.13 Clim	ate Change	3-98
3.13.1	Current Climatic Conditions	3-98
3.13.2	Projected Future Climatic Conditions	3-100

3.13.3	mplications for Stream Flow in Icicle Creek	3-100
3.14 Noise		3-116
3.14.1	Regulatory Setting	3-117
3.14.	1.1 Federal Noise Control Standards	
3.14.	1.2 State and Local Noise Control Standards	
3.14.2	Current Noise Environment	3-119
3.15 Recre	ation	
3.15.1	Alpine Lakes Area	3-119
3.15.	1.1 Hiking	
3.15.	1.2 Horseback Riding and Stock Use	
3.15.	1.3 Backpacking/Camping	
3.15.	1.4 Recreational Fishing	
3.15.	1.5 Water-Based Recreation	
3.15.	1.6 Winter Recreation	
3.15.2	cicle Creek Corridor	3-125
3.15.	2.1 Hiking and Stock Use	
3.15.	2.2 Camping	
3.15	2.3 Recreational Fishing	
3.15	2.4 Water-Based Recreation	3-128
3.15.3	Nenatchee River Corridor	3-128
3.15.	3.1 Hiking and Stock Use	3-128
3.15.	3.2 Camping	
3.15.	3.3 Recreational Fishing	
3.15.	3.4 Water-Based Recreation	
3.16 Land	Use	3-129
3.16.1	Regulatory Setting	3-130
3.16.	1.1 Federal Land Use Regulations	
3.16.	1.2 State Land Use Regulations	3-131
3.16.	1.3 Local Land Use Regulations	3-131
3.16.	1.4 Current Land Use	
3.16.	1.5 Federal Ownership and Land Use	
3.16.	1.6 Private Ownership and Land Use	

3.16.	1.7 Comprehensive Planning	3-134
3.16.	1.8 Upper Wenatchee Community Lands Plan	3-134
3.17 Wilde	rness Area	3-135
3.17.1	Wilderness Act History	
3.17.	1.1 Pre-Wilderness Act Use	
3.17.	1.2 Wilderness Act History and Designation	3-137
3.17.	1.3 Alpine Lakes Management Act	3-137
3.17.	1.4 Intended Wilderness	3-138
3.17.2	Use	
3.17.2	2.1 Wilderness Use	3-140
3.17.2	2.2 Non-Wilderness Use	3-140
3.17.3	Wilderness Character	
3.18 Shore	lines	3-143
3.18.1	Alpine Lakes	
3.18.2 l	cicle Creek Corridor	
3.18.3	Wenatchee River Corridor	
3.19 Utiliti	es	3-147
3.19.1	Water Purveyors	
3.19.	1.1 City of Leavenworth	
3.19.	1.2 City of Leavenworth	
3.20 Trans	portation	3-149
3.20.1	Alpine Lakes	
3.20.2 I	cicle Creek Corridor	3-150
3.20.3	Wenatchee River Corridor	
3.21 Cultur	ral Resources	3-150
3.21.1 E	Environmental Context	3-151
3.21.2	Cultural Context	3-151
3.21.3 I	Previously Recorded Resources	
3.21.4	Archaeological Survey	
3.22 Indiar	n Sacred Sites	3-155
3.23 Indiar	n Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest	3-156

3.23.1	Legal Framework for Protection	3-156
3.23.2	Usual and Accustomed Areas	3-157
3.24 Soc	oeconomics	
3.24.1	Regional Economic Setting	3-158
3.24.2	Population, Housing Stock, and Property Values	3-158
3.24.3	Labor Force	3-159
3.24.4	Employment by Industry	3-159
3.24.5	Wages and Income	3-160
3.24.6	Costs and Benefits	3-160
3.2	4.6.1 Land Value and Annual Property Tax Revenue	3-161
3.2	4.6.2 Jobs and Labor Income	3-161
3.2	4.6.3 Increased Instream Values	3-161
3.25 Env	ronmental Justice	
3.25.1	Minority Populations	3-162
3.25.2	Low-income Populations	3-163

# Chapter 4.0 – IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

I.1 Introduction	4-1
l.2 Earth	4-1
4.2.1 No-action Alternative	4-1
4.2.1.1 Short-term Impacts	4-1
4.2.1.2 Long-term Impacts	4-2
4.2.2 Alternative 1	4-2
4.2.2.1 Short-term Impacts	4-3
4.2.2.2 Long-term Impacts	4-7
4.2.3 Alternative 24	-10
4.2.3.1 Short-term Impacts4	1-10
4.2.3.2 Long-term Impacts4	1-11
4.2.4 Alternative 34	-11
4.2.4.1 Short-term Impacts4	1-11
4.2.4.2 Long-term Impacts	1-11

	4.2.5	5	Alte	rnative 4 4-1	1
		4.2.5	5.1	Short-term Impacts	12
	4.2.5.2		5 <i>.2</i>	Long-term Impacts	13
	4.2.6	6	Alte	rnative 5 4-1	4
		4.2.6	6.1	Short-term Impacts	14
		4.2.6	6.2	Long-term Impacts	14
	4.2.7	7	Mitig	gation Measures 4-1	5
		4.2.7	7.1	Short-term Impacts	15
		4.2.7	7.2	Long-term Impacts	15
4.3	3 5	Surfa	ace \	Water4-1	5
	4.3.1	l	No-a	action Alternative	6
		4.3.	1.1	Short-term Impacts 4-1	16
		4.3.	1.2	Long-term Impacts 4-1	16
	4.3.2	2	Alte	rnative 1 4-1	7
		4.3.2	2.1	Short-term Impacts 4-1	17
		4.3.2	2.2	Long-term Impacts	19
	4.3.3	3	Alte	rnative 2 4-2	23
		4.3.3	3.1	Short-term Impacts	23
		4.3.3	3.2	Long-term Impacts	23
	4.3.4	1	Alte	rnative 3 4-2	24
		4.3.4	4.1	Short-term Impacts	<u>?</u> 4
		4.3.4	4.2	Long-term Impacts	<u>?</u> 4
	4.3.5	5	Alte	rnative 4 4-2	24
		4.3.5	5.1	Short-term Impacts	25
		4.3.5	5. <i>2</i>	Long-term Impacts	25
	4.3.6	6	Alte	rnative 5	26
		4.3.6	6.1	Short-term Impacts	?6
		4.3.6	6.2	Long-term Impacts	?7
	4.3.7	7	Mitig	gation Measures 4-2	27
		4.3.7	7.1	Short-term Impacts	?7
		4.3.7	7.2	Long-term Impacts	?7
4.4	1 (	Grou	ndw	vater4-2	8

	4.4.1	l No-	action Alternative4-28
		4.4.1.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.4.1.2	Long-term Impacts
	4.4.2	2 Alte	ernative 14-29
		4.4.2.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.4.2.2	Long-term Impacts
	4.4.3	B Alte	ernative 24-36
		4.4.3.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.4.3.2	Long-term Impacts
	4.4.4	4 Alte	ernative 34-36
		4.4.4.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.4.4.2	Long-term Impacts
	4.4.5	5 Alte	ernative 44-37
		4.4.5.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.4.5.2	Long-term Impacts
	4.4.6	6 Alte	ernative 54-38
		4.4.6.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.4.6.2	Long-term Impacts
	4.4.7	7 Miti	igation Measures4-39
		4.4.7.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.4.7.2	Long-term Impacts
4.5	i V	Vater Q	uality
	4.5.1	l No-	action Alternative4-41
		4.5.1.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.5.1.2	Long-term Impacts4-41
	4.5.2	2 Alte	ernative 14-42
		4.5.2.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.5.2.2	Long-term Impacts4-49
	4.5.3	B Alte	ernative 2
		4.5.3.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.5.3.2	Long-term Impacts4-55
	4.5.4	l Alte	ernative 3

		4.5.4	4.1	Short-term Impacts	5
		4.5.4	4.2	Long-term Impacts	5
	4.5.5	5	Alte	rnative 4 4-5	6
		4.5.5	5.1	Short-term Impacts	6
		4.5.5	5.2	Long-term Impacts	8
	4.5.6	6	Alte	rnative 5	1
		4.5.0	6.1	Short-term Impacts	1
		4.5.0	6.2	Long-term Impacts	2
	4.5.7	7	Miti	gation Measures 4-6	2
		4.5.2	7.1	Short-term Impacts	2
		4.5.2	7.2	Long-term Impacts	3
4.6	i V	Vate	er Us	se4-64	4
	4.6.1	l	No-a	action Alternative	4
		4.6.	1.1	Short-term Impacts	4
		4.6.	1.2	Long-term Impacts	4
	4.6.2	2	Alte	rnative 1	5
		4.6.2	2.1	Short-term Impacts 4-6	5
		4.6.2	2.2	Long-term Impacts	7
	4.6.3	3	Alte	rnative 2	0
		4.6.3.1		Short-term Impacts	0
		4.6.	3.2	Long-term Impacts	0
	4.6.4	1	Alte	rnative 3 4-7	1
		4.6.4	4.1	Short-term Impacts	'1
		4.6.4	4.2	Long-term Impacts	'1
	4.6.5	5	Alte	rnative 4 4-7	2
		4.6.5	5.1	Short-term Impacts	2
		4.6.5	5.2	Long-term Impacts	2
	4.6.6	6	Alte	rnative 5	4
		4.6.0	6.1	Short-term Impacts	'4
		4.6.0	6.2	Long-term Impacts	'5
	4.6.7	7	Mitig	gation Measures 4-7	5
		4.6.2	7.1	Short-term Impacts	'5

		4.6.7	7.2	Long-term Impacts
4.7	7 F	Fish.		
	4.7.	1	No-a	action Alternative4-76
		4.7.1	1.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.7.1	1.2	Long-term Impacts
	4.7.2	2	Alte	rnative 14-77
		4.7.2	2.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.7.2	2.2	Long-term Impacts
	4.7.3	3	Alte	rnative 24-93
		4.7.3	3.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.7.3	3.2	Long-term Impacts
	4.7.4	4	Alte	rnative 34-95
		4.7.4	4.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.7.4	4.2	Long-term Impacts
	4.7.	5	Alte	rnative 44-95
		4.7.5	5.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.7.5	5 <i>.2</i>	Long-term Impacts
	4.7.	6	Alte	rnative 54-103
		4.7.6	6.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.7.6	6.2	Long-term Impacts
	4.7.	7	Miti	gation Measures4-105
		4.7.7	7.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.7.7	7.2	Long-term Impacts
4.8	3 \	Vege	tatio	on 4-107
	4.8.	1	No-a	action Alternative4-107
		4.8.1	1.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.8.1	1.2	Long-term Impacts
	4.8.2	2	Alte	rnative 14-108
		4.8.2	2.1	Short-term Impacts
		4.8.2	2.2	Long-term Impacts
	4.8.3	3	Alte	rnative 24-117
		4.8.3	3.1	Short-term Impacts

		4.8.3.2	2	Long-term Impacts 4-	117
	4.8.4	1 A	Alter	native 3 4-1	118
		4.8.4.	1	Short-term Impacts 4-	118
		4.8.4.2	2	Long-term Impacts	118
	4.8.5	5 A	Alter	native 4 4-1	118
		4.8.5.	1	Short-term Impacts 4-	119
		4.8.5.2	2	Long-term Impacts	120
	4.8.6	6 A	Alter	native 5 4-1	123
		4.8.6.	1	Short-term Impacts 4-	123
		4.8.6.2	2	Long-term Impacts	124
	4.8.7	7 N	Vitig	gation Measures	124
		4.8.7.	1	Short-term Impacts 4-	124
		4.8.7.2	2	Long-term Impacts	125
4.9	) V	Vildlif	fe	4-1	25
	4.9.1	I N	lo-a	ction Alternative 4-1	125
		4.9.1.	1	Short-term Impacts 4-	125
		4.9.1.2	2	Long-term Impacts 4-	126
	4.9.2	<u>2</u> A	Alter	native 1 4-1	126
		4.9.2.	1	Short-term Impacts 4-	126
		4.9.2.2		Long-term Impacts 4-	131
	4.9.3	3 A	Alter	native 2 4-1	135
		4.9.3.	1	Short-term Impacts 4-	135
		4.9.3.2	2	Long-term Impacts	136
	4.9.4	1 A	Alter	native 3 4-1	136
		4.9.4.	1	Short-term Impacts 4-	136
		4.9.4.2	2	Long-term Impacts	137
	4.9.5	5 A	Alter	native 4 4-1	137
		4.9.5.	1	Short-term Impacts 4-	137
		4.9.5.2	2	Long-term Impacts 4-	140
	4.9.6	6 A	Alter	native 5 4-1	142
		4.9.6.	1	Short-term Impacts 4-	143
		4.9.6.2	2	Long-term Impacts	143

4.9	9.7 Mit	igation Measures	4-144
	4.9.7.1	Short-term Impacts	4-144
	4.9.7.2	Long-term Impacts	4-144
4.10	Threater	ned and Endangered Species	4-144
4.1	10.1 No-	action Alternative	4-145
	4.10.1.1	Short-term Impacts	4-145
	4.10.1.2	Long-term Impacts	4-145
4.1	10.2 Alte	ernative 1	4-146
	4.10.2.1	Short-term Impacts	4-146
	4.10.2.2	Long-term Impacts	4-151
4.′	10.3 Alte	ernative 2	4-157
	4.10.3.1	Short-term Impacts	4-157
	4.10.3.2	Long-term Impacts	4-157
4.′	10.4 Alte	ernative 3	4-158
	4.10.4.1	Short-term Impacts	4-158
	4.10.4.2	Long-term Impacts	4-158
4.′	10.5 Alte	ernative 4	4-159
	4.10.5.1	Short-term Impacts	4-159
	4.10.5.2	Long-term Impacts	4-162
4.7	10.6 Alte	ernative 5	4-165
	4.10.6.1	Short-term Impacts	4-165
	4.10.6.2	Long-term Impacts	4-166
4.′	10.7 Mit	igation Measures	4-166
	4.10.7.1	Short-term Impacts	4-166
	4.10.7.2	Long-term Impacts	4-167
4.11	Aestheti	cs	4-167
4.1	11.1 No-	action Alternative	4-168
	4.11.1.1	Short-term Impacts	4-168
	4.11.1.2	Long-term Impacts	4-169
4.1	11.2 Alte	ernative 1	4-169
	4.11.2.1	Short-term Impacts	4-169
	4.11.2.2	Long-term Impacts	4-192

	4.11	.3	Alte	rnative 2 4-2	214
		4.11	.3.1	Short-term Impacts	214
		4.11	.3.2	Long-term Impacts	214
	4.11	.4	Alte	rnative 3	216
		4.11	.4.1	Short-term Impacts	216
		4.11	.4.2	Long-term Impacts	216
	4.11	.5	Alte	rnative 4 4-2	216
		4.11	1.5.1	Short-term Impacts	217
		4.11	.5.2	Long-term Impacts	218
	4.11	.6	Alte	rnative 5	224
		4.11	1.6.1	Short-term Impacts	<u>?</u> 24
		4.11	.6.2	Long-term Impacts	225
	4.11	.7	Miti	gation Measures 4-2	228
		4.11	.7.1	Short-term Impacts	228
		4.11	.7.2	Long-term Impacts	228
4.1	12 /	Air C	luali	ity4-2	29
	4.12	2.1	No-a	action Alternative	229
		4.12	2.1.1	Short-term Impacts	<u>?29</u>
		4.12	2.1.2	Long-term Impacts	230
	4.12	2.2	Alte	rnative 1	230
		4.12	2.2.1	Short-term Impacts	230
		4.12	2.2.2	Long-term Impacts	233
	4.12	2.3	Alte	rnative 2	235
		4.12	2.3.1	Short-term Impacts	235
		4.12	2.3.2	Long-term Impacts	235
	4.12	2.4	Alte	rnative 3 4-2	235
		4.12	2.4.1	Short-term Impacts	236
		4.12	2.4.2	Long-term Impacts	236
	4.12	2.5	Alte	rnative 4 4-2	236
		4.12	2.5.1	Short-term Impacts	236
		4.12	2.5.2	Long-term Impacts	<u>237</u>
	4.12	2.6	Alte	rnative 5	238

4.12.6	6.1 Short-term Impacts	4-238
4.12.6	6.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.12.7 N	Nitigation Measures	4-238
4.12.7	7.1 Short-term Impacts	4-239
4.12.7	7.2 Long-term Impacts	4-239
4.13 Climat	te Change	4-239
4.13.1 N	No-action Alternative	4-240
4.13.1	1.1 Short-term Impacts	4-240
4.13.1	1.2 Long-term Impacts	4-240
4.13.2 A	Alternative 1	4-241
4.13.2	2.1 Short-term Impacts	4-241
4.13.2	2.2 Long-term Impacts	4-244
4.13.3 A	Alternative 2	4-248
4.13.3	3.1 Short-term Impacts	4-248
4.13.3	3.2 Long-term Impacts	4-248
4.13.4 A	Alternative 3	4-249
4.13.4	4.1 Short-term Impacts	4-249
4.13.4	4.2 Long-term Impacts	4-249
4.13.5 A	Alternative 4	4-249
4.13.5	5.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.13.5	5.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.13.6 A	Alternative 5	4-251
4.13.6	6.1 Short-term Impacts	4-252
4.13.6	6.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.13.7 N	Nitigation Measures	4-252
4.13.7	7.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.13.7	7.2 Long-term Impacts	4-253
4.14 Noise		4-253
4.14.1 N	No-action Alternative	4-253
4.14.1	1.1 Short-term Impacts	4-253
4.14.1	1.2 Long-term Impacts	4-254
4.14.2 A	Alternative 1	4-254

		4.14	.2.1	Short-term Impacts	4-254
		4.14	.2.2	Long-term Impacts	4-260
	4.14	.3	Alte	rnative 2	4-261
		4.14	.3.1	Short-term Impacts	4-262
		4.14	.3.2	Long-term Impacts	4-262
	4.14	.4	Alte	rnative 3	4-262
		4.14	.4.1	Short-term Impacts	4-262
		4.14	.4.2	Long-term Impacts	4-263
	4.14	.5	Alte	rnative 4	4-263
		4.14	.5.1	Short-term Impacts	4-263
		4.14	.5.2	Long-term Impacts	4-265
	4.14	.6	Alte	rnative 5	4-266
		4.14	.6.1	Short-term Impacts	4-266
		4.14	.6.2	Long-term Impacts	4-267
	4.14	.7	Mitig	gation Measures	4-267
		4.14	.7.1	Short-term Impacts	4-267
		4.14	.7.2	Long-term Impacts	4-268
4.1	5 F	Recr	eatic	on4	-268
	4.15	.1	No-a	action Alternative	4-268
		4.15	. 1. 1	Short-term Impacts	4-268
		4.15	.1.2	Long-term Impacts	4-269
	4.15	.2	Alte	rnative 1	4-269
		4.15	.2.1	Short-term Impacts	4-270
		4.15	.2.2	Long-term Impacts	4-274
	4.15	.3	Alte	rnative 2	4-276
		4.15	.3.1	Short-term Impacts	4-276
		4.15	.3.2	Long-term Impacts	4-277
	4.15	.4	Alte	rnative 3	4-277
		4.15	.4.1	Short-term Impacts	4-277
		4.15	.4.2	Long-term Impacts	4-277
	4.15	.5	Alte	rnative 4	4-278
		4.15	.5.1	Short-term Impacts	4-278

4.15.	5.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.15.6	Alternative 5	4-280
4.15.	6.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.15.7	Nitigation Measures	4-281
4.15.	7.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.15.	7.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.16 Land	Use	4-282
4.16.1	No-action Alternative	4-282
4.16.	1.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.16.	1.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.16.2	Alternative 1	4-283
4.16	2.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.16	2.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.16.3	Alternative 2	4-288
4.16.	3.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.16.	3.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.16.4	Alternative 3	4-289
4.16.	4.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.16.	4.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.16.5	Alternative 4	4-289
4.16.	5.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.16.	5.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.16.6	Alternative 5	4-291
4.16.	6.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.16.	6.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.16.7	Nitigation Measures	4-292
4.16.	7.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.16.	7.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.17 Wilde	rness Area	4-293
4.17.1	No-action Alternative	4-293
4.17.	1.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.17.	1.2 Long-term Impacts	

	4.17.2	Alte	rnative 1 4-2	94
	4.17	7.2.1	Short-term Impacts	294
	4.17	7.2.2	Long-term Impacts	296
	4.17.3	Alte	rnative 2	98
	4.17	7.3.1	Short-term Impacts	298
	4.17	7.3.2	Long-term Impacts	<u>?98</u>
	4.17.4	Alte	rnative 3 4-2	98
	4.17	7.4.1	Short-term Impacts	<u>?99</u>
	4.17	7.4.2	Long-term Impacts	<u>?99</u>
	4.17.5	Alte	rnative 4 4-2	99
	4.17	7.5.1	Short-term Impacts	<u>?99</u>
	4.17	7.5.2	Long-term Impacts	301
	4.17.6	Alte	rnative 5	:02
	4.17	7.6.1	Short-term Impacts	302
	4.17	7.6.2	Long-term Impacts	302
	4.17.7	Miti	gation Measures 4-3	:02
	4.17	7.7.1	Short-term Impacts	302
	4.17	7.7.2	Long-term Impacts	302
4.18 Shorelines				03
	4.18.1	No-a	action Alternative 4-3	03
	4.18	8.1.1	Short-term Impacts	303
	4.18	8.1.2	Long-term Impacts	304
	4.18.2	Alte	rnative 1	604
	4.18	8.2.1	Short-term Impacts	305
	4.18	8.2.2	Long-term Impacts	308
	4.18.3	Alte	rnative 2	12
	4.18	8.3.1	Short-term Impacts	312
	4.18	8.3.2	Long-term Impacts	312
	4.18.4	Alte	rnative 3 4-3	13
	4.18	8.4.1	Short-term Impacts	313
	4.18	8.4.2	Long-term Impacts	313
	4.18.5	Alte	rnative 4	313

4.18.	5.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.18.	5.2 Long-term Impacts	4-314
4.18.6	Alternative 5	4-317
4.18.0	6.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.18.0	6.2 Long-term Impacts	4-317
4.18.7 I	Mitigation Measures	4-318
4.18.	7.1 Short-term Impacts	4-318
4.18.	7.2 Long-term Impacts	4-318
4.19 Utiliti	es	4-318
4.19.1 I	No-action Alternative	4-319
4.19.	1.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.19.	1.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.19.2	Alternative 1	4-319
4.19.2	2.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.19.2	2.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.19.3	Alternative 2	4-323
4.19.3	3.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.19.	3.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.19.4	Alternative 3	4-323
4.19.4	4.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.19.4	4.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.19.5	Alternative 4	4-324
4.19.	5.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.19.	5.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.19.6	Alternative 5	4-326
4.19.0	6.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.19.0	6.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.19.7 I	Mitigation Measures	4-326
4.19.1	7.1 Short-term Impacts	
4.19.	7.2 Long-term Impacts	
4.20 Trans	portation	4-327
4.20.1	No-action Alternative	

		4.20	.1.1	Short-term Impacts	4-327
		4.20	.1.2	Long-term Impacts	4-327
	4.20	.2	Alte	rnative 1	4-327
		4.20	.2.1	Short-term Impacts	4-328
		4.20	.2.2	Long-term Impacts	4-330
	4.20	.3	Alte	rnative 2	4-331
		4.20	.3.1	Short-term Impacts	4-331
		4.20	.3.2	Long-term Impacts	<i>4-332</i>
	4.20	.4	Alte	rnative 3	4-332
		4.20	.4.1	Short-term Impacts	<i>4-332</i>
		4.20	.4.2	Long-term Impacts	<i>4-332</i>
	4.20	.5	Alte	rnative 4	4-332
		4.20	.5.1	Short-term Impacts	<i>4-332</i>
		4.20	.5.2	Long-term Impacts	4-333
	4.20	.6	Alte	rnative 5	4-334
		4.20	.6.1	Short-term Impacts	4-334
		4.20	.6.2	Long-term Impacts	4-334
	4.20	.7	Miti	gation Measures	4-334
		4.20	.7.1	Short-term Impacts	4-334
		4.20	.7.2	Long-term Impacts	4-335
4.2	1 0	Cultu	Iral	Resources (Archaeological, Ethnographic, and	
	ŀ	listo	oric S	Sites of Significance)4	1-335
	4.21	.1	No-a	action Alternative	4-335
		4.21	.1.1	Short-term Impacts	4-335
		4.21	.1.2	Long-term Impacts	4-336
	4.21	.2	Alte	rnative 1	4-336
		4.21	.2.1	Short-term Impacts	4-336
		4.21	.2.2	Long-term Impacts	4-342
	4.21	.3	Alte	rnative 2	4-345
		4.21	.3.1	Short-term Impacts	4-345
		4.21	.3.2	Long-term Impacts	4-345
	4.21	.4	Alte	rnative 3	4-346

		4.21	.4.1	Short-term Impacts	346
		4.21	.4.2	Long-term Impacts	346
	4.21	.5	Alte	rnative 44-3	46
		4.21	.5.1	Short-term Impacts	346
		4.21	.5.2	Long-term Impacts	348
	4.21	.6	Alte	rnative 54-3	49
		4.21	.6.1	Short-term Impacts	350
	4.21	.7	Miti	gation Measures4-3	50
		4.21	.7.1	Short-term Impacts	350
		4.21	.7.2	Long-term Impacts	351
4.2	22 I	ndia	n Sa	acred Sites 4-3	51
	4.22	.1	No-a	action Alternative4-3	51
		4.22	2.1.1	Short-term Impacts	351
		4.22	P.1.2	Long-term Impacts	352
	4.22	.2	Alte	rnative 14-3	52
		4.22	<i>2.2.1</i>	Short-term Impacts	352
		4.22	2.2.2	Long-term Impacts	355
	4.22	.3	Alte	rnative 24-3	58
		4.22	2.3.1	Short-term Impacts	358
		4.22	2.3.2	Long-term Impacts	358
	4.22	.4	Alte	rnative 34-3	59
		4.22	2.4.1	Short-term Impacts	359
		4.22	2.4.2	Long-term Impacts	359
	4.22	.5	Alte	rnative 44-3	59
		4.22	2.5.1	Short-term Impacts	360
		4.22	2.5.2	Long-term Impacts	361
	4.22	.6	Alte	rnative 54-3	62
		4.22	2.6.1	Short-term Impacts	362
		4.22	2.6.2	Long-term Impacts	362
	4.22	.7	Miti	gation Measures4-3	63
		4.22	2.7.1	Short-term Impacts	363
		4.22	.7.2	Long-term Impacts	363
4.23 Indian Tr	ust Assets and Fishing Harvest4-363				
----------------	-------------------------------------				
4.23.1 No-a	action Alternative				
4.23.1.1	Short-term Impacts				
4.23.1.2	Long-term Impacts				
4.23.2 Alter	rnative 1 4-365				
4.23.2.1	Short-term Impacts				
4.23.2.2	Long-term Impacts				
4.23.3 Alter	rnative 2 4-372				
4.23.3.1	Short-term Impacts 4-372				
4.23.3.2	Long-term Impacts				
4.23.4 Alter	rnative 3 4-373				
4.23.4.1	Short-term Impacts 4-373				
4.23.4.2	Long-term Impacts				
4.23.5 Alter	rnative 4 4-373				
4.23.5.1	Short-term Impacts 4-374				
4.23.5.2	Long-term Impacts				
4.23.6 Alter	rnative 5 4-377				
4.23.6.1	Short-term Impacts 4-377				
4.23.6.2	Long-term Impacts 4-377				
4.23.7 Mitig	gation Measures 4-378				
4.23.7.1	Short-term Impacts				
4.23.7.2	Long-term Impacts				
4.24 Socioeco	onomics4-378				
4.24.1 No-a	action Alternative				
4.24.2 Alter	rnative 1				
4.24.3 Alter	rnative 2 4-382				
4.24.4 Alter	rnative 3 4-382				
4.24.5 Alter	rnative 4 4-382				
4.24.6 Alter	rnative 5 4-383				
4.25 Environm	nental Justice4-383				
4.25.1 No-a	action Alternative				
4.25.1.1	Short-term Impacts				

4.2	5.1.2	Long-term Impacts	4-384
4.25.2	Alte	rnative 1	4-385
4.2	5.2.1	Short-term Impacts	4-385
4.2	5.2.2	Long-term Impacts	4-385
4.25.3	Alte	rnative 2	4-386
4.2	5.3.1	Short-term Impacts	4-386
4.2	5.3.2	Long-term Impacts	4-387
4.25.4	Alte	rnative 3	4-387
4.2	5.4.1	Short-term Impacts	4-387
4.2	5.4.2	Long-term Impacts	4-388
4.25.5	Alte	rnative 4	4-388
4.2	5.5.1	Short-term Impacts	4-388
4.2	5.5.2	Long-term Impacts	
4.25.6	Alte	rnative 5	4-389
4.2	5.6.1	Short-term Impacts	4-389
4.2	5.6.2	Long-term Impacts	4-390
4.25.7	Miti	gation Measures	4-390
4.2	5.7.1	Short-term Impacts	4-390
4.2	5. <i>7.2</i>	Long-term Impacts	4-391
4.26 Sum	nmar	y of Impacts and Benefits of the Icicle Stra	tegy by
Alte	rnati	ve	4-391
4.26.1	Sho	rt-Term	4-391
4.26.2	Lon	g-Term	4-398
4.27 Cum	nulat	ive Impacts	4-408
4.27.1	Past	t Actions	4-408
4.27.2	Pres	sent and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions	4-408
4.27.3	Cun	nulative Impacts of the Alternatives	4-409
4.2	7.3.1	Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)	4-410
4.2	7.3.2	Alternative 2	4-410
4.2	7.3.3	Alternative 3	4-411
4.2	7.3.4	Alternative 4	4-412
4.2	7.3.5	Alternative 5	

4.28	Unav	voidable Adverse Impacts4-413
4.2	28.1	Earth, Surface Water, Water Quality, Shorelines, and Fish 4-414
4.2	28.2	Aesthetics, Recreation, and Wilderness
4.2	28.3	Land-Use
4.2	28.4	Climate Change 4-415
4.2	28.5	Cultural Resources 4-415
4.29	Irrev	ersible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources4-416
4.30	Envi	ronmental Commitments4-417
4.3	30.1	Earth, Surface Water, Water Quality, Shorelines, & Fish 4-417
4.3	30.2	Aesthetics, Recreation, and Wilderness 4-417
4.3	30.3	Land-Use 4-417
4.:	30.4	Cultural Resources

### **Chapter 5.0 – CONSULTATION & COORDINATION**

5.´	l Pub	lic In	volvement5-1
	5.1.1	SEF	PA Scoping
	5.1.2	Pub	olic Meetings
	5.1.3	Sco	ping Comments
	5.1	.3.1	General Comments 5-2
	5.1	.3.2	Alternatives and Projects 5-2
	5.1	.3.3	Impacts to Resources
	5.1	.3.4	Permitting and Compliance with Laws
	5.1.4	Oth	er Meetings and Outreach5-3
	5.1.5	Dra	ft PEIS Comment Period5-5
5.2	2 Coo	rdin	ation and Consultation5-6
	5.2.1	Age	encies
	5.2	.1.1	National Marine Fisheries Service 5-6
	5.2	.1.2	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
	5.2	.1.3	U.S. Forest Service
	5.2	.1.4	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 5-7
	5.2	.1.5	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation 5-7

5.2.1.6	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	. 5-7
5.2.1.7	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	. 5-7
5.2.1.8	Washington Department of Natural Resources	. 5-7
5.2.1.9	<i>Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation</i>	. 5-7
5.2.2 Trib	al Consultation and Coordination	5-8
5.2.2.1	Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation	. 5-8
5.2.2.2	Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation	. 5-8
Chapter 6.0	- REFERENCES	6-1

## List of Tables

ES-1	Summary of Short-term Impacts of No-Action Alternative and Program Alternatives
ES-2	Summary of Long-term Impacts of No-Action Alternative and Program Alternatives ES-21
1-1	List of Icicle Work Group Members1-9
1-2	Focal Fish Species by Reach1-14
1-3	Icicle Creek Spring Chinook Fishery1-19
1-4	Projected Municipal & Domestic Water Demand through 20501-20
1-5	Optimum Flows by Species and Life Stage for Reach 11-28
1-6	Icicle Creek Projects Identified in the Upper Columbia Spring Chinook and Steelhead Recovery Plan1-36
1-7	Environmental Review Timeline1-41
2-1	Alternatives Being Considered2-13
2-2	How Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative) Meets Guiding Principles2-18
2-3	How Alternative 2 Meets Guiding Principles2-25
2-4	How Alternative 3 Meets Guiding Principles2-31
2-5	How Alternative 4 Meets Guiding Principles2-37
2-6	How Alternative 5 Meets Guiding Principles2-43
2-7	IPID and USFWS/USBR Storage and Diversion Rights, Icicle Creek Subbasin2-52
2-8	Recommended Restoration and Protections Actions by Biological Benefit2-82
2-9	Summary of Alternative 1 Costs and Benefits2-100
2-10	Summary of Alternative 2 Costs and Benefits2-107
2-11	Summary of Alternative 3 Costs and Benefits2-111
2-12	Summary of Alternative 4 Costs and Benefits2-122
2-13	Summary of Improvement Concept Evaluated for IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange2-124
2-14	Summary of Alternative 5 Costs and Benefits2-129

3-1	Alpine Lakes Annual Water Supply Statistics
3-2	Alpine Lakes Storage Volume Estimates
3-3	Leland Creek Drainage Flows
3-4	French Creek Drainage Flows
3-5	Estimated 2016 Flow at the Boulder Field
3-6	Clean Water Act Section 303(d) (Category 5) Listings for Project Waterbodies in the Primary and Secondary Project Development Areas. 3-27
3-7	Water Quality Improvement Projects Affecting Project Surface Waters and Associated Tributaries
3-8	Designated Use Listings for Project Waters in the Primary and Secondary Project Development Areas
3-9	Attributes of Alpine Lake Storage Rights
3-10	Icicle Creek Surface Water Rights
3-11	Number of Parcels Served by Entity per Parcel Size Class
3-12	Summary of Alpine Lakes Trout Stocking Status
3-13	Current Habitat Limitations on Lower Icicle Creek
3-14	Plant Species Observed at the Alpine Lakes during the July 2016 Site Visit
3-15	Federally Listed and Proposed Plant Species
3-16	Federally Listed and Proposed Species, ESA Status, and Preferred Habitats that Occur in Chelan County and the Alpine Lakes, Icicle Creek, and Wenatchee River Corridor Project Areas
3-17	Federally Listed and Proposed Species Critical Habitat Status that Occur in Chelan County and the Alpine Lakes, Icicle Creek, and Wenatchee River Corridor Project Areas
3-18	WDFW Priority Habitats that Occur in Chelan County and Potentially Occur within the Project Area
3-19	Sources of Regional Haze Pollutants
3-20	Available NWS Climate Records in/near Wenatchee River Watershed (adapted from Wenatchee Watershed Assessment, 2003)
3-21	Streamflow Percentage Change Based on Climate Change Modeling 2050
3-22	Typical Construction Noise Levels
ວ່າວ	Maximum Permissible Noise Levels for Non-Exempt Activities 3-118

3-24	Approximate Number of Day-Use Permits in Enchantment Permit Area Zone3-121
3-25	Lottery Applications by Year3-123
3-26	2015 Enchantment Zone Permit Area Data3-124
3-27	WDFW Trout Stocking in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area
3-28	USFS Campgrounds along Icicle Creek3-126
3-29	Sport Fishery Effort for Hatchery-origin Spring-run Chinook Salmon on Icicle Creek (WDFW)3-127
3-30	Zoning designations in Chelan County3-132
3-31	Land Use in Acres
3-32	Easement and Permit Summary for Select Alpine Lakes
3-33	Capital Improvement Projects Made by the City of Leavenworth to Improve Conservation and Accountability of Water Use (Aspect, 2014) 3-148
3-34	Chelan County Population, Housing Stock, and Property Value Changes 3-159
3-35	2014 Chelan County Employment3-160
3-36	2014 Chelan County Wages3-160
3-37	Race and Ethnicity3-163
3-38	Income, Poverty and Unemployment3-163
4-1	Instream Flow Changes4-16
4-2	Chelan County Riparian Buffer Protection and Mitigation Requirements .4-107
4-3	Ability to Maintain Minimum Flow Target of 100 cfs Under 2080 Climate Change Conditions4-240
4-4	Typical Construction Noise Levels4-253
4-5	OFM 2007 Input/Output Model Results for Costs and Benefits Associated with Program Alternatives
4-6	Assumed Fish Increases for Each Program Alternative4-381
4-7	Summary of Short-Term Impacts4-393
4-8	Summary of Long-Term Impacts4-400
4-9	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments4-416
5-1	Outreach Efforts5-4
5-2	Draft Permits, Approvals, and Relevant Triggers5-9

# **List of Figures**

ES-1	Icicle Creek Subbasin ES-2
1-1	Overview Map of Icicle Subbasin1-6
1-2	Chapter 173-545 WAC Prescribed Flows (1983 rule compared to 2007 revised rule)1-8
1-3	Instream Flow Rule Compared to Streamflow1-8
1-4	Focal Fish Species and Relevant Life Stages Periodicity within Icicle Work Group Study Reaches1-14
1-5a	Available Habitat by Flow for Focal Fish Species1-15
1-5b	Available Habitat by Flow for Focal Fish Species, Reach 1 and 21-16
1-5c	Available Habitat by Flow for Focal Fish Species, Reach 31-16
1-5d	Available Habitat by Flow for Focal Fish Species, Reach 41-17
1-5e	Available Habitat by Flow for Focal Fish Species, Reach 5
1-6	Time Frame and Frequency Instream Rule is Not Met in the Wenatchee River
1-7	Low Flows at Structure 2 (35.7 cfs)1-24
1-8	Icicle Creek Subbasin Distributions of Anadromous Salmonids 1-35
2-1	Guiding Principles with Metrics2-2
2-2	Minimum Flow (less the 20 cfs) and Instream Flow Goals (100 cfs) Overlaid by WUA for Spawning Steelhead in Icicle Creek Historical Channel
2-3	Comparison of Project Benefits and Costs to Flow and WUA, Step 12-6
2-4	Comparison of Project Benefits and Costs to Flow and WUA, Step 22-7
2-5	Comparison of Project Benefits and Costs to Flow and WUA, Step 32-8
2-6	Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative) Weekly Time Step, 2015 (Representative Drought Year)2-20
2-7	Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative) Weekly Time Step, 2014 (Representative Non-Drought Year)2-21
2-8	Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative) Weekly Time Step, Drought/Low Water Year Scenario2-22

2-9	Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative) Weekly Time Step, Non-Drought Scenario2-23
2-10	Alternative 2 Weekly Time Step, 2015 (Drought Year)2-26
2-11	Alternative 2 Weekly Time Step, 2014 (Non-Drought Year)2-27
2-12	Alternative 2 Weekly Time Step, Drought/Low Water Year Scenario2-28
2-13	Alternative 2 Weekly Time Step, Non-Drought Scenario2-29
2-14	Alternative 3 Weekly Time Step, 2015 (Drought Year)2-32
2-15	Alternative 3 Weekly Time Step, 2014 (Non-Drought Year)2-33
2-16	Alternative 3 Weekly Time Step, Drought/Low Water Year Scenario2-34
2-17	IWG Alternative 3 Weekly Time Step, Non-Drought Scenario 2-35
2-18	Alternative 4 Weekly Time Step, 2015 (Drought Year)2-38
2-19	Alternative 4 Weekly Time Step, 2014 (Non-Drought Year)2-39
2-20	IWG Alternative 4 Weekly Time Step, Drought/Low Water Year Scenario . 2-40
2-21	IWG Alternative 4 Weekly Time Step, Non-Drought Scenario 2-41
2-22	Alternative 5 Weekly Time Step, 2015 (Drought Year)2-44
2-23	Alternative 5 Weekly Time Step, 2014 (Non-Drought Year)2-45
2-24	IWG Alternative 5 Weekly Time Step, Drought/Low Water Year Scenario . 2-46
2-25	IWG Alternative 5 Weekly Time Step, Non-Drought Scenario2-47
2-26	Ownership of Lands Adjacent to Upper and Lower Snow Lakes and Nada Lake2-54
2-27	Automation Impacts – Eightmile Lake2-56
2-28	Current Alpine Lakes Infrastructure, Eightmile Dam (2015)2-57
2-29	Automation Impacts – Klonaqua Lake2-58
2-30	Automation Impacts – Colchuck Lake2-59
2-31	Automation Impacts – Square Lake2-60
2-32	Current Alpine Lakes Infrastructure, Square Lake Dam2-61
2-33	Automation Impacts – Snow Lakes2-62
2-34	Proposed Automation Schematic Details2-63
2-35	Irrigation Efficiencies2-65
2-36	COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange2-68
2-37	Domestic Conservation Efficiencies2-71
2-38	Eightmile Lake Restoration2-73

2-39	Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries2-76
2-40	700 cfs at Plunge Pool2-78
2-41	1,700 cfs at Plunge Pool2-78
2-42	Habitat Protection and Enhancement2-80
2-43	Combined Landscape Priorities for the Icicle Creek Area2-85
2-44	Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery2-88
2-45	Groundwater Investigation Site Plan2-89
2-46	Effluent Pump Back Pilot Program2-90
2-47	Circular Tanks for Fish Rearing2-91
2-48	Fish Passage and Fish Screening2-93
2-49	Structure 2
2-50	Example of pool and chute fishway2-95
2-51	LNFH/COIC Fixed Plate Screen (left) and COIC Bypass Screen (right) 2-97
2-52	Water Banking Process Overview2-98
2-53	IPID Dryden Pump Exchange
2-54	Eightmile Reservoir Enhancements2-113
2-55	Upper Klonaqua Storage Enhancement2-117
2-56	Upper Snow Storage Enhancement
2-57	IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange2-126
3-1	Surficial Geology
3-2	Icicle Creek Stream Flows at RM 5.83-13
3-3	Wenatchee Stream Flow near Peshastin Creek
3-4	Icicle Water Budget3-18
3-5	Wenatchee River Watershed Water Budget3-19
3-6	Instream Flow Rule for Icicle Creek and 2015 Flows
3-7	Wenatchee Instream Flow Rule at Monitor
3-8	Historical and Projected Demand in the Wenatchee River Watershed 3-46
3-9	Comparison of Surface Water Supply and Demand (1981 to 2011)
3-10	Wetland Near Eightmile Lake
3-11	Eightmile Lake Vista
3-12	Klonaqua Lake Vista

3-13	Square Lake Vista
3-14	Eightmile Lake Trail3-90
3-15	Campsite near Klonaqua Lake3-90
3-16	Valve House and Outlet near Nada Lake3-91
3-17	Gate Actuator and Gate Chamber near Klonaqua Lake
3-18	Dam Structure at Square Lake
3-19	Icicle Creek Boulder Field from Snow Lakes Trailhead3-93
3-20	Icicle Creek from Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, Structure 53-94
3-21	Wenatchee River at Icicle Road Bridge near Public River Access
3-22	Wenatchee River from Highway 2 Bridge at Town of Dryden3-96
3-23	Icicle Creek Modeled 2030 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions)3-102
3-24	Icicle Creek Modeled 2030 (High Greenhouse Gas Emissions)3-103
3-25	Icicle Creek Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions)3-104
3-26	Icicle Creek Modeled 2050 Flows (High Greenhouse Gas Emissions) 3-105
3-27	Icicle Creek Modeled 2080 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions)3-106
3-28	Icicle Creek Modeled 2080 Flows (High Greenhouse Gas Emissions) 3-107
3-29	Colchuck Lake Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions).3-109
3-30	Eightmile Lake Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions) 3-110
3-31	Klonaqua Lake Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions) 3-111
3-32	Square Lake Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions) 3-112
3-33	Nada Lake Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions)3-113
3-34	Lower Snow Lake Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions)
3-35	Upper Snow Lake Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions)3-115
3-36	Enchantment Permit Area Zones (USFS, 2017b)3-120
3-37	Recreation Sites and Existing Conditions within the Alpine Lakes Area.3-122
3-38	Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area3-136
3-39	Alpine Lakes Management Act Area3-139
4-1	Colchuck Lake Viewshed4-170

4-3	Upper and Lower Klonaqua Lakes Viewshed4-171
4-4	Snow Lake Viewshed4-171
4-5	Square Lake Viewshed
4-6	Colchuck Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking Northeast (August) 4-173
4-7	Colchuck Lake Viewpoint 2: Looking North (August)
4-8	Eightmile Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking West (August)4-175
4-9	Eightmile Lake Viewpoint 2: Looking Southeast (July)
4-10	Klonaqua Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking Southwest (July)
4-11	Snow Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking East (August)
4-12	Upper Snow Lake Viewpoint 2: Looking West (August)
4-13	Snow Lake Viewpoint 3 (Nada Lake): Looking Southwest
4-14	Square Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking West (September) 4-179
4-15	Wenatchee River Viewshed: Viewpoints 1 through 3 4-181
4-16	Wenatchee River Viewpoint 1: Looking Northwest (September)4-181
4-17	Wenatchee Viewpoint 2: Looking Northeast (September) 4-182
4-18	Wenatchee Viewpoint 3: Looking Northeast (September) 4-182
4-19	Icicle Creek Viewpoint 14-185
4-20	Icicle Creek Viewpoint 1: Looking Southwest4-185
4-21	Icicle Creek Fish Passage Improvements Viewshed
4-22	Icicle Creek Viewpoint 1: From Structure 5 Looking Upstream (Mid-water, 450 cfs)4-188
4-23	Icicle Creek Viewpoint 2: From Structure 2 Looking Downstream (Mid-water, 390 cfs)4-189
4-24	Icicle Creek Viewpoint 3: From Boulder Field Looking Upstream (Low-water, 85 cfs)4-190
4-25	Icicle Creek Viewshed4-191
4-26	Representative Photo: Solar-panel Associated with Existing Trees 4-193
4-27	Representative Photo: Actuator
4-28	Representative Photo: Utility Cover
4-29	Colchuck Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking Northeast, High Water 4-196
4-30	Colchuck Viewpoint 1: Looking Northeast, Low Water
4-31	Colchuck Lake Viewpoint 2: Looking North, High Water
4-32	Colchuck Lake Viewpoint 2: Looking North, Low Water

4-33	Eightmile Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking West, High Water4-198
4-34	Eightmile Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking West, Low Water4-198
4-35	Lower Klonaqua Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking Southwest, High Water4-199
4-36	Lower Klonaqua Viewpoint 1: Looking Southwest, Low Water
4-37	Lower Snow Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking East, High Water4-200
4-38	Lower Snow Viewpoint 1: Looking East, Low Water
4-39	Upper Snow Viewpoint 2: Looking West, High Water
4-40	Upper Snow Viewpoint 2: Looking West, Low Water
4-41	Square Viewpoint 1: Looking West4-202
4-42	Square Viewpoint 1: Looking West4-202
4-43	Icicle Creek Viewpoint 3: From Boulder Field Looking Upstream, High Water4-203
4-44	Icicle Creek Viewpoint 3: From Boulder Field Looking Upstream, Low Water4-203
4-45	Icicle Creek Viewpoint 2: From Structure 2 Looking Downstream, High Water4-204
4-46	Icicle Creek Viewpoint 2: From Structure 2 Looking Downstream, Low Water
4-47	Icicle Creek Viewpoint 1: From Structure 5 Looking Upstream, High Water4-205
4-48	Icicle Creek Viewpoint 1: From Structure 5 Looking Upstream, Low Water4-205
4-49	Representative Photo: Pump Station Intake Features and Armored Bank 4-206
4-50	Representative Photo: Pump Station Building (Prior to Revegetation) 4-207
4-51	Eightmile Lake Water Levels4-210
4-52	Eightmile Lake Viewpoint 2: Eightmile Lake Dam, Existing and Proposed 4-211
4-53	Eightmile Lake Viewpoint 1: High Lake Conditions, Existing and Proposed4-211
4-54	Eightmile Lake Viewpoint 1: Low Lake Level, Existing and Proposed Conditions4-211
4-55	Wenatchee River Viewshed: Viewpoint 44-215
4-56	Wenatchee Viewpoint 4: Looking Southwest (July)4-215
4-57	Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement: Dam, Existing and Proposed Conditions4-219

4-58	Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement: Higher Lake Level, Existing and Proposed Conditions
4-59	Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement: Low Lake Level, Existing and Proposed Conditions
4-60	Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Viewshed
4-61	Viewpoint 2: Upper Klonaqua Lake Outlet Visible from Lower Klonaqua Lake, Existing and Proposed Conditions
4-62	Viewpoint 1: Lower Snow Lake High Water, Existing and Proposed Conditions
4-63	Viewpoint 1: Lower Snow Lake Low Water, Existing and Proposed Conditions
4-64	Viewpoint 2: Upper Snow Lake High Water, Existing and Proposed Conditions
4-65	Viewpoint 2: Upper Snow Lake Low Water, Existing and Proposed Conditions
4-66	Wenatchee River Viewshed: Viewpoints 5 and 64-226
4-67	Wenatchee Viewpoint 5: Looking Southwest
4-68	Wenatchee Viewpoint 6: Looking Southwest

## **List of Appendices**

- A DPEIS Comments and Responsiveness Summary
- B Scoping Comments and Responsiveness Summary
- C Eightmile Lake Restoration Feasibility Study
- D Alpine Lakes Optimization and Automation Feasibility Study
- E WDFW Priority Species and Preferred
- F Easement Agreements and Deeds
- G Changing Streamflow in Icicle, Peshastin, and Mission Creeks and Flow Charts

# List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

	Abbreviation	Definition
7		
	7DADmax	7-Day Average Daily Maximum
Α		
	ac-ft	acre feet
	afy	acre feet per year
	ALWA	Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area
	asl	above sea level
В		
	BA	Biological Assessment
	BIA	Bureau of Indian Affairs
	BiOp	Biological Opinion
	BMPs	Best Management Practices
	BNSF	Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway
С		
	CAA	Clean Air Act
	CAO	Critical Area Ordinance
	CatEx	Categorical Exclusion
	CELP	Center for Environmental Law and Policy
	CFR	Code of Federal Regulations

	Abbreviation	Definition
С		
	cfs	cubic feet per second
	CIG	Climate Impacts Group
	COIC	Cascade Orchards Irrigation Company
	CPUE	catch per unit effort
	CSZ	Cascadia subduction zone
	CTCR	Confederal Tribes of the Colville Reservation
	CWA	Clean Water Act
	CWCP	Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan
D		
	DAHP	Washington State Department of Archeological and Historic Preservation
	dBA	A-weighted decibels
	dbh	diameter breast height
	DDD	dichloro-diphenyl-dichloroethane
	DDE	dichloro-diphenyl-ethane
	DDT	dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane
	DMR	Discharge Monitoring Reports
	DO	dissolved oxygen
	DOI	United States Department of Interior
	DPS	distinct population segment
	DS	Determination of Significance
	DSO	Dam Safety Office

Abbreviation Definition

EA	Environmental Assessment
Ecology	Washington State Department of Ecology
EDNA	environmental designation for noise abatement
EFH	essential fish habitat
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ERU	Equivalent Residential Unit
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESD	Washington Employment Security Department
ESU	Evolutionarily Significant Unit

### F

Ε

FCC	Federal Communications Commission
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency

### G

GEO	Governor's Executive Order
GHG	greenhouse gas
GHOD	Geologically Hazardous Overlay District
GP	Guiding Principle
gpd	gallons per day
gpm	gallons per minute

	Abbreviation	Definition
н		
	НРА	Hydraulic Project Approval
I		
	ICIFS	Icicle Creek Instream Flow Subcommittee
	ICWC	Icicle Creek Watershed Council
	IFIM	Instream Flow Incremental Methodology
	IPID	Icicle-Peshastin Irrigation District
	IID	Icicle Irrigation District
	ITAs	Indian Trust Assets
	IWG	Icicle Work Group
J		
-	JARPA	Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application
L		
	Ldn	average sound level
	Leq	equivalent sound pressure levels
	LNFH	Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery
	LWD	large woody material
Μ		
	MCRFRO	Mid-Columbia River Fisheries Resource Office
	MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
	MSA	Magnuson-Stevens Act
	MSA	Metropolitan Statistical Area
	MWG	Montgomery Water Group Inc.

Abbreviation	Definition
--------------	------------

Ν

NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NF	National Forest
NMFS	Nation Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRC	National Research Council
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSD	Natural Systems Design
NWP	Nationwide Permit
NWS	National Weather Service

### 0

O&M	operation and maintenance
OCPI	Overriding Consideration of the Public Interest
OCR	Office of the Columbia River
OFM	Washington Office of Financial Management
OHWM	ordinary high water mark

	Abbreviation	Definition
Ρ		
	РА	Proof of Appropriation
	PCBs	polychlorinated biphenyls
	PCN	preconstruction notification
	PEIS	Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
	PEM	palustrine emergent
	PFO	palustrine forest
	PHABSIM	Physical Habitat Simulation
	PHS	Priority Habitat and Species
	PID	Peshastin Irrigation District
	PM	particulate matter
	POTW	publicly owned treatment works
	PUD	Public Utility District
	PSS	palustrine scrub-shrub
Q		
	Qa	annual quantity
	Qi	instantaneous quantity
R		
	RAS	recirculating aquaculture system
	RCW	Revised Code of Washington
	RM	River Mile
	ROE	Report of Examination
	RV	recreational vehicle

Abbreviation	Definition
SAAQS	State Ambient Air Quality Standards
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMA	Shoreline Management Act
SMP	Shoreline Master Plan
SUP	stand-up paddleboard
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Control Plan

### Т

S

TCPs	Traditional Cultural Properties
TDH	total dynamic head
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
TWRA	Trust Water Rights Agreement
TWRP	Trust Water Rights Program

### U

U&A	Usual and Accustomed
UCSRB	Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board
UGA	urban growth area
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USBR	United States Bureau of Reclamation
USC	United States Code
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture

Abbreviation [	Definition
----------------	------------

U

USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USFS	United States Forest Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
UW	University of Washington
UWCLP	Upper Wenatchee Community Land Plan

### W

WAC	Washington Administrative Code
WDFW	Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife
WDNR	Washington State Department of Natural Resources
WISAARD	Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Data
WMSA	Wenatchee Metropolitan Statistical Area
WRIA	Water Resource Inventory Area
WSP	water system plan
WUA	weighted usable area
WWPU	Wenatchee Watershed Planning Unit

- Υ
- YN

Yakama Nation

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This Executive Summary reviews the analysis conducted in the programmatic environmental impact statement (PEIS) for proposals to improve water management in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Per Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11-400, the purpose of this PEIS is to provide discussion of the environmental impacts and to inform the Icicle Work Group (IWG), regulators, funders, and the public of reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures. A PEIS evaluates the effect of broad proposals and planning-level decisions, and thus the level of knowledge on project detail varies. The proposed alternatives and impacts discussed here are based on the current knowledge and understanding of project details. Per WAC 197-11-406, the co-leads initiated State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review as early in the process as possible so that the PEIS could be used effectively as part of the decision-making process.

## Introduction

Icicle Creek is a major tributary to the Wenatchee River and is located entirely within Chelan County, Washington. Flows from Icicle Creek supply a variety of demands, including domestic water supply (e.g., City of Leavenworth and rural Chelan County residents), agricultural irrigation (e.g., Icicle-Peshastin Irrigation District (IPID) and Cascade Orchards Irrigation Company (COIC)), artificial aquatic habitat for hatchery fish raised at the Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery (LNFH), natural aquatic habitat for wild (non-hatchery) fish, and recreation. Figure ES-1 provides an overview of the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Taken together, water needs in the Subbasin are often greater than the available supply.

To find solutions for water management within the Subbasin, the Chelan County Natural Resource Department (Chelan County, County) and the Washington State Department of Ecology's (Ecology) Office of the Columbia River (OCR) co-convened the IWG (Work Group) in December 2012. The IWG comprises a diverse set of stakeholders representing local, state, and federal agencies, tribes, irrigation and agricultural interests, municipal/domestic water managers, and environmental organizations. Since 2012, the IWG has been studying and negotiating an integrated water resource management strategy for the Icicle Creek Subbasin. The proposal discussed in this document is the result of this effort.

## **Purpose and Need for Action**

The current water management practices in the Icicle Creek Subbasin fail to consistently meet the demand for instream and out-of-stream water uses. This has been demonstrated by the minimum instream flows established in Chapter 173-545 WAC not being met, interruptible water users not receiving irrigation water, and litigation over water rights. There are additional issues in Icicle Creek surrounding fish habitat and passage, tribal fishing rights, and sustainable operation of the LFNH. The following sections summarize some of the key issues in water resource management and watershed function within Icicle Creek that lead to a need for a comprehensive water resource management plan within the Subbasin.

#### **ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN**

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

### Figure ES-1. Icicle Creek Subbasin



These problems have created a need to improve ecological function in Icicle Creek and to provide reliable water resources for agriculture and domestic water users. With the additional pressures on water resources that will likely result from a changing climate, it is imperative to address these problems in a way that considers potential future impacts of climate change. The Icicle Strategy seeks to address these issues while considering the potential climate impacts and ensuring all actions comply with state and federal law, including the Wilderness Acts.

### The Icicle Strategy and Guiding Principles

The Icicle Strategy is a comprehensive water resource management plan designed to balance and meet out-of-stream and instream water demand and resolve habitat and fisheries issues in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. The IWG developed the Icicle Strategy using stakeholder input and best available science. The crux of the Icicle Strategy is the Guiding Principles, which are a set of objectives that all members of the IWG agreed were in their mutual best interest to collaborate on and achieve. Over a 2-day work session facilitated by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) in December 2012, the IWG developed a list of shared goals to guide them in developing a strategy to meet the needs of the various stakeholders in the Subbasin. This list became known as the Guiding Principles, which have evolved since their initial development. These Guiding Principles, as they exist today, are described below:

**Improve Instream Flow:** This principle seeks to improve and enhance instream flows in the Icicle Creek historical channel. The goal is to modulate the flow in a way that enhances fish passage and fish utilization and promotes healthy habitats, serves channel formation function, meets aesthetic and water quality objectives, and is resilient to climate change.

The metric for this principle calls for 60 cubic feet per second (cfs) in drought years. To meet drought year goals, a minimum of 40 cfs will need to be protected instream. The short-term goal is for 100 cfs minimum flows in non-drought years, with a long-term goal set at 250 cfs. A maximum flow of 2,600 cfs can pass through LNFH's "Structure 2", which is located at River Mile (RM) 3.9 and is used to divert flows into the LNFH's Hatchery Channel. Based on work conducted by the IWG's Instream Flow Subcommittee, this flow maximum will remain in place.

**Improve Sustainability of LNFH:** This principle aims to enhance and maintain a healthy, sustainable LNFH that produces fish in adequate numbers to meet *U.S. v. Oregon*, which specifies fish production requirements. It also aims to produce diverse source availability to maximize fish health. To do this, calls for a 57 cfs supply to be protected long-term with a conservation goal of at least 20 cfs. It also includes appropriately screened diversions and minimizing unintended barriers to fish passage.

**Protect Treaty/Non-treaty Harvest:** Treaty harvest by the Yakama Nation, the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, and non-treaty fishing are important parts of the Icicle Creek Subbasin. This principle maintains that tribal and non-tribal, federally protected fishing and harvest rights must be met at all times regardless of season or drought conditions. It aims to improve the catch per unit effort (CPUE) and maintain multispecies harvest opportunities.

**Improve Domestic Supply:** As the population inside the Icicle Creek Subbasin grows, more water will be needed by the City of Leavenworth and surrounding areas in Chelan County. This principle calls for 1,750 acre-feet of reliable year-round supply, with 3 to 6 cfs on average and 6 to 12 cfs during peak flows to provide for projected growth through 2050. Additionally, this principle aims to improve domestic reliability for rural water users in the Icicle Creek Subbasin who depend on domestic wells to supply their drinking water.

**Improve Agricultural Reliability:** With agriculture vital to the health and prosperity of the region, this principle calls for projects to improve agricultural reliability that are operational, flexible, decrease risk of drought impacts, and are economically sustainable. It ensures current interruptible agricultural users have a firm supply in average water years.

**Enhance Icicle Creek Habitat:** This principle seeks to improve ecosystem health by protecting and enhancing aquatic and terrestrial habitat in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. This includes investments in physical habitat improvements that consider high-flow habitat and low-flow refuge, along with minimizing impediments to fish passage and improving limiting factors for spawning/rearing. It also offsets project-related terrestrial impacts with land acquisitions/easements.

**Comply with State and Federal Law, and Wilderness Acts:** Projects developed under the Icicle Strategy must comply with both Washington State and federal laws, including The Wilderness Act of 1964, the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Act of 1976, and the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Management Plan of 1981. The IWG actively identified and engaged regulators in the process of creating the approaches and projects for the Icicle Strategy.

## **Identification of Preferred Alterative**

Following the comprehensive scoping and public comment for the PEIS discussed in Chapter 2, Ecology and Chelan County have selected Alterative 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The co-leads determined that the suite of projects and elements that comprise Alternative 1 have the best chance of meeting the Guiding Principles over time, have the highest likelihood of funding, and have the lowest environmental footprint of the other alternatives considered. Alternative 1 will achieve the following:

- Improve Instream Flows
- Improve Sustainability of LNFH
- Protect Tribal and Non-Tribal Harvest
- Improve Domestic Supply
- Improve Agricultural Reliability
- Enhance Icicle Creek Habitat
- Comply with State and Federal Law
- Comply with Wilderness Acts

There are anticipated environmental impacts from all alternatives considered under the PEIS, but overall Alternative 1 is the environmentally preferred alternative to meet the Purpose and Need of the Icicle Strategy. While the No-action Alternative and Alternative 3 have lower costs and impacts, they cannot fully meet the Purpose and Need. Additionally, Alternative 3, when accounting for elements of the No-action Alternative likely to proceed, have similar or greater impacts than the Preferred Alternative. The overall effect of Alternative 1 is expected to be more beneficial than the No-action Alternative for both instream and out-of-stream water supplies while enhancing fish habitat.

### Alternatives

The Icicle Strategy seeks to improve water resources management in the Icicle Creek Subbasin and achieve the specific metrics outlined in the Guiding Principles. This PEIS evaluates five alternatives that meet the Guiding Principles, along with a No-action Alternative. Each alternative is composed of a package of several projects developed to help meet the IWG's Guiding Principles. In summary, the five alternatives and the Noaction Alternative include:

- No-action Alternative: The No-action Alternative is presented to show the impacts of not implementing the Icicle Strategy. Under the No-action Alterative, some projects may be developed on separate and different pathways by proponents other than the IWG, although it is unlikely all would be implemented. Funding for projects would be delayed or less competitive without an integrated solution, resulting in slower implementation of projects that do succeed without IWG support. Project beneficiaries may be different and not focused on meeting guiding principles. Projects that may be implemented, on their own independent timelines, could improve streamflow by approximately 32 cfs and 18,094 acre-feet.
- Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative): The IWG has identified the first alternative as the Base Package, consisting of 12 elements that work in concert to achieve all of the Guiding Principles. The package is a mix of projects, including automating and optimizing reservoir releases at seven Alpine Lakes; efforts to make hatchery, irrigation, and domestic use more efficient; enhancement of habitat, fish passage, and fish screening; and protection of tribal and non-tribal fisheries. The suite of projects proposed under Alternative 1 is estimated to cost \$82.0 million, which includes a 25 percent contingency for all projects are anticipated to provide 89 cfs and 31,958 acre-feet of total water benefit (instream and out-of-stream), of which 88 cfs and 28,458 acre-feet instream flow benefit. This estimate of instream flow benefit includes reach benefit for out-of-stream uses that would occur downstream.
- Alternative 2: This alternative builds on the foundation of Alternative 1, but replaces the Alpine Lakes Optimization project with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange project. Alternative 2 is estimated to cost \$91.4 million, which includes a 25 percent contingency for all projects and an additional 25 percent contingency for projects within the ALWA. This alternative would provide 84 cfs and 27,978 acre-feet of total water benefit (instream and out-of-stream), of which 83 cfs and 24,478 acre-feet of instream flow

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

benefit. This estimate of instream flow benefit includes reach benefit for out-of-stream uses that would occur downstream.

- Alternative 3: This alternative also builds on the foundation of Alternative 1, but focuses on project selection outside the ALWA through greater reliance on conservation and pump exchange projects. Because supply and demand cannot be matched well without storage, it also includes a legislative change for instream flow impacts that would occur when conserved water is not able to fully meet demand in-time and in-place. This is a requirement given recent Supreme Court clarity in the *Foster/Yelm* case. Alternative 3 is estimated to cost \$89.0 million, which includes a 25 percent contingency. This alternative would provide 71 cfs and 24,378 acre-feet of total water benefit (instream and out-of-stream), of which 70 cfs and 23,578 of instream flow benefit. This estimate of instream flow benefit includes reach benefit for out-of-stream uses that would occur downstream.
- Alternative 4: This alternative provides a greater emphasis on development of water supplies, with enhancements to Eightmile Lake and storage improvements at the Upper Klonaqua and Snow Lakes. This alternative was selected to evaluate the value of greater flexibility in shaping water availability to meet future changes in both supply and demand. The estimated cost, which includes a 25 percent contingency for all projects and an additional 25 percent contingency for projects within the ALWA, is \$87.8 million. However, it does not include cost estimates for the Upper Klonaqua Lakes Storage Enhancement project because costs are unknown at this stage of project development. This alternative would provide 132 cfs and 35,385 acre-feet of total water benefit, of which 131 cfs and 34,585 acre-feet of instream flow benefit. This estimate of instream flow benefit includes reach benefit for out-of-stream uses that would occur downstream.
- Alternative 5: This alternative builds on the foundation of Alternative 1, but provides a greater emphasis on out-of-basin water supplies. Under Alternative 5, the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies element would be replaced with the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange. Under the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange, the IPID diversion would be completely removed from Icicle Creek, and it would be replaced with three pump stations on the Wenatchee River. The estimated cost, which includes a 25 percent contingency, is \$177.3 million. This alternative would provide 196 cfs and 58,958 acrefeet of total water benefit, and 195 cfs and 55,458 acrefeet of instream flow benefit to Icicle Creek. This estimate of instream flow benefit includes reach benefit for out-of-stream uses that would occur downstream.

The SEPA co-leads, in consultation with the IWG, selected Alternative 1 as the Preferred Alternative after public comment on this Draft PEIS closed and comments were considered.

### No-action Alternative

The No-action Alternative represents what might happen if no integrated, comprehensive strategy for managing water resources in Icicle Creek is adopted and implemented by the IWG to meet the Guiding Principles established by the IWG. Under the No-action Alternative, some projects may still be developed, but projects would be developed on

separate timelines and for different purposes than those outlined in the Guiding Principles. Projects would likely be developed independently by members of the IWG or by proponents other than the IWG. Funding for projects would likely be delayed and projects may be less competitive for funding without an integrated strategy. Projects could be delayed or not implemented at all because of the lack of consensus-building at the local level. The No-action Alternative would fail to meet the instream flow Guiding Principle.

It is difficult to predict which of the projects might be constructed, delayed, or not implemented. However, based on the level of study and potential funding available for the various projects at the time of this PEIS, the following projects<sup>1</sup> are likely to be implemented in some form under the No-action Alternative.

- Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation modernizes and automates the outlet works and gate infrastructure at seven lakes. Under the Icicle Strategy, this project would be implemented for instream flow benefit. However, if the Icicle Strategy does not advance, it is probable that at some point IPID would implement this project to improve their operations as part of routine reservoir maintenance that all infrastructure owners consider. However, if IPID pursues modernization and automation of the gates on its own, releases for the purposes of benefiting instream flow would not be guaranteed and would more likely be optimized for agricultural use.
- **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies** would likely continue to be explored and implemented if funding were available because IPID has continually worked to improve efficiency within the District. However, funding may be more limited if not included as part of an integrated water resource management strategy, which could limit the scope and magnitude of efficiency projects. Additionally, all water saved through irrigation efficiency upgrades would likely assist IPID in meeting agricultural reliability purposes only, rather than bolstering instream flows, unless funding is used for a specific project that requires a trust water right transfer or some other commitment to instream flows.
- **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange** funding opportunities will likely exist for this project if the Icicle Strategy is not implemented. The COIC project is already proceeding with design and environmental permitting based on the strength of consensus built by the IWG over the last 5 years. Funding for the project is primarily based on the potential benefit the project offers to Icicle Creek. The project would shift the point of diversion for COIC from Icicle Creek to a location near the confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. The project would also improve efficiency. The project would benefit Icicle Creek and assist in providing more reliable service to COIC.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Refer to Section 2.5 for full descriptions of projects.

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- **Domestic Conservation** would likely continue to be explored and implemented if funding were available because the City of Leavenworth has already invested in conservation in the past and is required to pursue water use efficiency measures as part of conservation planning required by Municipal Water Law. The County also has addressed continuing rural conservation options by teaming with local water purveyors on how to incentivize or promote this idea. However, funding may be more limited if not included as part of an integrated water resource management plan, which could limit the magnitude of conservation projects. Regardless, water saved under the No-action Alternative would benefit the domestic uses in a similar manner as, although potentially to a lesser degree than would occur for the other alternatives.
- Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration will occur because IPID has a long-term • responsibility to maintain its infrastructure to provide reliable water service to its irrigation customers, while protecting public safety of those downstream of their dams. While the Eightmile Lake Dam is in need of repair, the District has prioritized other capital improvements over this project in recent years, including conservation and other dam maintenance, in part to allow for this project to be evaluated in more detail by the IWG. However, the need to make improvements has become more urgent because the outlet is collapsing and losing capacity. In addition, a fire in 2017 burned to the shoreline of the lake, likely changing the hydrology of inflow to the lake and raising concerns about the condition and safety of the dam. IPID declared an emergency on March 13, 2018, as a result of the 2017 fire and is actively coordinating with local, state, and federal agencies on this project. If not implemented or funded as part of an integrated strategy, IPID would not be obligated to release any of this water for instream flow or domestic benefit as envisioned under multiple Alternatives considered in this PEIS. Instead that water would be retained for agricultural reliability and drought resiliency.
- Habitat Protection and Enhancement may occur at a reduced level. Prior to the IWG, Chelan County has worked on habitat improvements in lower Icicle Creek. This would likely continue, although funding may be more limited if not included as part of an integrated water resource management plan project and the extent of the habitat protection and enhancement could be lower.
- **Instream Flow Rule Amendment** may be sought if other required projects are completed (e.g., LNFH improvements and habitat enhancement), as envisioned under the original rule language in WAC 173-545-090. However, this may occur over a longer timeline.
- LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements focuses on projects to reduce surface water use and improve access to groundwater. Projects required in the Biological Opinion (BiOp) would continue without the Icicle Strategy. These include consideration of water reuse, groundwater augmentation, and a pump

back that would allow for changing operations at Structure 2 and the division of water between the historic and hatchery channels.

- Fish Screen Compliance upgrades will likely continue if the Icicle Strategy is not implemented. These upgrades are required by law, and grant funding has already been expended on the design of screening improvements for the City of Leavenworth and IPID diversions. Screening for COIC is included in the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies project, while screening for LNFH is required under the BiOp and will be the subject of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental review. However, implementation may occur on a slower timeline based on funding and would not necessarily occur in a way that would benefit other projects included in the Icicle Strategy, such as Habitat Protection and Enhancement.
- **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange** may be implemented under the No-action Alternative. However, the project would likely be rescaled and focused, at least initially, on reducing diversions from Peshastin Creek and improving the reliability of water supply to the Peshastin Irrigation District (PID) Main Canal, which could result in no benefit or less benefit in Icicle Creek.

### Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)

Alternative 1, also referred to as the Base Package, meets all the objectives defined in the IWG's Guiding Principles. Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative). These projects have been agreed to and moved forward by the IWG for review in this PEIS. While IWG members had reserved a final recommendation on Alternative 1 until resolution of the PEIS and consultation with the co-leads, it has been determined that this alternative represented the best recommendation available after four years of study by IWG members and study in the PEIS.

Alternative 1 includes the following projects<sup>2</sup>:

- Alpine Lakes Reservoirs Optimization, Modernization, and Automation modernizes and automates the outlet works and gate infrastructure at seven lakes. The intent is to improve management and releases of stored water at seven lakes in the Icicle Creek Subbasin based on changing conditions to meet the Subbasin's needs. It increases streamflow for fish and improves reliability and operation of stored water for agricultural use and the LNFH.
- **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies** explores options to improve irrigation delivery and onfarm efficiencies. Projects may include canal piping or lining, on-farm efficiency upgrades, and a lawn buyback program, which would improve drought resiliency and reliability to district users. This project also benefits fish by increasing streamflow.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Taken from Icicle Strategy SEPA Checklist: http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/naturalresources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/SEPA/Icicle% 20Strategy% 20SEPAChecklist% 20Si gned.pdf

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange** proposes to change COIC's point of diversion from its existing location at RM 4.5 on Icicle Creek to a location on the right bank of the Wenatchee River near its confluence with Icicle Creek or on the left bank of Icicle Creek near its confluence with the Wenatchee River and implement other water saving measures, such as piping the delivery system. The augmented streamflow has the potential to improve reliability of water supply for agriculture, benefit fish passage and habitat, and maintain treaty and non-treaty harvests.
- **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies** focuses on conservation projects in the City of Leavenworth and Chelan County and implements municipal and rural water efficiency projects such as leak detection and repair, meter installation, a lawn buyback program, and water use conservation to improve domestic supply.
- **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration** rebuilds the Eightmile Lake dam to restore usable storage to the historical and permitted high water storage elevation. This would increase streamflow for fish and meet the domestic water needs of the City of Leavenworth and surrounding rural areas in Chelan County and improves the reliability and drought resiliency for agricultural users.
- **Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries** ensures that projects and actions taken do not have negative effects on tribal fishery activity in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. It monitors fishery effectiveness and implements actions for improvement, while protecting Tribal Treaty and federally protected harvest rights and non-tribal harvest at all times.
- Habitat Protection and Enhancement identifies and implements stream restoration and protection projects such as riparian plantings, engineered log jams, and conservation easements to improve stream habitat and ecosystem health.
- **Instream Flow Rule Amendment** modifies the instream flow rule's interim domestic reservation of 0.1 cfs to a final level of 0.5 cfs. This helps meet domestic water needs through 2050. As described in Chapter 173-545 WAC, the rule amendment requires instream flow and habitat restoration. This will improve domestic supply in the Icicle Creek subbasin.
- LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements focuses on projects to reduce surface water use and improve access to groundwater. These projects may include onsite reuse, an effluent pump back, and wellfield enhancements for year-round benefits. It would also increase streamflow for fish and improve access to reliable water for the hatchery's operations. These projects also improve water quality in Icicle Creek.
- **Fish Passage** improves passage by assessing and removing barriers, so fish have better access to healthy habitats. This could include improved operation at Structure 2 and modification of channel morphology at the Boulder Field. Improved passage will increase the amount of habitat fish can access within the subbasin.
- **Fish Screening** upgrades fish screens on diversions to meet current standards. This will bring the major diverters on Icicle Creek into compliance with Washington State and NMFS screening requirements and bring LNFH into compliance with the screening requirements set in the BiOp (Nation Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), 2015). These projects reduce fish mortality, which ultimately improves fish passage.

• Water Markets creates an Icicle Water Market and seeds it with an initial 1,000 acrefeet of water for agriculture use in the Icicle Creek Subbasin and Wenatchee River Basins during shortages.

Additional projects may be pursued outside of the Icicle Strategy if Alternative 1 is selected as the preferred alternative, such as the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange. However, project beneficiaries may be different and project timelines are unknown.

Alternative 1 addresses all the IWG's Guiding Principles. This suite of projects is expected to cost \$82M, provides 89 cfs and 31,958 acre-feet of total water benefit (88 cfs and 28,458 acre-feet of instream benefit).

### Alternative 2

The IWG developed Alternative 2 in response to SEPA scoping comments that requested examination of pump station options and omission of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation project. This alternative includes most of the projects from in Alternative 1—with the exception of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation—and adds the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange project.

Alternative 2 includes the following projects:

- **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange** would install a pump station on the right bank of the Wenatchee River near Dryden and a delivery pipeline that would extend through private orchards and driveways to the IPID canals. Water pumped from the Wenatchee River would allow for a corresponding reduction in diversions from Icicle and Peshastin Creeks, which would improve streamflow. The augmented streamflow has the potential to improve reliability of water supply for agriculture, benefit fish passage and habitat, and maintain treaty and non-treaty harvests.
- IPID Irrigation Efficiencies
- COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange
- Domestic Conservation Efficiencies
- Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration
- Tribal Fisheries Protection
- Habitat Protection and Enhancement
- Instream Flow Rule Amendment
- LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements
- Fish Passage
- Fish Screening
- Water Markets

Additional projects may be pursued outside of the Icicle Strategy if Alternative 2 is selected as the preferred alternative, such as the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange. However, project beneficiaries may be different and project timelines are unknown.

Alternative 2 addresses all the IWG's Guiding Principles. This suite of projects is expected to cost \$91M, provides 84 cfs and 27,978 acre-feet of total water benefit (instream and out-of-stream).

## Alternative 3

Alternative 3 is a response to SEPA scoping comments that expressed a desire for an alternative that excluded projects within the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area. Alternative 3 includes most of the projects in Alternative 1, with the exception of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation and the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration. It calls for a legislative change to waive impacts to instream flows when conservation and pump-exchange-based supplies cannot perfectly meet demand required to provide domestic reliability. For example, conservation supplies are available from April to October in this Alternative, but the Guiding Principle for domestic reliability requires year-round supplies. Because instream flows are at times not met from November to March, this would impair instream flows if legislative approval was not provided. Ecology no longer has the authority to waive these kinds of impacts through an Overriding Consideration of the Public Interest (OCPI) determination under RCW 90.54.020 given clarity from the Supreme Court in cases like *Swinomish* and *Foster/Yelm*.

Alternative 3 includes the following projects:

- IPID Dryden Pump Exchange
- IPID Irrigation Efficiencies
- COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange
- Domestic Conservation Efficiencies
- Tribal Fisheries Protection
- Habitat Protection and Enhancement
- Instream Flow Rule Amendment
- LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements
- Fish Passage
- Fish Screening
- Water Markets
- Legislative Change for Instream Flow Impacts. Under this project, the IWG would seek a legislative change that would allow impairment to the Instream Flow Rule when increased flow from conservation do not line up temporally with demand. (GP4)

Additional projects may be pursued outside of the Icicle Strategy if Alternative 3 is selected as the preferred alternative, such as the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project. However, project beneficiaries may be different and project timelines are unknown.

Alternative 3 addresses all the IWG's Guiding Principles. This suite of projects is expected to cost \$86.9M, provides 71 cfs and 24,378 acre-feet of total water benefit (instream and out-of-stream).

### Alternative 4

Alternative 4 was created as a response to SEPA scoping comments that requested increased storage in the Icicle Creek Subbasin as an adaptive measure to climate change uncertainty and to better react to changes in future demand. This alternative has all the same projects as the Base Package presented in Alternative 1, but calls for increasing storage at Eightmile Lake to above the historical high water mark and enhancing storage and release at Upper Klonaqua and Upper Snow Lakes. Conservation was not reduced over that identified in Alternative 1 because it was necessary to meet other Guiding Principles (e.g., LNFH hatchery reliability, agricultural reliability).

- Alpine Lakes Reservoirs Optimization, Modernization, and Automation
- **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement** differs from the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration project included in Alternatives 1, 2, and 5. It calls for increasing the useable storage to approximately 3,500 acre-feet by rebuilding the dam to raise the high-water storage elevation and increasing the available drawdown.
- Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement takes advantage of potential storage in Upper Klonaqua Lake by installing infrastructure to draw down the lake. Options for drawdown include tunneling, pumping, and siphon. Bathymetry suggests up to 2,448.2 acre-feet of water could be available for release.
- Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement would raise the dam on Upper Snow Lake to increase storage capacity by 1,079 acre-feet.
- IPID Irrigation Efficiencies
- COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange
- Domestic Conservation Efficiencies
- Tribal Fisheries Protection
- Habitat Protection and Enhancement
- Instream Flow Rule Amendment
- LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements
- Fish Passage
- Fish Screening
- Water Markets
Additional projects may be pursued outside of the Icicle Strategy if Alternative 4 is selected as the preferred alternative. However, project beneficiaries may be different and project timelines are unknown.

Alternative 4 addresses all the IWG's Guiding Principles. This suite of projects is expected to cost \$83.8M, provides 132 cfs and 35,385 acre-feet of total water benefit (instream and out-of-stream).

## Alternative 5

The IWG developed Alternative 5 in response to continued stakeholder input that suggested completely removing IPID's diversion from Icicle Creek to the Wenatchee River. As part of its irrigation comprehensive plan update, IPID completed a very cursory review of a project that would replace the IID and PID canal systems with a pressurized pipe delivery system supplied by pump stations on the Wenatchee River at three locations, referred to herein as the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project. Alternative 5 includes the same projects as Alternative 1, except the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies project is replaced by the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project. This alternative would not eliminate the need for operation and management of storage within the Alpine Lakes Wilderness. IPID would need to continue to store and release water from reservoirs within the Alpine Lakes Wilderness to ensure water was available in the Wenatchee River for their use because instream flows are insufficient on both Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River in the summer to meet IPID out-of-stream uses without storage. Alternative 5 would provide up to 195 cfs of instream flow benefit in Icicle Creek in both drought and non-drought years.

Alternative 5 includes the following projects:

- **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange** would fully replace the IPID canal systems with a pressurized pipe delivery system. Three intake and pump station facilities would be constructed on the Wenatchee River to supply the new system. The existing surface water diversion facilities on Icicle Creek and Peshastin Creek would be removed. This project would increase stream flow in Icicle Creek by up to 117 cfs, improve reliability of water supply for agriculture, benefit fish passage and habitat, and maintain treaty and non-treaty harvests.
- Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation
- COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange
- Domestic Conservation
- Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration
- Tribal Fishery Preservation and Management
- Habitat Protection and Enhancement
- Instream Flow Rule Amendment
- LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

- Fish Passage
- Fish Screen Compliance
- Water Markets

Alternative 5 addresses all the IWG's Guiding Principles. This suite of projects is expected to cost \$174.4M, provides 196 cfs and 55,458 acre-feet of total water benefit (instream and out-of-stream).

### Impacts to Resources

The following is a summary of the overall impacts to resources within the project area based on current evaluation. These impacts are organized based on short-term, construction related impacts, and long-term impacts anticipated for the operation and maintenance of projects. Table ES-1 and Table ES-2 provides a summary of impacts to each resource evaluated in this PEIS.

### **Overall Impacts and Benefits of the Icicle Strategy**

The overall impacts of the Icicle Strategy are expected to be beneficial, although some localized adverse impacts could occur from the Program Alternatives. The Icicle Strategy is expected to provide benefit to the Icicle Creek Subbasin, as laid out in the Guiding Principles. The integrated planning approach developed for the Icicle Strategy is intended to improve water resource and the riverine ecosystem on a watershed scale.

#### Short-Term

Construction activities required for many of the project elements comprising the Program Alternatives would cause short-term impacts. These impacts include erosion and sedimentation, construction dewatering, vegetation removal, construction emissions and dust, noise, aesthetic impacts for equipment and stock piles, and traffic delays. Construction may also temporarily block access to areas near construction sites, resulting in temporary disruption to activities in those areas, such as fishing or recreational use. Additionally, other impacts such as increased noise and dust or aesthetic changes might create a disturbance for recreationalists and wilderness users. Noise and vibrations could also temporary disturb fish and wildlife species. Cultural resources could also be disturbed during construction and access to Usual & Accustomed Fishing sites could be temporary restricted, especially for any construction near the plunge pool in front of the LNFH. These access impacts would be temporary and could be minimized by scheduling construction after the fishing season. Table 4-7 provides short-term impacts of implementation for the five Program Alternatives and the No-Action Alternative.

Implementation of the various projects under the Program Alternatives would be phased overtime depending on the design process, environmental review, and available funding. Because of this, construction impacts for various projects under an alternative are not likely to occur at the same time, minimizing the cumulative impact at any given time. Additionally, some project may be phased specifically to reduce recreational, Indian Trust Assets, and wilderness user impacts.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

# Table ES-1 Summary of Short-term Impacts of No-Action Alternative and Program Alternatives

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Earth	Construction-related erosion and sedimentation from ongoing projects.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1, greater in Wenatchee corridor
Surface Water Resources	Use of cofferdams and dewatering during construction of on-going project.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1 greater in Wenatchee corridor
Groundwater Resources	Dewatering impacts during construction of ongoing projects.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1 greater in Wenatchee corridor
Water Quality	Construction of ongoing projects could result in temporary water quality impacts. Impacts include risk of erosion and contamination from construction activities.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1 greater in Wenatchee corridor
Water Use	Potential construction related impacts to surface water diversions. Work would be coordinated to minimize impacts.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1 greater in Wenatchee corridor
Fish	Temporary habitat disturbance, construction-related impacts.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1, greater in Wenatchee corridor

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Vegetation	Some vegetation removal from construction of ongoing projects.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1, greater in Wenatchee corridor
Wildlife	Temporary disruption of habitat during construction of ongoing projects.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1, greater in Wenatchee corridor
Threatened and Endangered Species	Temporary disruption of habitat during construction from noise and disturbance. Construction would generally occur outside breeding season, reducing impacts.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1, greater in Wenatchee corridor
Aesthetics	Construction activities and equipment of ongoing projects would generally create impacts on visual settings.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1, greater in Wenatchee corridor
Air Quality	Construction related emissions from ongoing projects including transportation and use of heavy equipment.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1, greater in Wenatchee corridor

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Climate Change	Minor amounts of greenhouse gas emissions related to construction of ongoing projects.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Noise	Increased noise from construction of ongoing projects.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Recreation	Access restriction, nuisance noise, and aesthetics impacts during construction of ongoing projects.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Land Use	Temporary access restrictions during construction of ongoing projects. Private owner access would be maintained.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Wilderness Area	Ongoing projects would likely be outside ALWA. No wilderness impacts are anticipated.	Temporary impacts to wilderness character related to construction activities include noise, construction equipment transport and staging, and presence and housing of construction workers.	Less than Alternative 1	Projects would likely be outside ALWA. No wilderness impacts are anticipated.	Greater than Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1
Shorelines	Increased potential for shoreline erosion related to ground disturbing activities.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Resources	No-Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Utilities	Potential temporary disruption in water service related to instream construction activities near diversions.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Transportation	Traffic delays associated with equipment transport and construction of ongoing projects. Least number of helicopter trips during construction.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action. Several helicopter trips for transporting construction equipment.	Similar to Alternative 1 Less than Alternative 1.	Less than Alternative 1 Similar to the No- action Alternative.	Greater than Alternative 1 More than Alterative 1.	Greater than Alternative 1 Similar to Alternative 1.
Cultural Resources	Ground disturbing activities and construction work on culturally significant structures could result in impacts. Compliance with regulations and coordination with affected tribes would ensure any potential issues and mitigation measures would be addressed prior to construction.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Indian Sacred Sites	Ground disturbing activities would have the potential to impact sacred sites. Ongoing coordination with potentially affected tribes and compliance with regulations would ensure any potential issues would be addressed prior to construction.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest	Potential to temporarily block access to Usual & Accustomed fishing areas.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Socioeconomics	Increased construction jobs from ongoing projects. Impacts would be smallest of all alternatives because fewer projects would be constructed.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1

Table ES-2
Summary of Long-term Impacts of No-Action Alternative and Program Alternatives

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Earth	Some potential for erosion, and sediment transport resulting from long-term operation of ongoing projects. These impacts are expected to be minor.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Surface Water Resources	Ongoing projects would likely increase stream flow by 20 to 30 cfs. Benefits would be localized.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action. Would increase instream flow by 88 cfs. Increases expected when flow is naturally at its lowest. Flexibility in flow management to respond to low-flow conditions.	Similar to Alternative 1. Would increase instream flow by 83 cfs. Increases expected when flow is naturally at its lowest.	Less than Alternative 1. Would increase instream flow by 70 cfs. Benefits would not be as adaptable to low flows.	Greater than Alternative 1. Would increase instream flow by 131 cfs. Increases expected when flow naturally at its lowest. Flexibility in flow management to respond to low-flow conditions.	Greater than Alternative 1. Would increase stream flow by 195 cfs. Increases expected when flow is naturally at its lowest.
Groundwater Resources	Groundwater recharge near Icicle Creek is expected to decrease compared to other alternatives. Groundwater recharge could increase in some areas compared with other alternatives because some conservation projects (piping canals or fix leaky pipes) would not be implemented.	Increased groundwater use; increased groundwater recharge near lcicle Creek; reduced groundwater recharge resulting from conservation projects.	Similar to Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Water Quality	Localized benefits from ongoing water quantity and quality improvements. Expected benefits include increased dissolved oxygen and cooler temperatures.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1
Water Use	Water use would be relatively unchanged. Localized instream flow benefit from ongoing conservation projects. No water made available for projected domestic growth.	Increased water available for instream and out-of- stream uses. Water available to meet projected domestic growth.	Similar to Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1
Fish	Ongoing projects could provide localized habitat and flow improvements. However, critical low- flow periods would likely persist in some reaches, which would continue to impact habitat availability and passage.	Increased stream flow, passage improvements, and habitat improvements. Flow releases from Alpine Lakes would be managed to provide greatest fisheries benefit and minimize any impacts.	Similar to Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1. Less instream flow benefit, OCPI needed, and benefits would not be as adaptable to low flows.	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater benefits than Alternative 1 through increased instream flow

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Vegetation	Localized benefits to riparian vegetation from ongoing projects.	Improvements to riparian habitat resulting from increased flows and riparian habitat restoration efforts. Relatively small negative impacts from increased Eightmile Lake level; however, this is within historical range. Installation of pump station may also have small impacts.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less benefit to riparian vegetation in Icicle Creek than Alternative 1. Impacts associated with Eightmile Lake may not occur under this alternative.	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater benefits than Alternative 1 through increased instream flow improving vegetation
Wildlife	Largely beneficial for wildlife dependent on lcicle Creek because ongoing projects would seek to improve instream flows during low-flow season. Benefit is more limited than under other alternatives. Impacts are less than significant.	Similar but greater benefits compared to No-action. Greater impacts, although impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less benefit than Alternative 1. Impacts to wildlife greater than Alternative 1.	Greater benefits and impacts than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Resources	No-Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
	Alternative				-	
Threatened and Endangered Species	Ongoing projects would provide localized habitat and flow improvements.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-Action. Overall positive impacts from habitat improvements. Minor changes in shoreline associated with Eightmile project and new pump station not anticipated to impact threatened and endangered species.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less habitat improvement than Alternative 1, which is less beneficial to aquatic threatened and endangered species. Less terrestrial habitat impacts Alternative 1.	Greater instream habitat improvement than Alternative 1. Greater terrestrial habitat impacts than Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1
Aesthetics	Anticipated to be largely beneficial for aesthetics because the projects likely to be implemented are expected to improve habitat and upgrade aging and degraded infrastructure.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-Action. Potential visual impacts from pump station project, which would be mitigated. Less than significant impacts of increased lake bed exposure.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Air Quality	No significant long - term impacts identified	No significant long - term impacts identified	No significant long - term impacts identified. Greater impacts than Alternative 1 due to increased power reliance.	No significant long - term impacts identified. Greater impacts than Alternative 1 due to increased power reliance.	No significant long - term impacts identified. Similar to Alternative 1.	No significant long - term impacts identified. Greater impacts than Alternative 1 due to increased power reliance.

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Resources	No-Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Climate Change	Alternative Water supply shortages and critically low stream flow conditions would likely become worse. Limited ability to respond to climate change-induced impacts.	Increased instream flow and water supplies. Ability to adaptively manage flow to respond to impacts of climate change. Meets 100cfs streamflow goals in 2080 under low, medium, and high climate change scenarios.	Greater impacts than Alternative 1 due to increased power reliance.	Greater impacts than Alternative 1 due to increased power reliance.	Similar to than Alternative 1	Greater impacts than Alternative 1 due to increased power reliance.
Noise	Increased noise related to pump station operation. Construction measures would ensure compliance with Chapter 137-60 WAC.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Recreation	Increased streamflow resulting from implementation of ongoing projects expected to improve water-based recreation.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action. Increased lake levels may have some impacts on current location of campsites and trails at Eightmile Lake. However, these impacts are expected to be limited because lake level increase would be modest.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater benefits than Alternative 1 from increased flow; similar impacts for other recreation

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Land Use	Easements or property acquisition could be required for some ongoing projects. Long-term impacts on current land use trends. Development of up to 56.1 acres.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action. Potential land use change from market reallocation of water and increased water for domestic supply. Conversion of some upland areas from private to public ownership.	Similar to Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1
Wilderness Area	Ongoing projects would likely be outside ALWA. No wilderness impacts are anticipated. Maintenance activities by IPID and USFWS in ALWA would remain unchanged.	Long-term impacts to wilderness character would include equipment related to projects in ALWA (i.e. solar panels). Concealing equipment and implementing architectural style to complement the area would minimize impacts.	Similar to Alternative 1	Similar to No Action.	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1
Shorelines	Long-term impacts on shorelines would likely result from the COIC project, but are anticipated to be less than significant. These impacts would be mitigated by complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal regulations.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No Action. Increased drawdown range at Eightmile lake is expected to impact shorelines, but impacts would be less than significant compared to current conditions.	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1 Impacts from pump stations will be greater, however there would be no impact resulting from changes to drawdown range at Eightmile Lake.	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Utilities	No anticipated impacts on water- based utilities associated with this project. Power demand is not expected to significantly increase because of ongoing projects.	Increased water service potential related to increased domestic supply. Power demand is not expected to significantly increase because of projects.	Greater than Alternative 1 because of long- term power reliance.	Greater than Alternative 1 because of long- term power reliance.	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1 because of long- term power reliance.
Transportation	No long-term impacts to transportation anticipated.	Reduced helicopter supported transport in the Wilderness Area related to IPID maintenance activities	No long-term impacts to transportation anticipated.	No long-term impacts to transportation anticipated.	Similar to Alternative 1	No long-term impacts to transportation anticipated. Similar to Alternative 1
Cultural Resources	For all projects, coordination with DAHP and mitigation measures would be required.	Alpine Lakes dams are eligible for listing under the National Register of Historic Places. Mitigation measures would be required to avoid significant adverse impacts. For all projects, coordination with DAHP and mitigation measures would be required.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5	
Indian Sacred Sites	No expected adverse impacts to Indian Sacred Sites.	Ongoing coordination with potentially affected tribes and compliance with regulations would ensure any potential issues would be addressed prior to construction.	Similar to Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1	
Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest	No significant long- term impacts as required by Guiding Principles.	No significant long- term impacts as required by Guiding Principles	No significant long- term impacts as required by Guiding Principles	No significant long- term impacts as required by Guiding Principles	No significant long- term impacts as required by Guiding Principles	No significant long- term impacts as required by Guiding Principles	
Socioeconomics	Assumed lowest socioeconomic benefits because fewer projects would be implemented.	Lowest construction costs, job creation, long-term economic benefit, and second- lowest assumed fish increases of Program Alternatives	Highest construction costs, job creation, and long-term economic benefit of Program Alternatives. Second highest assumed fish increases.	Higher construction jobs and long-term economic benefit than Alternatives 1 and 4. Lowest assumed fish increases.	Higher construction jobs and long-term economic benefit than Alternative 1. third highest assumed fish increases.	Lowest construction costs, job creation, and long-term economic benefit of Program Alternatives. Highest assumed fish increases.	
Environmental Justice	Ongoing projects are not expected to disproportionately impact minority or low-income communities.	Projects are not expected to disproportionately impact minority or low-income communities.	Projects are not expected to disproportionately impact minority or low-income communities.	Projects are not expected to disproportionately impact minority or low-income communities.	Projects are not expected to disproportionately impact minority or low-income communities.	Projects are not expected to disproportionately impact minority or low-income communities.	

Many of the projects proposed under the Program Alternatives could advance under the No-action Alternative. Ongoing projects would likely include work at LNFH to implement water re-use, water quality improvements, and groundwater augmentation. Additionally, Fish Screening Compliance, COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange, and some fish passage would likely continue. The construction level, short-term impacts for these project elements would be the same under the Program Alternatives and the No-action Alternative. But because fewer projects would likely be implemented, overall construction-related impacts would be lowest under the No-action Alternative compared with other alternatives. IPID and USFWS would likely maintain and upgrade their storage facilities under the No-action Alternative, and construction level impacts could be similar to those discussed in the Program Alternatives.

The short-term impacts identified for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5 are similar because they contain many of the same projects. The most significant difference is there would be fewer construction-related impacts in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area under Alternative 2, 3, and 5 and more along the Wenatchee River corridor. This could lead to increased impacts to fish and shorelines with the construction of a Wenatchee River pump stations under Alternative 2, 3, and 5, but fewer impacts to other threatened and endangered species and wilderness users. Alternative 3 would have no construction-related short-term impacts in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area.

Alternative 4 would have the greatest construction impacts because it is made up of the most projects. In addition to the short-term impacts identified for Alternative 1 in common with Alternative 4, there would be additional impacts from building two additional storage enhancement projects, and expending storage at Eightmile Lake. In addition to Alternative 4 having more projects, the scale of the storage projects is relatively larger than the scale of other water development projects proposed in Alternative 1.

#### Long-Term

Implementation of the Icicle Strategy would provide benefit to Icicle Creek Subbasin by meeting the Guiding Principles. The Guiding Principles, which are discussed in detail in Section 1.2, The Icicle Strategy Guiding Principles, of this document, include improved instream flows, improved sustainability of LNFH, protection of the tribal and non-tribal fish harvest, improved domestic supply, improved agricultural reliability, enhancement of Icicle Creek habitat, and compliance with state and federal laws and Wilderness Acts. All Program Alternatives would meet the Guiding Principles and provide these benefits; although there are important differences, which are summarized below. Additionally, all the Program Alternatives would increase resiliency to stream impacts resulting from climate change. Table 4-8 provides an overview of long-term impacts for each Program Alternative and the No-action Alternative.

The No-action Alternative would not meet the goals and provide the benefits prescribed in the Guiding Principles, although some instream flow, LNFH, fish passage, and screening improvements would be made. Under the No-action Alternative, ongoing projects could increase streamflow by approximately 32 cfs, with localized benefit in water quality, fish habitat, and improved riparian vegetation. Impacts of the No-action Alternative would include decreased ability to respond to climate change and conflict between water users would not be resolved. Under the No-action Alternative, IPID would

#### PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

still manage, operate, and repair their dam sites, so long-term impacts identified by these activities would still likely occur under the No-action Alternative.

Alternative 1 would provide 88 cfs of instream flow benefit and meet all the Guiding Principles. Additionally, Alternative 1 would allow flexibility in flow management and allow the instream flow goal of 100 cfs to be met in 2080 under low, medium, and high climate change scenarios. Additionally, under Alternative 1 there would be net-benefit water quality improvements, increased available water for out-of-stream users, improved habitat benefit for fish and wildlife, and improved water-based recreational opportunities. Impacts of Alternative 1 would include noise disturbance resulting from the operation of a pump station, and aesthetic impacts resulting from increased drawdown at Eightmile Lake and installation of modernized equipment in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area (ALWA), which could be minimized by construction design.

Alternative 2 would provide 83 cfs of instream flow benefit and meet all the Guiding Principles. Additionally, Alternative 2 would allow the instream flow goal of 100 cfs to be met in 2080 under low and medium climate change scenarios, but not under a high climate change scenario. Many of the net benefits to water quality, water use, habitat, and recreation that would exist under Alternative 1 would also exist under Alternative 2 because of the commonality of projects. Additionally, Alternative 2 would have many of the same impacts as Alternative 1. The impact of Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1 is reduced flexibility in flow management that would result from not implementing the Alpine Lake Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project.

Alternative 3 would provide 70 cfs of instream flow benefit and meet all the Guiding Principles. Many of the net benefits to water quality, water use, habitat, and recreation that would exist under Alternative 1 would also exist under Alternative 3 because many projects are common to both alternatives. In addition, many of the impacts under Alternative 1 would also occur under Alternative 3. The primary impacts of Alternative 3 compared to Alternative 1 would be less resiliency to climate change and no flexibility in flow management.

Alternative 4 would provide 131 cfs of instream flow benefit and meet all the Guiding Principles. Alternative 1 would allow flexibility in flow management and allow the instream flow goal of 100 cfs to be met in 2080 under low, medium, and high climate change scenarios. As with other alternatives, there would also be net benefits to water quantity, water use, and water-based recreation. Alternative 4 would have the greatest impact on wilderness character and recreation in the Wilderness Area. This is because more infrastructure would be built or expanded in the Wilderness Area. Additionally, this would have an increased impact on shoreline vegetation and habitat.

Alternative 5 would provide 195 cfs of instream flow benefit and meet all the Guiding Principles. Additionally, Alternative 5 would allow the instream flow goal of 100 cfs to be met in 2080 under low, medium, and high climate change scenarios. Many of the net benefits to water quality, water use, habitat, and recreation that would exist under Alternative 1 would also exist under Alternative 5 because of the commonality of projects. Additionally, Alternative 5 would have many of the same impacts as Alternative 1.

## **Environmental Commitments**

Environmental commitments are measures or practices to reduce or avoid adverse effects resulting from project operations (long-term impacts). The projects elements proposed in the Program Alternatives are at various stages in the planning process, so the detail of specific mitigation measures varies. Additional measures would be developed during project level environmental review if needed. The following sections summarizes major environmental commitments for the Icicle Strategy.

## Earth, Surface Water, Water Quality, Shorelines, and Fish

The primarily long-term impact associated with the Program Alternatives is increased flow, habitat, and improved water quality. Increased erosion and sedimentation resulting from increased streamflow was identified as a potential impact. However, this increased potential for erosion and sedimentation is expected to be non-significant given that increased flows will remain within the natural flow range, which high flows in Icicle creek already have scour forming flows. The potential for these impacts would be mitigated by following the required regulatory permits for construction and operation of projects. Benefits to vegetation, riparian habitat, floodplain function, and the riverine ecosystem are anticipated to also counter act these impacts. Additional impacts include fish and redd stranding associated with releases for the Alpine Lakes. Alpine Lake releases can be timed and managed to minimize these impacts.

## Aesthetics, Recreation, and Wilderness

Potential impacts to aesthetics could result from construction of the COIC and the IPID pump exchange projects. The COIC pump exchange is included in all Program Alternatives. Some form of an IPID pump exchange is included in Alternative 2, Alternative 3, and Alternative 5. Potential impacts can be minimized based on siting or use of vegetation screen.

Aesthetic impacts are also possible under the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project. This project is included in Alterative 1 and Alternative 4. The greatest potential long-term impact is from new equipment installed to automate lake releases. This equipment also has the potential to impact ALWA wilderness character<sup>3</sup>. Designing structures to camouflage into the natural environment and using local construction materials can minimize these impacts. The actual impacts of the drawdown on aesthetics is expected to be less than significant because this conditional already exists, although less frequently.

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project also has the potential to create visual impacts. This project is proposed under Alternative 1 and 2. One potential impact is the new dam structure. This also has the potential to impact wilderness character. Involving an architect in the design of the facility to ensure it matches the look of the current dam structure and blends into the natural environment will help minimize this impact. The increase in lake level also has the potential to impact current camp locations at Eightmile

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> As established in the 1964 Wilderness Act, wilderness preservation is "for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character."

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Lake. However, with the modest rise in lake level, this impact would be minor. A minimum tools analysis would be done to minimize impacts during project construction.

Storage enhancement projects proposed under Alternative 4 have the potential to impact aesthetics, wilderness character, and recreation. These impacts and specific mitigation measures would be addressed in project-level environmental review.

### Land-Use

All land acquisitions or easements for projects proposed in the four Program Alternatives would need to provide appropriate compensation in accordance with applicable State or Federal regulations. Any land acquired under the Habitat Enhancement project, which is included in all Program Alternatives, would require a willing seller.

### Climate Change

Changes in streamflow and water availability caused by climate change will constrain instream and out-of-stream uses. The Program Alternatives would provide for increased streamflow and the flexibility to adaptively manage flow in response to conditions.

### **Cultural Resources**

Four of the five dams and water release structures at the Alpine Lakes are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. To reduce cultural resources impacts associated with the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project and the Eightmile Storage Restoration Project coordination with DAHP would occur to identify appropriate mitigation. With implementation of mitigation, these projects are not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources. Mitigation measures might include maintaining some historical infrastructure and ensuring structure design is consistent with the historical structures.

For all projects that involve ground disturbance, additional cultural resource review would be required once specific locations for project elements are identified. Coordination in affected tribes and DAHP would help minimize any potential impacts. Prior to construction, any potential long-term impacts affecting cultural resources would be addressed.

## **Consultation and Coordination**

The concluding sections of this Executive Summary briefly describes the public Involvement process and the numerous agencies coordinated and consulted with leading up to and during the SEPA process for the Icicle Strategy.

### Public Involvement

Public involvement allows interested and affected individuals, organizations, agencies, and other governmental entities to be consulted and included in the decision-making process. The IWG has incorporated public involvement into their quarterly meetings, which are open to the public, and have made numerous presentations at conferences, to local community groups, and individual stakeholder groups to raise awareness of the Icicle Strategy and the PEIS process. The IWG co-leads Chelan County and Ecology also solicited comments from the public on the proposed Icicle Strategy through the SEPA

scoping process to help shape the alternatives considered in this document and the analysis of the impacts. Formal and informal input was used.

The SEPA Scoping process began on February 9, 2016, when the co-leads issued a threshold determination of significance on the Icicle Strategy. Scoping is the process of soliciting input on a proposal to define the scope of the EIS. The comments received during the scoping process allowed the co-leads to identify significant issues, identify elements of the environment that could be affected, develop alternatives, and determine the appropriate environmental documents to be prepared.

Under WAC 197-11-410, the co-leads elected to expand the scoping process, and held a public open house in Leavenworth, Washington on April 20, 2016. Approximately 70 participants attended the open house. At the meeting, the co-leads provided a presentation that included an overview of the SEPA process, the Icicle Strategy, and Alternative 1. Additionally, display materials and handouts were available. Public comments were accepted at the meeting and until May 11, 2016.

## Draft PEIS Comment Period

Publication and distribution of the Draft PEIS occurred on May 31, 2018. There was a 60-day public comment period extended from that ended on July 30, 2018.

Following the release of the DPEIS, the co-leads hosted a public information session at Ecology's Northwest Regional Office in Bellevue, Washington on June 25, 2018. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an overview of the Icicle Strategy, the alternatives considered, and the DPEIS. The intent of this meeting was to provide western Washington stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about the DPEIS and how to participate in the process. Members of the public informally discussed points of view and were provided information on where to obtain a copy of the DPEIS and how to comment.

The co-leads also hosted a formal public hearing at the Leavenworth Festhalle in Leavenworth, Washington, on June 27, 2018. This meeting included posters, a presentation, and a court recorder who was made available to receive public comment. The purpose of the meeting was parallel to the public meeting held June 25, 2018 and included the same presentation. Materials from the public hearing are still available on the Chelan County website.<sup>4</sup>

During the comment period, the co-leads considered 8,825 comments. Comments received before or after the comment period (May 31 to July 30, 2018) and duplicative comments that were sent by the same sender were not considered. More information about the comments received are provided in Appendix A. Full comments and responses are also provide in Appendix A.

## Agency Consultation and Coordination

Chelan County and Ecology are the co-lead agencies responsible for the preparation of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) and meeting lead agency obligations required by SEPA. The co-lead agencies discussed the Icicle Strategy with National Marine Fisheries Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Forest Service, US

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> https://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/pages/icicle-strategy-draft-peis-public-hearing

#### PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Bureau of Reclamation, US Army Corp of Engineers, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washing Department of Natural Resources, Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, Confederated Tribes and Banks of the Yakama Nation, and Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation. Several of these agencies are represented on the IWG. The co-lead agencies will continue to coordinate and consult with these agencies regarding other applicable regulatory requirements as the preferred alternative moves forward to project level environmental review, feasibility, design, and environmental permitting.

# **CHAPTER 1.0 INTRODUCTION**

## 1.1 Programmatic SEPA Review

The purpose of this Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) is to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of implementing a comprehensive water resource management plan in the Icicle Creek Subbasin, with the Guiding Principles as the water management objectives. In accordance with State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), the proposal includes preparation of a PEIS (this document) to identify potential environmental impacts, mitigation strategies, and a preferred alternative.

The alternatives identified as potentially meeting the Guiding Principles are generally not at a project-level environmental review because they are still in the planning phase. In accordance with WAC 197-11-704, this PEIS evaluates non-project actions such as policies, plans, and programs at a programmatic level. However, where project level information is available, the co-lead agencies for this PEIS have attempted to include it. Additionally, the PEIS will serve as a foundational document for future project-level environmental review. Future environmental review is described in Section 1.9.

SEPA applies to all decisions made by state and local agencies in Washington State. Under SEPA, one government agency is typically identified as the lead agency for identifying and evaluating the potential adverse environmental impacts of a proposal. This evaluation is documented and sent to the public and other agencies for their review and comment.

The EIS provides critical information to all agencies in the environmental review and approval process. This information also helps to determine if avoidance, minimization, or compensatory mitigation measures will address any probable significant impacts.

For the Icicle Creek Water Resource Management Strategy (Icicle Strategy), the coconveners (Ecology and Chelan County) entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to act as SEPA co-lead agencies per Chapter 43.21 RCW to conduct an environmental review of the Icicle Strategy.

See Section 1.9 for an overview of the SEPA process.

## 1.1.1 Document Organization

This PEIS discusses the development of the Icicle Strategy and analyzes five alternatives for implementing the Icicle Strategy as well as a no-action alternative. This document is organized into five main chapters, a references section, and appendices:

• Chapter 1 provides background information on the proposed Icicle Strategy, describes the program, the purpose and need for the action, relevant background information on the study area, history of water management in the Icicle Subbasin, prior studies and activities dealing with water management issues, and a brief description of public involvement.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- Chapter 2 presents a description of all proposed alternatives reviewed under this PEIS. The chapter also summarizes how the alternatives were developed and describes alternatives eliminated from detailed evaluation.
- Chapter 3 describes the affected environment and existing conditions in the Icicle Subbasin.
- Chapter 4 evaluates the potential short-term (construction) and long-term (operational) effects and proposed mitigation measures for all alternatives.
- Chapter 5 describes the public involvement, consultation and coordination, and compliance with other laws that have and will occur.
- Chapter 6 will provide references used throughout the documents.
- Comments and Responses are provided in Appendix A, which includes the comments received on the Draft PEIS as well as responses to those comments.

Appendices to accompany information presented in this PEIS are attached at the end of the document.

## **1.2 Purpose and Need for Action**

The purpose and need for this PEIS is the goal of the co-leads and supporting stakeholders to develop an Icicle Creek Water Resource Management Strategy (Icicle Strategy) through a collaborative process that will achieve diverse benefits defined by adopted Guiding Principles for the subbasin. The current water management practices in the Icicle Creek Subbasin fail to consistently meet the demand for instream and out-of-stream water uses, including minimum instream flows for fish, municipal and domestic water supply, and agricultural water supply. This has been demonstrated by the minimum instream flows established in Chapter 173-545 WAC not being met, interruptible water users not receiving irrigation water, and litigation over water rights and Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery (LNFH) operations. There are additional issues in Icicle Creek surrounding fish habitat and passage, tribal and non-tribal fish harvest, and sustainable operation of the LNFH. The following sections summarize some of the key issues in water resource management and watershed function within Icicle Creek that lead to a need for comprehensive water resource management within the Subbasin.

**Instream Flows:** Instream flows in Icicle Creek are an important component of the local and regional environmental value system. Benefits of adequate instream flows include healthy aquatic and riparian ecosystems, protection of Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed fish species, water quality, aesthetics, and recreation. Instream flow protection has been promoted through instream flow rules and watershed planning initiatives, with high importance assigned to improving habitat for salmonids. However, instream flows in late summer often drop below those set in WAC 173-545-040. The rule sets minimum flows in the lower reaches of Icicle Creek at 275 cfs, but in drought years flow can be less than 20 cfs in the historical channel near the LNFH. These low stream flows affect water

quality and limit habitat diversity for aquatic species, and have contributed to exceedances of state and federal standards for temperature. Icicle Creek supports three ESA-listed species: Upper Columbia spring Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout.

**Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery:** The United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) funds the operation and maintenance of LNFH as mitigation for fish losses resulting from the construction of Grand Coulee Dam and creation of the Columbia Basin Project. LNFH is operated by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on behalf of USBR. Water supply to the hatchery is from a combination of Icicle Creek flows and groundwater wells with reservoir storage (Snow Lakes and Nada Lake) located in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area. To ensure current production goals of 1.2 million fish are met annually, LNFH needs a reliable supply of cool, pathogen-free water yearround.

Operations at LNFH have resulted in lawsuits and a Biological Opinion (BiOp) under the ESA Section 7 Consultation process. These actions are discussed in more detail later in this Chapter.

**Tribal and Non-Tribal Harvest:** The Yakama Nation and the Wenatchi Band of the Colville Confederated Tribes have federally-recognized and adjudicated harvest rights in lower Icicle Creek.

Adult spring-run Chinook salmon return to LNFH between mid-April and mid-July each year. A tribal fishery is permitted during this time if run size is large enough to both meet the hatchery broodstock goal of ~1,200 spawners and provide fish in excess of hatchery needs. The broodstock goal is a function of the hatchery's obligation under U.S. v. Oregon to produce 1.2 million juvenile spring Chinook salmon (Parker, 2014).

The success of the tribal fishery is dependent on the concentration of returning adult salmon in the pool at the base of the fish ladder, the location where the majority of tribal fishing currently occurs (Parker, 2014). Tribal members fish with traditional dipnets or with modern rod-and-reel from scaffolds/platforms erected along the streambank. As demonstrated in Table 1-3, tribal fish harvest has declined considerably since 2001.

**Domestic Supply:** Icicle Creek and groundwater in the Icicle Creek Subbasin are important water sources for municipal and domestic uses. The City of Leavenworth has a population of ~2,000 (Census, 2010) and is an internationally renowned tourist destination, attracting millions of visitors each year. The City of Leavenworth has asserted water rights to withdraw up to 6.198 cfs from Icicle Creek (3.18 cfs interruptible, 3.02 cfs uninterruptible) and up to 6.68 cfs from groundwater (4.46 cfs interruptible, 2.23 cfs uninterruptible) for municipal use (Varela & Associates, 2018). Chelan County currently supplies exempt wells under the reserve created in WAC 173-545-090. However, these collective urban and rural water rights are not sufficient to support population projections out to 2050. The City of Leavenworth and Ecology have litigation on hold while they find a non-litigious solution to water management in Icicle Creek.

**Agricultural Reliability:** Agriculture is an important component of the Chelan County economy. In 2012, over 75,000 acres were in agricultural production, generating \$206,000,000 in market value in Chelan County (USDA, 2012). The waters of the Icicle

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Creek Subbasin play an important role in this agricultural production by providing water to IPID and COIC, which supply water to nearly 9,000 acres. These 9,000 acres are predominantly planted in tree fruit. In total, 137 cfs of irrigation diversions are authorized from Icicle Creek.

IPID manages five lakes in the watershed to augment natural water supplies from Icicle Creek during drought and non-drought years. In a drought year, the storage from all the lakes are used to provide water to IPID. In non-drought years, the district drains one lake rotationally for maintenance activities and for additional irrigation supply. Since not all droughts are the same, in some dry years a combination of lakes (1 to 5) are drawn down.

Despite the importance of agriculture and irrigation, there is not enough water to supply all of the irrigation demand. For example, in many drought years, IPID partially curtails its use even with reservoir releases. Additionally, in the Icicle Creek Subbasin and Wenatchee Basin, there are water rights that are regularly curtailed based on low streamflow in the Wenatchee River. On average, these water users face curtailment at least 7 out of every 10 years.

**Habitat:** The Upper Columbia Revised Biological Strategy (Biological Strategy, 2017) identifies the following factors affecting habitat conditions for ESA-listed salmonids in Icicle Creek:

- Land development downstream of LNFH has affected stream channel migration, recruitment of large wood, and off-channel habitat.
- There is a barrier to migration in the boulder field.
- Water withdrawals in Icicle Creek (primarily between Rat Creek and the hatchery) likely contribute to low flows and high temperatures.
- The Icicle Road upstream of Chatter Creek may confine the stream channel and affect floodplain function in certain places.

Additional passage barriers exist at the hatchery that are used for operation, including water management, broodstock collection, and to maintain the tribal fishery. These are discussed in more detail in Section 1.2.1.2.

These problems have created a need to improve ecological function in Icicle Creek and to provide reliable water resources for agriculture and domestic water users. With the additional pressures on water resources that will likely result from a changing climate, it is imperative to address these problems in a way that considers potential future impacts of climate change. The Icicle Strategy seeks to address these issues while considering the potential climate impacts and ensuring all actions comply with state and federal law, including the Wilderness Acts.

## **1.3 Icicle Creek Subbasin Background and History**

Icicle Creek is a major tributary of the Wenatchee River and is a significant water resource subbasin of Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 45 (Wenatchee River Basin). Basin-wide planning is founded on the Instream Flow Rule (1983), adopted Watershed Plan (2006), and the Detailed Implementation Plan (2008).

## 1.3.1 Location and Setting

Icicle Creek is the largest subbasin in WRIA 45, covering 136,916 acres. Icicle Creek joins the Wenatchee River at RM 25.6, contributing 20 percent of the Wenatchee River's annual flow. Precipitation ranges from 120 inches at the Cascade crest to 20 inches at the mouth of the Icicle. Elevation ranges from approximately 9,000 feet at the Cascade crest to 1,102 feet at the mouth.

The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) manages 87 percent of the land in the Subbasin, of which 74 percent of the subbasin is located within the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area (ALWA). The remaining 13 percent of land in the subbasin is in other federal government, state, local, or private ownership.

Other than forestry and wilderness protection, land use within the Subbasin includes residential and agriculture uses, which occur in the lower portion of the watershed. The major water diversions are in the lower 5 miles of Icicle Creek for in-basin and out-of-basin irrigation, domestic water use, and fish propagation.

## 1.3.2 Project Area

The Icicle Strategy focuses on the entire Icicle Creek Subbasin (see Figure 1-1). In this document, the Icicle Creek Subbasin is defined as the Icicle Project Area. However, there are three primary areas within and outside of the Icicle Project Area that could likely be affected by the proposal. These areas include the Alpine Lakes area, Icicle Creek, and the Wenatchee River Corridor downstream of the confluence with Icicle Creek. These areas are described in greater detail below.

### 1.3.2.1 Alpine Lakes Area

The Alpine Lakes Area encompasses the headwaters of Icicle Creek. These include several lakes located within the ALWA, that are actively managed as reservoirs to supply IPID and LNFH. These lakes include Upper and Lower Snow Lakes and Nada Lake, which make up the Snow Lakes system, and Colchuck Lake, Eightmile Lake, Klonaqua Lake, and Square Lake. These Lakes are highlighted on Figure 1-1.

Also, included in the Alpine Lakes Area are the tributaries of Icicle Creek. Of primary interest are those that drain the above listed lakes. These tributaries include French, Leland, Eightmile, and Snow Creeks.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 1-1. Overview Map of Icicle Subbasin



### 1.3.2.2 Icicle Creek

This 31.8-mile area includes Upper and Lower Icicle Creek, from Josephine Lake to the confluence with the Wenatchee River. This area includes most of the water resource diversions, fish passage barriers, and degraded habitat that the Icicle Strategy seeks to improve. This is also the area where critical low flows occur in the late summer and early fall. The location of Icicle Creek can be seen on Figure 1-1.

### 1.3.2.3 Wenatchee River Corridor

The Wenatchee River corridor describes the area downstream of Icicle Creek with its confluence with the Wenatchee River that could be impacted by water management changes in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. This area starts at the location where Icicle Creek is intercepted by the Wenatchee River, slightly upstream where the City of Leavenworth has wells in continuity with the River, and extends downstream to the confluence of the Wenatchee River and the Columbia River near the town of Wenatchee.

## 1.3.3 History of Water Management

Water supply in the Icicle Creek Subbasin is heavily dependent on snow pack in the upper reaches of the watershed. Combined with storage water from reservoirs in the upper watershed, snowmelt is crucial for summer flows and providing water for out-of-stream uses. The storage in the upper watershed occurs in seven reservoirs located within the ALWA. Four of these reservoirs, Colchuck, Eightmile, Klonaqua, and Square, were built in the 1920s to 1940s by IPID. The water stored in these reservoirs is conveyed in Icicle Creek and its tributaries and diverted for irrigation at RM 5.7. The dams on Upper and Lower Snow Lakes and Nada Lake were originally constructed by Icicle Irrigation District (IID) in the 1930s and later expanded in the 1940s by USBR. The water stored in the Snow Lake system is conveyed in Icicle Creek and its tributaries and diverted for irrigation at RM 5.7, respectively.

Diversions from Icicle Creek were established in the early 1900s. By 1927, a water rights adjudication was underway in the Icicle Subbasin. Generally, adjudications arise when streamflow is insufficient to satisfy all out-of-stream demand every year. Today, there are four large diversions on lower Icicle Creek: IPID (RM 5.7), City of Leavenworth (RM 5.7), LNFH (RM 4.5), and COIC (RM 4.5). The location of these diversions is shown on Figure 1-1. Three of these diverters, IPID, COIC, and the City of Leavenworth, hold adjudicated certificates that were confirmed during the 1927 adjudication.

Adequate streamflow has long been a problem in Icicle Creek. In 1983, Ecology implemented the Wenatchee Instream Flow Rule (Chapter 173-545 WAC), which protects flows in Icicle Creek and other rivers and streams in the Wenatchee Basin. The recommended flows in this rule were revised in 2007 based on watershed planning. The revised rule prescribes flows between 267 and 650 cfs of water in Icicle Creek, depending on the time of year (Figure 1-2). The instream flow rule is discussed in more detail in Section 3.6 of this PEIS. Currently, these instream flows are not always met. Figure 1-3 shows the Wenatchee instream flow rule compared to different flow scenarios from 1981 to 2011 on the mainstem Wenatchee. Flows in Icicle Creek near the historic channel are much lower than in the Wenatchee River, on the order of 60 cfs in average years and less than 20 cfs in drought years.



Figure 1-2. Chapter 173-545 WAC Prescribed Flows (1983 rule compared to 2007 revised rule).

Figure 1-3. Instream Flow Rule Compared to Streamflow



The Icicle Creek Subbasin and the areas downstream that are affected by its water management have been identified as a critical area within the watershed planning process (through the Wenatchee Instream Flow Study, Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Study, and Watershed Assessment) for meeting all of the needs it serves. Improved flow understanding and projects envisioned by the IWG will significantly improve this current instream flow imbalance.

## 1.4 The Icicle Work Group

To find solutions for water management within the Icicle Subbasin, the Chelan County Natural Resource Department (Chelan County, County) and the Washington State Department of Ecology's (Ecology) Office of the Columbia River (OCR) co-convened the Icicle Work Group (IWG, Work Group) in December 2012. The IWG comprises a diverse set of stakeholders representing local, state, and federal agencies, tribes, irrigation and agricultural interests, municipal/domestic water managers, and environmental organizations (Table 1-1).

Organization	Interest					
Confederated Tribes & Bands of the Yakama Nation	Tribal Fisheries					
Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation	Tribal Fisheries					
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR)	Hatchery					
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – LNFH	Hatchery					
NOAA – Fisheries	Fisheries					
Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife	Fisheries & Wildlife					
Washington State Department of Ecology	Co-convener/Water Manager/ Water Supply Developer					
Icicle and Peshastin Irrigation District	Irrigation Water					
City of Leavenworth	Domestic Water					
Chelan County	Co-convener/Domestic Water/ Watershed Plan Implementer					
Cascade Orchards Irrigation Company	Irrigation Water					
Icicle Creek Watershed Council	Environmental					
Washington Water Trust	Fisheries/Environmental					
Trout Unlimited – Washington Water Project	Fisheries/Environmental					
U.S. Forest Service	Land Manager					
City of Cashmere	Domestic Water					
Cascadia Conservation District	Conservation					
Agricultural Representatives (two)	Irrigation Water					

Table 1-1 List of Icicle Work Group Members

The IWG seeks to find collaborative solutions for water management within the Icicle Creek Subbasin. This includes balancing out-of-stream water uses, such as domestic and agricultural uses, with instream uses, such as fish habitat, recreation, and ecosystem processes while protecting treaty and non-treaty fishing interests. The IWG's purpose is to develop a comprehensive Icicle Creek Water Resource Management Strategy (Icicle Strategy) that uses best available science to identify and support water management solutions that lead to implementation of high-priority water resource projects within the Icicle Creek Subbasin. The IWG adopted operating procedures that include membership selection, expectations for members, dispute resolution, conflict of interest criteria, subcommittee procedures, and decision-making procedures.<sup>1</sup>

The IWG meets quarterly to make decisions on implementing and monitoring progress made on the Icicle Strategy. As needed, the IWG forms subgroups that meet and inform the IWG of the best available science to meet Icicle Strategy objectives. One key subgroup is the IWG Instream Flow Subcommittee, which comprises local, state, federal, and tribal fish biologists that help evaluate how additional Icicle Creek instream flow quantities and habitat improvements made available from project implementation can be maximized for fish benefit in Icicle Creek and its tributaries. A Steering Committee chaired by the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and consisting of eight voting members of the IWG also meets regularly to help implement IWG decisions, coordinate funding efforts, and prioritize emerging issues for IWG consideration.

After 3 years of study, stakeholder coordination, project investigations, and collaboration the IWG determined that the PEIS was the next appropriate step in implementing the Icicle Strategy. This would allow greater input by the public on the Guiding Principles and the potential projects that could collectively meet them, and help understand benefits and impacts associated with implementation of the strategy.

## 1.4.1 Icicle Work Group Authority

The authority for the IWG comes from the Washington State Legislature in the form of the Watershed Planning Act (Chapter 90.82 RCW) and the Columbia River Basin Water Management Act (Chapter 90.90 RCW). The IWG generally consists of parties who have come together in a collaborative and volunteer manner to help improve Icicle Creek's ability to meet multiple, and at times conflicting, water needs.

## 1.4.1.1 Watershed Planning

In 1998, the Washington Legislature passed the Watershed Planning Act (Chapter 90.82 RCW). The purpose of the Watershed Management Act is to conduct watershed scale planning for managing water resources by local entities and stakeholders. The objectives of watershed planning are to "meet the needs of a growing population and a healthy economy statewide, meet the needs of fish and healthy watersheds statewide, and advance these two principles in increments over time."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-

resources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/FINAL%20IWG%20Operating%20Procedures%202016.pdf

### 1.4.1.2 OCR's Authority

In 2006, the Legislature tasked and funded Ecology to develop new water supplies for both instream and out-of-stream uses. Ecology created OCR whose purpose is to develop new water supplies using a variety of tools/project types, including; storage, conservation, and voluntary regional water management agreements.<sup>2</sup>

The Legislature provided OCR with five directives (Chapter 90.90 RCW):

- Develop water supplies for instream as well as out-of-stream uses (RCW 90.90.020(1)(a)(ii)).
- Secure alternatives to groundwater for agricultural users in the Odessa subarea aquifer (RCW 90.90.020(3)(a)).
- Find sources of water supply for pending water right applications (RCW 90.90.020(3)(b)).
- Find a new uninterruptible supply of water for the holders of interruptible water rights on the Columbia River mainstem (RCW 90.90.020(3)(c)).
- Develop water sources for new municipal, domestic, industrial, and irrigation water needs within the Columbia River Basin (RCW 90.90.020(3)(d)).

## **1.5 The lcicle Strategy and Guiding Principles**

The Icicle Strategy is a comprehensive water resource management plan that contemplates climate change and is designed to balance and meet out-of-stream and instream water demand both now and into the future. The water management and watershed conditions that led to the Icicle Strategy are discussed in Sections 1.3 and 1.4. The IWG developed the Icicle Strategy using stakeholder input and best available science. The centerpiece of the Icicle Strategy is the Guiding Principles, which are a set of objectives that all members of the IWG agreed were in their mutual best interest to collaborate on and achieve. Over a 2-day work session facilitated by USBR in December 2012, the IWG developed a list of shared goals to guide them in developing a strategy to meet the needs of the various stakeholders in the Subbasin. This list became known as the Guiding Principles, which have evolved since their initial development. The following is a list of the Guiding Principles, as developed during the December 2012 work session:

- 1. Streamflow that:
  - a. Provides passage,
  - b. Provides healthy habitat,
  - c. Serves channel formation function,
  - d. Meets aesthetic and water quality objectives, and
  - e. Is resilient to climate change.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wr/cwp/cr\_overview.html

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- 2. Sustainable LNFH that:
  - a. Provides healthy fish in adequate numbers,
  - b. Is resource efficient,
  - c. Significantly reduces phosphorus loading,
  - d. Has appropriately screened diversion(s), and
  - e. Does not impede fish passage.
- 3. Tribal treaty and federally protected fishing/harvest rights are met at all times.
- 4. Provide additional water to meet municipal and domestic demand.
- 5. Improved agricultural reliability that:
  - a. Is operational,
  - b. Is flexible,
  - c. Decreases risk of drought impacts, and
  - d. Is economically sustainable.
- 6. Improve ecosystem health, including protection and enhancement of aquatic and terrestrial habitat.
- 7. Comply with state and federal law.
- 8. Protect non-treaty harvest.
- 9. Comply with the Wilderness Act of 1964, the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Act of 1976, and the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Management Plan.

Over the following 3-years, these Guiding Principles evolved to seven principles that have both qualitative and quantitative descriptions. The following section, Section 1.2.1, describes the process of fine-tuning these Guiding Principles through scientific study and consensus-based stakeholder negotiations. Section 1.2.2 describes the Guiding Principles as they are today.

## **1.5.1** Refining Guiding Principles and Developing Metrics

The IWG agreed that before a set of projects could be identified to accomplish the objectives established in the Guiding Principles, quantitative metrics and more qualitative descriptions would be required to help define the magnitude of the gap between current river operations and the values expressed in the Guiding Principles. Through 3-years of scientific study and project feasibility development along with Work Group discussion, the IWG developed metrics for their objectives. Additionally, the IWG honed their list of nine principles into a list of seven: improve instream flows, improve sustainability of LNFH, protect tribal and non-tribal harvest, improve domestic supply, improve agricultural reliability, enhance Icicle Creek habitat, comply with state and federal law, and Wilderness Acts. The following sections describe the process for developing these metrics for each Guiding Principle.

### 1.5.1.1 Improve Instream Flow

To determine streamflow restoration goals, the IWG formed a technical subcommittee of experts on instream flow and fish habitat to provide technical guidance on establishing instream flow goals for the Guiding Principles. This group is known as the Icicle Creek Instream Flow Subcommittee (ICIFS). Much of the methodology used by the ICIFS to make its recommendation is summarized in its presentation to the IWG in 2014<sup>3</sup>. To make flow recommendations, the ICIFS reviewed existing reports that discussed flow and habitat in Icicle Creek and reviewed their collective understanding of how to improve flows in Icicle Creek:

- Instream Flow Study Report for Icicle Creek (Cates, 1985)
- Icicle Creek Target Flow Report for Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery (2004)
- U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Technical Memorandum, Instream Flow Assessment of Icicle Creek, Washington, Ron Sutton and Chelsie Morris (2005)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Icicle Creek Fish Passage Evaluation for the LNFH (2013)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Icicle Creek Instream Flow and Fish Habitat Analysis for the LNFH (2013)
- U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, LNFH Icicle Creek Rapid Geomorphic Assessment (2014)

The effort was complicated because different portions of Icicle Creek and its tributaries are used by different fish species and have different limitations (e.g., flow, passage, and habitat). To address these differences, the ICIFC researched the flow and habitat information as well as fish utilization in different portions of the river. Based on this research, the IWG identified the following target reaches:

- **Reach 1** RM 5.7 to headwaters (upstream of major diversions)
- Reach 2 RM 5.7 to 4.5 (IPID/City of Leavenworth point of diversion to LNFH/COIC point of diversion)
- **Reach 3** RM 4.5 to 3.9 (LNFH/COIC point of diversion to Structure 2)
- **Reach 4** RM 3.9 to 2.7 (the historical channel)
- **Reach 5** RM 2.7 to 0.0 (downstream of LNFH outflow to the Wenatchee River confluence)

The ICIFC then documented fish presence and life history in each of the reaches. Table 1-2 and Figure 1-4 illustrate the presence and life history of each species in Icicle Creek.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/pages/icicle-creek-instream-flow-committee

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Focal Fish Species by Reach							
Reach	River Mile	Life History & Stage by Species					
1	Headwaters to RM 5.7	Steelhead – P, S, R Rainbow trout – S, R Bull trout – P, S, R Cutthroat trout – R					
2	RM 5.7 to RM 4.5	Steelhead – P, R Bull trout – P					
3	RM 4.5 to RM 3.9	Steelhead – P, R Bull trout – P					
4	RM 3.9 to RM 2.7	Steelhead – P, R, S Bull trout – P Lamprey – P					
5	RM 2.7 to RM 0.0	Steelhead – S, R Bull trout – P Lamprey – P					

Table 1-2Focal Fish Species by Reach

Note – P = Passage, S = Spawning, R = Rearing

Assumptions: 1) No spring Chinook salmon assessment; 2) Assumed steelhead production is present

# Figure 1-4. Focal Fish Species and Relevant Life Stages Periodicity within Icicle Work Group Study Reaches

	Life stage	Migration	Spawning	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Νον	Dec
Steelhead, Rainbow trout	Adult	✓	✓												
	Rearing														
Dull trout	Adult/Subadult	✓													
	Rearing														
Cutthroat trout	Adult	$\checkmark$													
	Addit		$\checkmark$												
	Rearing														
Lamprey	Adult	✓													
	Adult		$\checkmark$												

(Source: USFWS 2013 draft)

Note: Gray shading indicates utilization for each month.

For each reach, the ICIFS summarized available habitat flow relationships for likely target species by reach as weighted usable area (WUA) by reach (Figures 1-5a through 1-5e). WUA is the stream surface area weighted by habitat suitability variables, such as velocity, depth, and substrate.

Figure 1-5a. Available Habitat by Flow for Focal Fish Species



Notes: CFS = cubic feet per second; RB = Rainbow Trout; SH = Steelhead


Figure 1-5b. Available Habitat by Flow for Focal Fish Species, Reach 1 and 2

Source: US Army Corp of Engineers, 1985 Notes: LF = linear feet; BT = Bull Trout



Figure 1-5c. Available Habitat by Flow for Focal Fish Species, Reach 3

Source: Montgomery, 2004



Figure 1-5d. Available Habitat by Flow for Focal Fish Species, Reach 4



Figure 1-5e. Available Habitat by Flow for Focal Fish Species, Reach 5

After considering all of this information, the ICIFS decided to select a key reach of the river, fish species, and fish life stage on which to base flow recommendations. This approach presumed that if projects were constructed that met that reach/fish/life stage pairing, then the health of the rest of the Icicle Creek fishery would also be proportionately improved. Flows necessary to improve steelhead rearing in the historical channel (Reach 4) became the reference to evaluate flow improvement targets.

Maximum habitat benefit (100 percent WUA) for steelhead rearing in Reach 4 would be achieved with a flow of 250 cubic feet per second (cfs) and the IWG adopted this as their long-term goal. However, the IWG recognized a diminishing return on investment above 100 cfs when considering additional habitat achieved for each 1 cfs of flow improvement. The IWG also recognized that funding may be a constraint, at least initially, to achieve the highest level of flow improvement. Therefore, the IWG endorsed an initial flow restoration target of 100 cfs, which increases WUA by nearly four-fold compared to the current low flow scenarios, while maintaining the long-term restoration goal of 250 cfs. The IWG envisions the short-term goal to be achievable within approximately 10 years, and the long-term goal to be achievable in approximately 50 years.

#### 1.5.1.2 Improve Sustainability of LNFH

The IWG recognizes that improving sustainability of LNFH is important to the watershed. This includes ensuring the hatchery provides healthy fish in adequate numbers, is resource efficient, achieves improved water quality, and does not impede fish passage. In determining metrics for this Guiding Principle, the IWG deferred to fish production goals established in U.S. v. Oregon, which is an ongoing federal lawsuit regarding fishing rights, and consulted with Work Group members who have expertise in hatchery operations, ichthyology, and watershed processes. Additionally, concurrent with the adoption process of a Guiding Principle for a sustainable hatchery by the IWG, NOAA Fisheries was developing a new biological opinion for the hatchery, which is discussed in more detail in Section 1.5.2.

Based on the instream flow and habitat restoration goals, and the potential for conservation and source upgrades at the hatchery that would assist in maximizing fish health, the IWG set several metrics for this Guiding Principle. These metrics include a water conservation goal of 20 cfs to be left in the historical channel, operating/modifying the passage barriers at Structure 2 and LNFH diversion (called Structure 1) to minimize passage impediments, and ensuring cool, pathogen-free water for hatchery operations. The location of Structure 2 and LNFH diversion are provided on Figure 1-1.

#### 1.5.1.3 Protect Treaty/Non-treaty Harvest

The fishery of the Lower Icicle Creek is a traditional fishing site for the Yakama and Colville Tribes (Wenatchi band) traditionally known as the Wenatshapam fishery. Both tribes exercise federally recognized fishing rights at this location, targeting adult Chinook salmon returning to the LNFH, generally from May to late July. The Wenatshapam fishery serves as important cultural and subsistence resources, and is one of the few locations in the Upper Columbia River where tribal spring Chinook harvest occurs. The rights of the Yakama and Wenatchi band to the Wenatshapam fishery has been upheld and affirmed in US v. Oregon. All changes to water management in Icicle Creek must maintain this fishery.

In addition to the tribal fishery on Icicle Creek, the area is popular for recreational fishing. Consequently, the IWG has set protecting the non-treaty fishery as a Guiding Principle of the Work Group. Trout fishing occurs in the stream from near the IPID footbridge to Leland Creek, and throughout the Leland Creek catchment. The trout fishery is open from late May through the end of October and the primary trout species caught is rainbow trout. There is also a non-tribal, hatchery spring Chinook season that occurs on Icicle Creek from mid-May through July when the number of returning salmon are sufficient to meet broodstock collection goals at the LNFH. The average number of anglers participating in the spring Chinook fishery is approximately 2,688 (WDFW Creel Survey, 2016). WDFW does not conduct surveys of the trout fishery, so the average number of participating anglers is unknown.

Generally, the flow and habitat improvements endorsed by the IWG in other Guiding Principles were thought to have a neutral to positive effect on the tribal and non-tribal fishery. However, over the past several years, there have been documented declines in catch per unit effort (CPUE) in the tribal harvest. Per data provided by the Yakama Nation, tribal harvest peaked in 2001, and has been declining since. Catch numbers from 2014 indicate a 90 percent decline from the 2001 peak harvest (Table 1-3). As such, any further modifications to Icicle Creek could have unintended consequences and would need to be monitored closely. Therefore, the IWG sponsored some initial evaluations (e.g., a bathymetry survey of the current fishing area and sediment transport study) and included an adaptive management program as part of the Guiding Principles to ensure that this important fishery is not adversely affected.

Return Year	Trapped @ Hatchery	Sport Harvest	YN Harvest	CCT Harvest	Percent Tribal Harvest	Remaining in River	Total Run
1999	2,103	108	175		7.2	45	2,431
2000	4,457	1,606	3,238		34.2	163	9,464
2001	6,259	2,260	5,075		33.6	1,488	15,082
2002	6,459	1,201	3,796		30.9	828	12,284
2003	4,825	935	1,852		22.7	549	8,161
2004	2,308	347	863		23.1	214	3,732
2005	2,560	103	1,063		28.0	67	3,793
2006	1,957	529	588		18.7	73	3,147
2007	1,708	115	751		28.6	48	2,622
2008	3,229	347	1,036		21.2	283	4,895
2009	3,232	640	617	210	13.2	195	4,684
2010	11,307	993	683	310	5.2	237	13,220
2011	4,970	873	233	365	3.8	77	6,153
2012	3,749	971	287	123	5.6	131	5,138
2013	2,094	323	42		1.6	134	2,593
2014	4,375	TBD	547		10.4	357	5,279

Table 1-3 Icicle Creek Spring Chinook Fishery

Note - all fish are of hatchery origin

YN = Yakama Nation; CCT = Colville Confederated Tribes

Blank boxes represent absence of data

#### 1.5.1.4 Improve Domestic Supply

For long-term economic and water security for both urban and rural residents, and to settle existing litigation between the City of Leavenworth and Ecology, the IWG made meeting current and future domestic water supplies through at least 2050 a priority.

To determine domestic need through 2050, the IWG relied on the Wenatchee Watershed Plan (2006) to predict rural development in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. The Wenatchee Watershed Plan projected 31 new homes in the Icicle Creek Subbasin through 2014. The Wenatchee Watershed Plan predicted demand in the Icicle subbasin for additional rural development at 4.7 homes per year. From 2014 to 2050 (36 years), approximately 169 additional homes are anticipated for this time period. The total projected rural residential demand through 2050 is 200 homes. Based on average indoor use of 200 gallons per day, as estimated in the Wenatchee Watershed Plan, and an estimated consumptive outdoor water use during the critical low flow month of September of 0.15 acre-feet (Aspect, 2013), the per unit rural domestic demand is 0.37 acre-feet per unit. The total rural domestic demand through 2050 is estimated at 74 acre-feet.

The water need for the City of Leavenworth was determined in two phases. The first phase was the determination of current need, as demonstrated in litigation over water rights with the Department of Ecology. This litigation is over the rights to 800 acre-feet of water. The second phase was to determine the future demand through 2050 using the City of Leavenworth Water System Plan (2011). This plan predicts the additional future water need at 867 acre-feet. Based on the average per unit use of 304 gallons per day, or 0.34 acre-feet per year (Water System Plan, 2001), this would provide water to 2,546 new residential and commercial connections (Table 1-4). The total water needed to meet future demand thru 2050 in the City of Leavenworth is 1,667 acre-feet.

	acre- feet/unit <sup>1</sup>	Projected & Current Need (acre-feet)	Total Additional Units
City of Leavenworth	0.34	1,667	2,546
Exempt Wells, Icicle Basin <sup>2</sup>	0.37	74	199

 Table 1-4

 Projected Municipal & Domestic Water Demand through 2050

<sup>1</sup>City of Leavenworth gpd/unit is the City of Leavenworth Water System Plan (2011)

<sup>2</sup>Exempt Wells use is Wenatchee Reserve Account Review (Aspect Consulting, 2013)

#### 1.5.1.5 Improve Agricultural Reliability

Improving agricultural reliability is focused on giving interruptible water users a firm water supply. An interruptible water user is a water user whose water right has a later priority date than the instream flow rule, making the water right junior to the instream flow rule. An instream flow rule, which is discussed in more detail in Section 1.4.2, is a water right to protect environmental flows in a river or stream. If a water right is junior to the instream flow rule, it can only be used when the instream flow rule is met. In Washington water law, a water user can only exercise their water right when senior water rights in the basin are fully satisfied. To determine the extent of the interruptible water user issue, we reviewed all water right holders with an interruptible provision within the Wenatchee Basin and found 47 interruptible water users. Of these 47 interruptible rights,

34 have irrigation as a purpose of use. This equates to 5.6 cfs and 1,150 acre-feet per year. Figure 1-6 shows when and how often the instream flow rule is not met and interruptible water users are told to cease diversions in the Wenatchee Basin (bars represent number of interruptions for a specific week out of a 30-year record (1984-2014)).

#### Figure 1-6. Time Frame and Frequency Instream Rule is Not Met in the Wenatchee River





(Wenatchee River at Peshastin, 1984-2014)

In addition to providing water to interruptible water users, the IWG decided to look for opportunities to improve infrastructure and operations for agricultural water users with major diversions on Icicle Creek. These infrastructure improvements have focused on modernizing and repairing the dams owned and operated by IPID, and improving operations for COIC. These infrastructure improvements add to long term reliable water supplies for agriculture users especially in drought years when use has been curtailed, which endangers commercial agriculture.

#### 1.5.1.6 Enhance Icicle Creek Habitat

The IWG adopted habitat enhancement as a Guiding Principle in response to recommendations for habitat and passage improvements in the Wenatchee Watershed Plan. To identify potential habitat and passage improvements the IWG relied on their ICIFC to conduct a reach-by-reach assessment of passage barriers and habitat conditions. This reach-by-reach approach resulted in identifying the boulder field located at RM 5.6 and several structures related to operations of LNFH as passage barriers. The LNFH passage barriers include Structure 5, Structure 2, and Structure 1, however some of these barriers have dual functions. For example, Structure 5 is an intentional barrier that protects the tribal fishery, another Guiding Principle. Similarly, Structure 2 protects the historical channel from flows above 2,600 cfs that would otherwise degrade existing habitat. The IWG considered options on where barriers should be considered for modification, removal, or retention given, in some cases, their multi-purpose functions.

Additionally, the group identified several habitat improvement opportunities in lower Icicle Creek and the historical channel (Reach 4 and Reach 5). Chelan County and the IWG have commissioned more habitat and passage studies to identify and prioritize habitat restoration and passage improvement projects, which are discussed in the *Lower Icicle Creek Geomorphic and Hydraulic Assessment for the Identification of Protection and Restoration Actions* prepared by Natural Systems Design for the County (Natural Systems Design, 2017).

#### 1.5.1.7 Comply with State and Federal Law, and Wilderness Acts

All actions taken by the IWG must comply with state and federal law. All members of the Work Group agreed that a project cannot move forward if it is out of compliance with laws. Laws of specific interest include:

- The Wilderness Act
- The Alpine Lakes Area Management Act
- The Clean Water Act
- Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
- Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act
- National Historic Preservation Act
- Chapter 90.03 RCW State Surface Water Code
- Chapter 90.44 RCW State Groundwater Code
- Chapter 77.57 RCW Fishways, Flow, and Screening

Table 5-22 in Chapter 5 provides a complete list of permits and laws applicable to the proposed projects under the Icicle Strategy, and Section 1.9 describes permits, actions, and laws related to the Icicle Strategy.

### 1.5.2 Final Guiding Principles

The result of the processes described above was the fine-tuning of the Guiding Principles into what they are today. As discussed above, this involved combining some principles, adding qualitative descriptions, and adding quantitative metrics. Below is the description of the IWG's Guiding Principles today, after 3-years of scientific study and negotiation.

#### 1.5.2.1 Improve Instream Flow

This principle seeks to improve and enhance instream flows in the Icicle Creek historical channel. The goal is to modulate the flow in a way that enhances fish passage, fish life and promotes healthy habitats, serves channel formation function, meets aesthetic and water quality objectives, and is resilient to climate change.

The metric for this principle calls for drought year and non-drought year minimum flows, as well as an interim and long-term flow restoration goal.

During drought years, the instream flow goal is set at 60 cfs. To meet drought year goals, a minimum of 40 cfs will need to be protected instream, assuming a drought year base flow of 20 cfs.

The short-term, non-drought year goal is 100 cfs minimum flows, which would provide 90-percent WUA for steelhead. The long-term goal was set was at 250 cfs (100 percent WUA for steelhead). A maximum flow of 2,600 cfs can pass through Structure 2. Based on work conducted by the IWG's Instream Flow Subcommittee, this flow maximum will remain in place to preserve habitat function.

#### 1.5.2.2 Improve Sustainability of LNFH

This principle aims to enhance and maintain a healthy, sustainable LNFH that produces fish in adequate numbers to meet U.S. v. Oregon, which specifies fish production requirements. Meeting this goal requires sufficient, diverse water source availability to maximize fish health, with groundwater supplies providing cool, pathogen free water. This principle calls for a 57 cfs supply for fish production from groundwater and surface sources. This principle also calls for LNFH to conserve at least 20 cfs compared to current usage. It also includes appropriately screened diversions and minimizing unintended barriers to fish passage.

#### 1.5.2.3 Protect Treaty/Non-treaty Harvest

Treaty harvest by the Yakama Nation, the Colville Confederated Tribes, and non-treaty fishing are important parts of the Icicle Creek Subbasin. This principle maintains that tribal and non-tribal, federally protected fishing and harvest rights must be met at all times regardless of season or drought conditions. It aims to improve the CPUE and maintain multispecies harvest opportunities.

As part of this principle, the IWG is developing a Tribal Impacts Assessment and Adaptive Management Plan that addresses attraction flows, sediment transport, fish migration/straying, and site access and amenities.

#### 1.5.2.4 Improve Domestic Supply

As the population inside the Icicle Creek Subbasin grows, more water will be needed by the City of Leavenworth and surrounding areas in Chelan County. This principle calls for 1,750 acre-feet of reliable year-round supply, with 2.5 to 5 cfs for peaking. Additionally, this principle aims to improve domestic reliability for rural water users in the Icicle Creek Subbasin who depend on domestic wells to supply their drinking water.

#### 1.5.2.5 Improve Agricultural Reliability

With agriculture vital to the economic health and prosperity of the region, this principle calls for projects to improve agricultural reliability that are operational, flexible, decrease risk of drought impacts, and are economically sustainable. It ensures current interruptible agricultural users have a firm supply in average water years.

#### 1.5.2.6 Enhance Icicle Creek Habitat

This principle seeks to improve ecosystem health by protecting and enhancing aquatic and terrestrial habitat in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. This includes investments in physical habitat improvements that consider high-flow habitat and low-flow refuge, along with minimizing impediments to fish passage and improving limiting factors for spawning/rearing. It also offsets project-related terrestrial impacts with land acquisitions/easements.

#### 1.5.2.7 Comply with State and Federal Law, and Wilderness Acts

Projects developed under the Icicle Strategy must comply with both Washington State and federal laws, including the Wilderness Act of 1964, the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Act of 1976, and the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Management Plan of 1981. The IWG actively identified and engaged regulators in the process of creating the alternatives and projects for the Icicle Strategy. Section 1.9 provides a more detailed description of applicable permits and laws.

# 1.5.3 Current Water Resources Conditions in the Icicle Subbasin

Seasonal low flows in lower Icicle Creek between the major diversions and the hatchery return are a common problem. Figure 1-7 shows low flow conditions that commonly occur during late summer. These low flows diminish water quality and limit habitat diversity for salmonids and are the leading issues in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Water withdrawals in Icicle Creek (primarily between Rat Creek and the hatchery) likely contribute to low flows and high summer temperatures in lower Icicle Creek. Icicle Creek has exceeded state and federal water quality standards for temperature and dissolved oxygen (DO)/pH. Salmonid populations are at risk because of limited habitat diversity and quantity, obstructions, and increased sediment loads. The change in the landscape and vegetation after the 1994 Rat Creek Fire has contributed to increased sediment loads in Icicle Creek (MWG, 2006).

#### Figure 1-7. Low Flows at Structure 2 in 2001 (20 cfs)



As described in the previous section, Chapter 173-545 WAC sets flow requirements in lower Icicle Creek. Additionally, Chapter 173-545 WAC provides for a reservation of water for future uses. Based on Chapter 173-545 WAC, the control point for stream flow targets in the Icicle Subbasin is at the East Leavenworth Bridge. This control point is monitored by Ecology Gage 45B070. There is also a USGS gage located upstream of the major water right diversion at RM 5.8. All water rights issued after the establishment of the instream flow rule are considered junior to the rule and must not be exercised when instream flows at the Ecology gage are not met (unless the water right is debited from the reserve).

# 1.6 Prior Investigations and Activities in the Icicle Basin

This PEIS builds on a foundation of historical planning and scientific studies completed in the Icicle Subbasin. The following sections provide brief summaries of this work, which is incorporated by reference into this evaluation. The References section at the end of this document can be used to obtain greater detail.

#### 1.6.1 Watershed Plan

As previously discussed, the Washington State Legislature passed the Watershed Management Act (formed under ESHB 2514; Chapter 90.82 RCW) in 1998. Chelan County, the Wenatchee Reclamation District, and the City of Wenatchee assembled late in 1998 and determined they would pursue watershed planning under Chapter 90.82 RCW. The Wenatchee Watershed Planning Unit (WWPU) formed in 1999; Chelan County was designated Lead Agency for grant management purposes and to provide administrative, facilitation, and technical support to the process. Participation on the WWPU has always been open to include "anyone who has an interest in the Wenatchee River Watershed" (WWPU, 2003). Active Planning Unit members are grouped as governmental or non-governmental based on their ability to implement specific and tangible elements of the plan. Much of the watershed planning work in WRIA 45 has been (and continues to be) performed by several key technical subcommittees under the direction of the Planning Unit. These committees address technical and policy issues associated with each of the technical elements and develop alternative approaches for the Planning Unit's consideration. The Water Quantity/Instream Flow/Water Storage, Water Quality, and Habitat Technical Subcommittees include a broad range of representation from those with special technical expertise or an interest in the subject area.<sup>4</sup>

The Wenatchee Planning Unit produced the Wenatchee Watershed Plan in 2006. This plan identifies issues with water quality, water quantity, instream flow, and habitat within the watershed and provides recommendations for addressing those issues. The Planning Unit produced a Detailed Implementation Plan in 2008 to provide implementation pathways for the recommendations in the Watershed Plan. The Planning Unit has also commissioned several reports and studies to address water management in the basin.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-

resources/documents/Planning/Wen\_Planning/Wen\_Watershed\_Plan/text/final\_watershed\_plan.pdf

# 1.6.2 Biological Opinion

In 2006, a Biological Assessment (BA) for Operation and Maintenance of LNFH was conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFSWS, 2006). The focus of the BA was to provide updated information on the hatchery's operation and maintenance, and an updated assessment on the potential effects of the hatchery on federally listed, proposed, and candidate species as well as designated critical habitat. The BA outlined the project location, affected action area, foreseeable future actions in the Icicle Creek Watershed (including the Icicle Creek Restoration Project and LNFH's Water Supply System Rehabilitation Project), operation and maintenance of the LNFH (historical and current), description of species and critical habitat, current condition of the habitat, integration of species and habitat condition, analysis of potential effects to ESA-listed species, analysis of potential effects to the current condition of the habitat, cumulative effects, and effect determination and response requested. The critical species and habitat included bull trout. The BA included an assessment of the current condition of the habitat, including water quality, habitat access and elements, channel condition and dynamics, flow and hydrology, and watershed conditions. The results of the assessment indicated that of the species and habitat considered, the bull trout habitat had an indicator of degraded and was determined to be adversely affected by current LNFH operations. This resulted in formal consultation with National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

Consultation with NMFS resulted in a Biological Opinion published in May 2015. Key proposed operations, maintenance, and construction at LNFH required in this Biological Opinion included:

- Install recirculating aquaculture system (RAS) tanks to reduce surface water needs
- Reduce surface water diversions by as much as 20 cfs annually
- Work towards collective instream flow goal of 100 cfs in Icicle Creek
- Evaluate to determine the efficiency and scope of expanded use of Snow Lake and Nada Lake Supplemental Reservoirs as a means to ensure flow for the LNFH's surface water right and improve instream flows outside of the current supplementation period
- Reduce use of Structure 2 for recharge by exploring effluent pump back and development of well fields
- Discontinue use of Structure 2 for aquifer recharge in August
- Limit diverted quantities at Structure 2 if certain flow requirements aren't met in September
- Limit use of Structure 2 in March when adult steelhead are detected
- Screen Structure 1 so it meets current NMFS screening standards

Many of these elements were integrated into the Guiding Principle for a sustainable LNFH (Section 2.1.2.2). The Biological Opinion set an 8-year timeline to accomplish these upgrades.

LNFH and NMFS re-opened consultation and prepared a new Biological Opinion as a result of the Wild Fish Conservancy v. Irving case, which concluded in the U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Washington remanding the Biological Opinion for not fully considering climate change. This Biological Opinion was released by NMFS in 2018.

### 1.6.3 Habitat, Passage and Instream Flow Studies

Several entities have worked on or commissioned reports regarding fisheries and instream flows in the Icicle Subbasin. These entities include Chelan County, Ecology, LNFH, as well as numerous local and non-profit organizations. These investigations are summarized in this section. Full reports can be accessed from Chelan County's Icicle Work Group webpage.<sup>5</sup>

#### 1.6.3.1 Icicle Water Temperatures (All Reaches)

There are several salmonid species in lower Icicle Creek that could be impacted by changes in water temperature. Bull Trout require cooler water than most other salmonid species, preferring temperatures between 9 and 13 °C. Other salmonids found in lower Icicle Creek have a tolerance for higher temperatures, being found in waters up to 22 °C (Ringel, 2007).

USFWS' Mid-Columbia River Fisheries Resource Office (MCRFRO) has monitored water temperature in Icicle Creek since 2005 when Ecology set a TMDL for temperature to evaluate the impact of LNFH operations on stream temperatures (Ecology, 2005<sup>6</sup>; Fraser, 2015). Temperature loggers are deployed upstream, adjacent, and downstream of LNFH and in two tributary streams (Snow Creek and Jack Creek) (Hall and Kelly-Ringel, 2011).

For the Wenatchee Basin, mean summer and 7-Day Average Daily Maximum (7DADmax) values were calculated for each site and day using the running average of the previous 7 days (Hall and Kelly-Ringel, 2011). Between 2005 and 2010, the warmest mean high 7DADmax overall was 20.4 °C (range 19.4 to 22.1 °C), occurring in the Wenatchee River. The warmest mean high 7DADmax within Icicle Creek was 19.4 °C (range 18.9 19.8 °C), occurring downstream of the LNFH. The warmest mean high 7DADmax upstream of LNFH influence was 18.5 °C (range 17.4 to 19.8 °C) occurring upstream of Snow Creek.

The summer season coolest mean high 7DADmax of 15.8 °C (range 14.7 to 17.3 °C) occurred in Jack Creek. Within the LNFH operational influence, the summer season coolest mean high 7DADmax of 16.9 °C (range 16.2 to 18.3 °C) occurred in the LNFH spillway pool. In Snow Creek, the mean high 7DADmax for the years sampled was 17.3 °C (range 15.9 to 18.5 °C).

#### 1.6.3.2 Instream Flow Study and Report for Icicle Creek (Reach 1)

In 1985, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers produced an instream flow study in support of a hydropower feasibility study on Icicle Creek. This study used Instream Flow Incremental Methodology (IFIM) to study flows and consider the potential impacts to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/pages/icicle-work-group?parent=Planning

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/0503011.pdf

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

fish habitat that could occur as a result of changes in instream flow caused by the potential project. The primary species of interest for this report were rainbow trout, cutthroat trout, brook trout, and bull char (bull trout). The results found that some spawning and juvenile habitat occurs in Reach 1 for all species listed above. Table 1-5 provides details of optimum flows for each species in Reach 1.

Species	Life Stage	Optimum Flow (cfs; approx.)
Rainbow Trout	Spawning	400
	Adult	500
	Juvenile	200
Cutthroat Trout	Spawning	400
	Adult	250
	Juvenile	200
Brook Trout	Spawning	400
	Adult	100
	Juvenile	100
Bull Trout	Spawning	400
	Adult	125
	Juvenile	125
Whitefish	Spawning	300
	Adult	500
	Juvenile	200
Steelhead	Spawning	400
	Adult	-
	Juvenile	200
Spring Chinook	Spawning	250
	Adult	-
	Juvenile	175

Table 1-5
Optimum Flows by Species and Life Stage for Reach 1

#### 1.6.3.3 Icicle Creek Boulder Field Fish Passage Assessment (Reach 2)

In 2013, EcoAssets and Trout Unlimited produced an assessment of passage at the boulder field (RM 5.6). The purpose of this study was to document the extent of anthropogenic impact on fish passage and identify fish passage options at this location. The study found that the "Anchor Boulder", which is the largest boulder in the boulder field, is the primary impediment to passage in this reach. The study also found evidence that there are anthropogenic impacts on the development of the boulder field and suggested several alternatives to improve passage, including channel profile adjustment, roughened channel, various types of fishways, and constructed riffle.

#### 1.6.3.4 Icicle Creek Target Flows (Reach 3)

Montgomery Water Group produced a report in 2004 for LNFH on target flows. The purpose of the report was to summarize the analysis of target flows for the reach of Icicle Creek downstream of the LNFH diversion (Reach 3) because of low flows during late summer. The primary concerns with flow through this reach were passage and rearing habitat. This study found that passage is likely in Reach 3 at flows as low as 20 cfs,

which was consistent with the findings of a similar report produced in 2001 (USFWS, 2001). This study also found that maximum habitat benefit was likely for adult and juvenile bull trout and steelhead at 291 cfs. However, an optimal flow was not estimated for this reach because of data gaps.

#### 1.6.3.5 Icicle Creek Fish Passage Evaluation for the Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery (Reach 4)

In 2013, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service conducted a fish passage evaluation for the LNFH to characterize physical and hydraulic conditions associated with a range of streamflow's at Structures 1, 2, and 5, and open-channel flows in the historical channel in Icicle Creek adjacent to the LNFH (Anglin et al., 2013). These structures are used to operate LNFH: Structure 1 is the surface water diversion located at RM 4.5, Structure 2 bifurcates flows at RM 3.9 to direct part of Icicle Creek into the hatchery channel for groundwater recharge and some into the historical channel, and Structure 5 is a barrier structure operated for broodstock collection and to impede upstream migration during tribal harvest.

Results of this study indicated variable limitation of fish passage associated with unique conditions involved with each structure or location. Passage criteria, species periodicity, and stream flows ranging from 90 percent to 10 percent exceedance flow (Icicle Creek) were integrated by month to identify depth and velocity passage limitations at the structures and in the historical channel. Detailed tables were generated to allow managers and stakeholders to determine when passage limitations occur, and whether options exist to eliminate barriers or improve passage conditions at these sites. Because fish passage is not a binary situation, interpretation of the results and development of improved fish passage options should be conducted jointly by technical experts, managers, tribes and other stakeholders to determine actions that will meet the multiple goals for Icicle Creek.

Key outcomes of this study included the installation of independent radial gates and the re-operation of Structure 2 to improve passage, continuation of capturing and moving non-target fish species at Structure 5, as well as velocity targets at both structures. Additionally, this report suggested improvements to the design and location of the fishway at Structure 1 and recommended maintaining 60 cfs in the historical channel for improved passage conditions.

#### 1.6.3.6 Lower Icicle Creek Reach Assessment (Reach 5)

In 2005, USBR produced an Instream Flow Assessment of Icicle Creek, Washington. The purpose of the study was to characterize the relationship between stream flow and fish habitat in Icicle Creek downstream from the LNFH (Reach 5). This assessment included a Physical Habitat Simulation (PHABSIM) and IFIM to assist the Planning Unit with instream flow recommendations for Icicle Creek. The primary outcome of this report was WUA charts for each life stage and species of interest. The study found optimum flow between 70 cfs (bull trout) and 670 cfs (steelhead) for spawning species of interest, and approximately 50 cfs (bull trout) and 240 cfs (steelhead) for juvenile species of interest.

In 2017, a geomorphic and hydraulic assessment of the lower 4.3 miles of Icicle Creek, starting from the confluence with the Wenatchee River and extending up-valley through the Historic Channel at the LNFH, was completed to provide a scientific basis for identification and development of stream restoration and protection actions for lower

Icicle Creek (NSD, 2017). The assessment included a review of background information, field surveys, and computer modeling to characterize existing conditions. Hydraulic modeling used to evaluate reach hydraulics and floodplain connectivity incorporated bathymetric survey data and floodplain topography based on 2015 LiDAR data. Habitat Suitability Modeling examined the value of existing habitats related to juvenile Chinook salmon and steelhead rearing, and adult steelhead spawning.

Results of this assessment found that rearing habitat in lower Icicle Creek is poor and limited by lack of cover due to widespread loss of large wood in the system and lack of connectivity to off-channel habitat areas during high flows. The assessment identifies and prioritizes project opportunities by sub-reach designed to protect existing floodplain, increase rearing habitat by providing cover and improving floodplain connectivity, and restore riparian vegetation.

### 1.6.4 Climate Change

The IWG is considering whether the Guiding Principles can be met in response to longterm changes in water supply associated with climate change. Four climate change evaluations are considered in this PEIS, including work by USFS, OCR/WSU, the Icicle Watershed Council/Trout Unlimited, and the UW Climate Impacts Group. Below is a summary of these reports. Section 3.12 discusses climate in more depth.

#### 1.6.4.1 USFS Report

The USFS published a report on climate change in the North Cascades region in 2014 to better understand upcoming resource management issues related to climate change in the North Cascades. In the Pacific Northwest, the current warming trend is expected to continue, with average warming of 2.1 °C by the 2040s and 3.8 °C by the 2080s; precipitation may vary slightly, but the magnitude and timing are uncertain. This warming will have far-reaching effects on aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. Hydrologic systems will be especially vulnerable as North Cascades watersheds become increasingly rain dominated, rather than snow dominated, resulting in more autumn/winter flooding, higher peak flows, and lower summer flows. This will greatly reduce suitable fish habitat, especially as stream temperatures increase above critical thresholds. In forest ecosystems, higher temperatures will increase stress and lower the growth and productivity of lower elevation tree species on both the western and eastern sides of the Cascade crest, although growth of high elevation tree species is expected to increase. Distribution and abundance of plant species may change over the long term, and increased disturbance (i.e., wildfire, insects, and invasive species) will cause rapid changes in ecosystem structure and function across broad landscapes, especially on the east side of the Cascades. This in turn will alter habitat for a wide range of animal species.

#### 1.6.4.2 Columbia River Basin Long-term Supply and Demand Forecast Report

OCR has a legislative mandate to produce a Supply and Demand Forecast once every 5 years to understand future water supplies and demands that factors in changes to climate, regional and global economics, Columbia River hydrology and hydropower operations and irrigation practices/technology. Previous editions were published in 2006 and 2011.

This section focuses on the 2016 report that provides a forecast to help OCR strategically fund water supply projects by improving understanding of where additional water supply is most needed, now and in the future. This most recent forecast offers a generalized, system-wide assessment of how future environmental and economic conditions will likely change water supply and demand over the next 20 years. The report evaluates surface water supply and demand for the Columbia River Basin, including the Wenatchee Basin. The impacts of climate change, regional and global economic conditions, and state-level water management actions on surface water supplies and irrigation demands were evaluated. Irrigation, municipal, and hydropower demands were forecasted, as well as instream flow requirements for fish stock status and habitat utilization, fish habitat condition, and stream flow. These evaluations were made for the entire Basin as well as by WRIAs. The current and future forecasts will build on and expand current knowledge and understanding and serve as a planning tool to maintain and enhance the region's economic, environmental, and cultural prosperity.

Icicle Creek is in WRIA 45 (Wenatchee). The tributary surface water forecast for WRIA 45 is characterized by substantial increases in flow from fall through early spring, and decreases in flow in June and July. Instream flow requirements are the largest water demand, with smaller irrigation demand and even smaller municipal demand. In WRIA 45, the Supply and Demand Forecast predicts a shift in crops, which will increase irrigation demand in May and decrease demand in late summer and fall, with little change in June and July. Modeling of curtailment of interruptible irrigation water rights indicated that curtailment occurred in 90 percent of the years between 1977 and 2006. The forecast shows more frequent and higher magnitude of curtailment events during the early irrigation season. Additionally, there is a predicted 11 percent increase in demand by 2035.

#### 1.6.4.3 Icicle Creek Watershed Council

Icicle Creek Watershed Council (ICWC) has conducted several studies examining the water budget in response to climate change. This work assumed a 35 percent decrease in streamflow (compared to 1994) as a result of climate change. This research found that reductions in streamflow would require additional inputs of up to 60 cfs in September, a critical low flow month, to offset the impacts of climate change in Icicle Creek. Examining the storage available in the upper Icicle Creek Watershed, the ICWC concluded that supplying 60 cfs from storage was possible to offset impacts of climate change with the assumed 35 percent decrease in streamflow.

#### 1.6.4.4 UW Climate Impacts Group Icicle Creek Study

UW Climate Impacts Group issued a report in 2017 that examines the changing streamflow in Icicle and Peshastin Creeks as the result of climate change. This analysis used off-the-shelf hydrologic climate change data sets. The objective was to develop estimates of projected changes in monthly streamflow for the seven alpine lakes and changes in daily streamflow for Icicle and Peshastin Creeks. Projections for the alpine lakes have allowed the IWG to assess how the alternatives perform under current and future climate conditions, which is discussed in detail in Section 3.12 and 4.12. The goal described in the Guiding Principles appear attainable based on this analysis, therefore additional refinement of the models did not occur at this stage of analysis. The daily flow projections allow an understanding of changes in extremes (high and low flows) and their implications for water management.

### 1.6.5 Water Storage

#### 1.6.5.1 Water Storage Report, Wenatchee River Basin

This report provided a summary of potential water storage projects and other water resource management strategies intended to increase water supply and instream flow in the Wenatchee River Basin. The Wenatchee River Basin is part of Ecology's WRIA 45, which is expressed by the drainage basin for the Wenatchee River. The primary water needs in the Wenatchee River Basin include irrigation, municipal and domestic water supply, and instream flows for fish passage and habitat. This report builds on information provided in the Multi-Purpose Water Storage Assessment in the Wenatchee River Watershed (MWG 2006) and other planning studies that have identified opportunities for improved management of water resources in the Wenatchee River Basin. A comparison of the costs and benefits of potential water storage projects with other water management strategies, such as water conservation on irrigation systems and acquisition of water rights, is also included. This report was prepared for Chelan County under a grant from the Columbia River Water Management Development Account administered by Ecology.

This report provides a preliminary summary of potential water storage projects and other water resource management strategies intended to improve the availability of water in the Wenatchee River Basin for both instream and out of stream water needs. This section includes a brief summary of the projects and strategies that were evaluated in this report.<sup>7</sup>

#### 1.6.5.2 Needs and Alternatives Analysis

The Needs and Alternatives Analysis for Icicle Creek Subbasin Storage Study (2007), reviewed reach-by-reach water supplies and demands in the Subbasin. This analysis split Icicle Creek into four reaches. Work by the IWG recognizes five reaches, splitting the reach identified as Reach 3 in this study into two separate reaches, with Structure 2 being the new dividing point. Water needs were estimated by comparing the available water supply to the water demands in the Icicle Subbasin. The water demands include irrigation diversions, municipal and domestic demand, LNFH diversions, and instream flows.

Reach 1, the most upstream reach of Icicle Creek, has little demand because of lack of population in this reach and no other diversions. The primary water demand is the instream flow needs. A surplus of water occurs during the spring melt, while a deficit occurs in August through October during the period of annual low flows. However, the flows in this reach are natural and slightly enhanced by discharge from high alpine lakes operated by the Icicle and Peshastin Irrigation District.

Reach 2 has a large seasonal demand coming from the Icicle and Peshastin Irrigation Districts at their diversion dam (RM 5.7). Reach 2 also contains the City of Leavenworth's surface water diversion (RM 5.7). Snow Creek flows into Icicle Creek in this reach and its water supply was added to the water supply provided by Icicle Creek. A surplus of water occurs during the spring melt, while a deficit occurs in August through October during the period of annual low flows. Slight deficits also occur in January through April. The primary need is for additional water in August and September.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-

resources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/Basin\_Wide\_Studies/2011WenStorageRpt.pdf

Reach 3 has a large demand from the LNFH and a seasonal demand from the Cascade Orchards Irrigation Company (both at RM 4.5). This reach spans the IWG reaches identified as Reach 3 and Reach 4. Although the LNFH demand is non-consumptive, Reach 3 flow is reduced. This document provides proposed flows for Icicle Creek and do not represent the flow that may be provided by LNFH in this reach as a result of negotiations with USFWS and NOAA Fisheries.

Reach 4 has no major diversions but all non-purveyor domestic water use, and all nondistrict irrigation use are assumed to take water from Icicle Creek in this reach because the majority of the population is located within this reach. The LNFH outflow adds supply to Icicle Creek at RM 2.7. Domestic irrigation demands are small enough that neither can be visibly seen on the graph. A surplus of water occurs during the spring melt, while deficits occur in August through October during the low flow period. Deficits also occur during the February through April time period due to icing. The primary need is for additional water in August and September.<sup>8</sup>

### 1.6.6 IPID Pump Exchange

A Pump Exchange project was examined as an alternative water supply to the Icicle and Peshastin Irrigation Districts, moving their Icicle Creek diversion to the Wenatchee River, which would increase streamflow in Icicle and Peshastin Creeks downstream of the current diversions. In 2012, Anchor QEA produced the Peshastin Irrigation District (PID) Pump Exchange Project Appraisal Study (Anchor, 2012) which evaluated five alternatives and selected a preferred alternative (Alternative 1) along with a second (Alternative 5) as a backup. In 2014, Forsgren and Associates produced a report for Trout Unlimited examining six pump station locations for IPID, including those examined in the Anchor report and additional locations at Monitor, the Cashmere Wastewater Treatment Plant, the Cashmere Mill Site, and at the Dryden Reclamation District Diversion. In 2015, Anchor QEA attempted to combine the findings of these studies into a report titled Summary of Additional Analysis, Icicle and Peshastin Irrigation Districts Pump Exchange (Anchor, 2015). The two most feasible plans proposed to pump water from the Wenatchee River immediately west of Dryden, Washington and near Leavenworth, Washington. Although both plans had pros and cons, they were both estimated to cost approximately \$8.5 million.

Chelan County received grant funding in 2016 from the Salmon Recovery Funding Board to proceed with preliminary design and feasibility of the pump station. The work proposed under this grant would result in preliminary design of a preferred pump exchange project that would deliver water from the Wenatchee River to the PID Canal to provide instream flow benefit in Peshastin Creek during the late summer. The preliminary design would consider the potential for designing the project to be scalable to expand delivery to IID to benefit Icicle Creek in the future, if appropriate. The preliminary design work would also evaluate operations and determine whether supplemental flows from the IID Canal could be reduced and whether operational discharges of Icicle Creek water to Peshastin Creek could be reduced.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/naturalresources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/Icicle\_Studies/DraftNeedsandAlts.pdf

# 1.7 Fish Recovery Efforts

The Wenatchee Watershed is home to a variety of aquatic species, including the following salmonids: spring- and summer-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), sockeye salmon (*O. nerka*), steelhead/rainbow trout (*O. mykiss*), westslope cutthroat trout (*O. clarki lewisi*), and migratory and resident bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*). The documented, presumed, and potential distributions of anadromous salmonids in the Icicle Creek Subbasin are shown in Figure 1-8. Pacific lamprey (*Entosphenus tridentatus*) and re-introduced coho salmon (*O. kisutch*), two species of cultural importance to the Yakama Nation and Colville Confederated Tribes, are also present in the Wenatchee Basin.

Much of the planning, protection, and restoration/enhancement work in WRIA 45 has focused on the needs of salmonids listed under the ESA. Upper Columbia River springrun Chinook salmon were listed as endangered in 1999 (64 FR 14308), Upper Columbia River steelhead were listed as endangered in 1997 (62 FR 43937) and reclassified as threatened in 2006 (71 FR 834), and Columbia River bull trout were listed as threatened in 1998 (63 FR 31647). NOAA Fisheries adopted the *Upper Columbia Spring Chinook and Steelhead Recovery Plan* (UCSRB, 2007) as its recovery plan for these species. Table 1-6 provides a list of priority projects from the recovery plan, as identified in appendix M1 of the report. As illustrated in the status column, the IWG and their partners have completed several of the identified projects. The USFWS finalized its recovery plan for bull trout in 2015 (USFWS, 2015).



#### Figure 1-8. Icicle Creek Subbasin Distributions of Anadromous Salmonids

Table 1-6
Icicle Creek Projects Identified in the Upper Columbia Spring Chinook and Steelhead
Recovery Plan

Project Name	Status	Ecological Concern	
USFWS LNFH Icicle Creek Restoration Project	Active	1 Habitat Quantity - Anthropogenic Barriers	
ICTU Icicle Creek Reach Level Analysis	Completed		
CCNRD Icicle Revegetation	Completed	4 Riparian Condition - Riparian Vegetation	
CCNRD Wenatchee Instream Flow Habitat Project	Completed		
CDLT Lower Icicle Creek Habitat Conservation	Completed	5 Peripheral and Transitional Habitats - Floodplain Condition	
CDLT Icicle Creek Conservation Opportunities Outreach	Completed		
CCNRD Lower Icicle Riparian Initiative	Completed	4 Riparian Condition - Riparian Vegetation	
TU-WWP Icicle Creek Alternatives Analysis	Conceptual	9 Water Quantity - Decreased Water Quantity	
CDLT Icicle Creek Copper Notch Conservation Easement	Completed	5 Peripheral and Transitional Habitats - Floodplain Condition	
USFS Icicle Creek Minimum Roads Analysis and Road System Improvements	Proposed		
CCNRD Icicle Irrigation District Efficiencies	Proposed		
CDLT Lower Wenatchee Leavenworth Audubon Center Acquisition	Completed	5 Peripheral and Transitional Habitats - Floodplain Condition	
TU-WWP - Icicle Creek Boulder Field Assessment	Completed	1 Habitat Quantity - Anthropogenic Barriers	
CCFEG Salmon Lifecycle Landscape	Completed		
TU-WWP Icicle Boulder Field Passage Design	Proposed		

# 1.8 Litigation Related to Water Management in the lcicle Creek Subbasin

Several water management challenges and conflicts have led to the development of the IWG and subsequently the Icicle Strategy, as laid out throughout this chapter. Many of these issues revolve around conflict over limited water resources, insufficient instream flows, and the need to meet future water demand. These conflicts have led the IWG to believe an integrated water resource management approach is the best option to address insufficient streamflow and conflict over water rights. Below is a synopsis of some of this conflict bared out through past litigation in the Icicle Creek Subbasin.

#### City of Leavenworth v. Washington State Department of Ecology

The City of Leavenworth's surface water certificate authorizes an instantaneous quantity (Qi) of diversion of 1.5 cfs from Icicle Creek. According to the City, the certificate does not list a specific time limit or maximum annual quantity (Qa) and contends that the Qa should be 1,085 acre-feet per year, which is based upon year-round, continuous diversion. Ecology states the City of Leavenworth has previously agreed to limit Qa to 275 acre-feet per year based upon a prior settlement before the PCHB. The City of Leavenworth filed a declaratory judgment action in Chelan County Superior Court seeking a determination of maximum Qa. In 2012, the court ruled in favor of Ecology, which the City of Leavenworth appealed to the Court of Appeals. Subsequently, the City of Leavenworth and Ecology have agreed to stay the litigation, or temporarily put on hold, while Ecology and the City of Leavenworth worked cooperatively to identify and fund projects in the Wenatchee River Basin that would augment Leavenworth's water rights for future growth.

#### Wild Fish Conservancy v. Salazar et al

USFWS operates a surface water diversion from Icicle Creek to supply water to the Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery for various uses. In 2009, the Wild Fish Conservancy and a local resident, Harriet Bullitt, filed a complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief in the Eastern District of Washington, United States District Court against Kenneth Salazar (in his official capacity as the Secretary of the United States Department of Interior), USFWS, USBR, United States Department of Interior (DOI), and LNFH on the basis that they have allegedly violated the State of Washington's Water Code by diverting water into the hatchery channel. The U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Washington, and the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in favor of the defendants (2013).

#### Wild Fish Conservancy v. Irving et al

Additional litigation has occurred between Wild Fish Conservancy and LNFH regarding the adequacy of the Biological Opinion. The U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Washington order granted in part and denied in part the plaintiff's and defendant's motions. The court found that the Biological Opinion was arbitrary and capricious because it failed to discuss the potential effects of climate change. However, the court sided with LNFH and NMFS regarding whether an environmental impact statement was required for the Biological Opinion. The Biological Opinion was remanded back to NOAA to address climate change impacts.

#### Wild Fish Conservancy v Washington State Department of Ecology

In 2010, Wild Fish Conservancy and Center for Environmental Law and Policy (CELP) appealed Ecology's issuance of a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 401 Certification for LNFH. Based on this litigation, Ecology rescinded the January 2010 Section 401 Certification and is currently working on issuing a new certification.

#### Center for Environmental Law and Policy v. USFWS

In CELP v. USFWS (2016), CELP and Wild Fish Conservancy sued the LNFH for allegedly operating without an NPDES permit. In this case, the courts found that the hatchery's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit expired in 1979, and that the hatchery has been discharging pollutants into Icicle Creek without an NPDES permit since that time, in violation of the CWA. A new NPDES permit and 401 Certification was issued in December 2017. CELP has filed an appeal to the 401 Certification, which is currently pending before the PCHB (Center for Environmental Policy and Wild Fish Conservancy v. Dep't of Ecology and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; PCHB No. 17-109.)

# **1.9 Overview of SEPA Process**

SEPA applies to all decisions made by state and local agencies in Washington State. Under SEPA, one government agency is typically identified as the lead agency for identifying and evaluating the potential adverse environmental impacts of a proposal. This evaluation is documented and sent to the public and other agencies for their review and comment.

Under SEPA, project proponents are asked to complete an environmental checklist. The checklist asks questions about the proposal and its potential impacts on the environment. After the checklist has been completed, the lead agency reviews it and other information about the proposal. If more information is needed, the lead agency can ask the applicant to conduct further studies. Public meetings and outreach events are used to share information about the proposal and seek feedback from interested parties. When a proponent has gathered and submitted enough information about their proposal, the lead agency will make a threshold determination:

- A determination of non-significance also called a DNS if it finds the proposal is unlikely to have a significant adverse environmental impact.
- A determination of significance if the information indicates the proposal is likely to have a significant adverse environmental impact. This requires the preparation of an EIS that evaluates the environmental impacts of the proposal and reasonable alternatives.
- A determination of mitigated non-significance also called an MDNS if it finds the proposal, with specific mitigation measures, would allow a DNS. This would allow the proposal to be clarified, changed, or conditioned to include those mitigation measures.

The EIS provides critical information to all agencies in the environmental review and approval process. This information also helps to determine avoidance, minimization, or compensatory mitigation measures to address any probable significant impacts.

For the Icicle Strategy, the co-conveners (Ecology and Chelan County) entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to act as SEPA co-lead agencies per Chapter 43.21 RCW to conduct an environmental review of the Icicle Strategy.

The following timeline lists the SEPA review process for the Icicle Strategy:

- February 2016: submitted SEPA checklist and issued threshold determination of significance; launch PEIS SEPA scoping
- April 2016: Public meeting
- May 2016: End of SEPA scoping comment period
- June 2016 to Spring 2018: Develop draft PEIS
- Spring 2018: Publish draft PEIS with a 60-day comment period
- Summer 2018: Public meeting in Leavenworth
- Winter 2018/2019: Issue final PEIS
- Winter 2018/2019: Begin project level environmental review or permitting

## 1.9.1 SEPA Scoping

SEPA scoping launched on February 9, 2016. The lead agencies, Ecology and Chelan County, elected to expand the scoping process in accordance with WAC 197-11-410 to promote interagency cooperation, public participation, and innovative ways to streamline the SEPA process. To support this, a public open house was held in Leavenworth, Washington on April 20, 2016, and public comments were received through May 11, 2016. Comments received during this period can be reviewed at: http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/ natural-resources/pages/icicle-strategy-sepa-comments (Appendix B).

### 1.9.2 SEPA PEIS

At the conclusion of the SEPA scoping process, the co-lead agencies reviewed and summarized the scoping comments submitted. The co-lead agencies decided to consider several different alternatives based on comments received during the scoping process, including the base package (a suite of projects previously identified by the IWG that can meet the Guiding Principles), along with a no-action alternative, and three other alternatives that were responsive to the scoping comments. The alternatives considered are described in Chapter 2 of this document. Descriptions of the affected environment can be found in Chapter 3, with analysis of potential impacts, cumulative impacts, and mitigation measures discussed in Chapters 4 and 5.

### **1.9.3** Next Steps in the Environmental Review Process

In considering future project implementation, government agencies responsible for project - level environmental review and permitting on projects covered by this PEIS will perform one of the following actions under WAC 197-11-600:

- Rely on the analysis presented in this PEIS unchanged.
- Issue an addendum "that adds analyses or information about a proposal but does not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives" in the PEIS.
- Prepare a Supplemental Project EIS if there are "substantial changes to a proposal so that the proposal is likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts" or there is "new information indicating a proposal's probable significant adverse environmental impacts." "A new threshold determination or SEIS is not required if probable significant adverse environmental impacts are covered by the range of alternatives and impacts analyzed in the existing environmental documents."

### 1.9.3.1 Project Level Environmental Review

If the IWG receives authorization and funding to carry the Icicle Strategy forward, the first steps in the process would be to undertake additional project definition, design, modeling, feasibility study review, and other appropriate technical analyses. Once the projects and actions have received adequate definition and design, they would undergo project-level environmental review. Projects for which adequate environmental review is covered in the PEIS, the permitting agency may decide to adopt the PEIS analysis and proceed to permitting. However, projects that may have new or additional significant adverse impacts not analyzed in the PEIS would require additional project-level review. The project-level environmental review could include detailed analysis of impacts and development of project-

specific mitigation, including an assessment of the anticipated effectiveness of mitigation measures to avoid or attenuate impacts. Projects carried forward would comply with permit requirements, as described in Section 1.9 of this chapter.

#### 1.9.3.2 NEPA Requirements and Integration

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires federal agencies to assess the environmental effects of their proposed actions prior to making decisions (EPA, 2016<sup>9</sup>). Using the NEPA process, agencies evaluate the environmental and related social and economic effects of their proposed actions. Agencies also provide opportunities for public review and comment on those evaluations.

NEPA is required on projects with a federal permitting nexus. Several projects under the various alternatives may require federal permitting and a federal level environmental review. NEPA can occur concurrently with the SEPA process. Conversely, SEPA and NEPA can occur on separate timelines. When this occurs, the subsequent review can adopt the finding of the previous review. For example, if NEPA precedes SEPA, the findings of the NEPA analysis can be adopted (WAC 197-11-610). Alternatively, in some instances a federal agency may use existing SEPA documents to meet NEPA requirements depending on the adopted NEPA policies of that agency, as was the case with USBR adopting the SEPA review of the Lake Roosevelt Incremental Storage Releases project.

If SEPA is conducted before NEPA, the SEPA process does not predetermine the NEPA process. Should a project or a suite of projects selected as part of the Preferred Alternative through this EIS or future SEPA process not be selected as a preferred alternative through a NEPA process, the IWG operating procedures require that the project be replaced by another project to meet the Guiding Principles. This is also the case if any project is determined to be fatally flawed based on cost, permitting, project -level environmental review, or other means. If this occurs, additional SEPA review would be conducted as required under Chapter 197-11 WAC.

For projects related to LNFH, the USBR and USFWS are currently reviewing proposals on Snow Lake valve replacement and automation, screening and upgrading the intake structure, water conservation measures at LNFH, and groundwater development. USBR has already initiated an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Snow Lake Valve Replacement Project and is considering additional EA and EIS work for the other projects.

For projects that require USFS permitting or approval, the co-leads anticipate USFS may serve as lead agency. This decision will be made by applicable federal agencies depending on federal permitting requirements and federal agency coordination.

### 1.9.3.3 Summary Timeline of All Environmental Review

The process of environmental review of Icicle Strategy projects is ingrained in each step of the various projects. As indicated in Table 1-7 some aspects of environmental review, such as weighing the impacts of each step on consistency with the Guiding Principles, are taken into consideration on a continuous basis and are always underlying any decision made. Other, more specific aspects of the environmental review process are enacted at key junctures in a project's timeline. The SEPA process began at the end of 2015 and will progress through

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> https://www.epa.gov/nepa, accessed September 15, 2016

2018. At the same time, meetings with local, state, and federal government agencies occurred to put together a package of interagency agreements and common goals to incorporate into the SEPA scope. The various steps in the Environmental Review can be seen in Table 1-7.

Task	Description	Dates		
IWG Process				
IWG Meetings	Determine framework for resolving any additional guiding principle deficiencies, project selection, and environmental review	Quarterly, 2012- Present		
Guiding Principle Metric Resolution	Resolve any unmet guiding principle metrics to allow project selection and level of investment determination	2012 through Mid-2017		
Integrated Project List Deliberation	IWG Steering Committee or Project Subcommittee weighs benefits, risk, impacts, and consistency with Guiding Principles	2012 through Present		
Environmental Review				
SEPA Scoping	SEPA Scoping	January 2016 through June 2016		
Lead Agency Determination	Meet with local, state, federal agencies to determine leads, scoping goals, interagency agreements, existing documents	January 2016 through June 2016		
Determination of Significance	Distribute DS and all studies assembled to-date to agencies and the public	February 2016		
Publish scoping comments/summary	Identify key issues to be addressed in Programmatic EIS	June 2016		
Data Gaps	Identify and resolve data gaps, supplemental environmental studies	June 2016 through April 2017		
Develop Programmatic EIS	Develop draft document, including Guiding Principles, Alternatives, and Affected Environment	June 2016 through June 2017		
Draft PEIS Internal	Draft PEIS to lead agencies	June 2017		
Circulate Draft EIS for Comment	Draft PEIS circulated for 60-day comment period	May 2018 through July 2018		
Public Comment	PEIS Comment period closes	July 2018		
Produce Final Programmatic EIS	PEIS Final document published	January 2019		
Finalize NEPA Integration Strategy	Budget and coordinate NEPA integration strategy	December 2018 through April 2019		
Begin Project LevelProject Level EIS's will likely follow same steps above, although other options exist (e.g., SEPA Addendum, Adoption of PEIS)		January 2019 through December 2020		
Project Development				
Begin Feasibility Studies	Feasibility study funding is provided in the 2015-2017 OCR Capital Budget, federal budget matches needed for some projects	2015 through May 2018		

Table 1-7 Environmental Review Timeline

### 1.9.3.4 Future Opportunities for Public Input

Public review and comment is an important part of the IWG decision making process. The public is a valuable stakeholder and the IWG aims to make decisions that benefit the greatest number of people. A 90-day comment period on scoping for the Programmatic EIS took place from February to May 2016. In addition, a draft of the Programmatic EIS will be circulated for a 60-day comment period. Additional comment periods will be scheduled and

conducted for subsequent NEPA and project level environmental reviews and permitting. IWG meetings are also open to the public and IWG members make numerous presentations to stakeholder groups on the Icicle Strategy.

# 1.10 Related Permits, Actions, and Laws

This section describes key federal and state regulations applicable to the Icicle Creek Strategy and program alternatives.

### 1.10.1 Endangered Species Act

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA; 16 United States Code [USC] 1536) is a federal law designed to protect and prevent the extinction of species of fish, wildlife, and plants, and their critical habitats, that are listed as threatened or endangered under the Act. The ESA is administered by the USFWS for terrestrial species and some freshwater fish species and NMFS for anadromous fish and marine species, collectively referred to as "the Services."

Under the ESA, it is unlawful for anyone to take a listed animal without a permit. "Take" is defined as harassment, harm, pursuit, hunting, shooting, wounding, killing, trapping, capturing, or collecting or attempting to engage in any of these activities. The USFWS and NMFS are Icicle Creek Work Group members and part of their respective roles is to ensure consistency with applicable state and federal laws, including the ESA. This has been established as one of the Guiding Principles of this program evaluation. In addition, any individual projects with the potential to result in take of a species protected under the ESA would undergo consultation with the Services prior to project implementation. For additional information about coordination with the Services specific to the Icicle Creek Strategy, refer to Chapter 5, *Consultation and Coordination*.

### 1.10.2 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act

Section 305(b)(2) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act (MSA) requires federal agencies to consult with NMFS on activities that may adversely affect essential fish habitat (EFH). EFH is defined in the MSA as those waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity. A federal action agency, or its official designee, must determine whether its actions may adversely affect EFH. If the agency determines that an action may adversely affect EFH, the action agency must prepare an EFH Assessment. If the action would not adversely affect EFH, then the agency should document this determination in its record. Any individual projects with the potential to result in adverse effects on EFH would undergo consultation with NMFS prior to project implementation. For additional information about coordination with NMFS specific to the Icicle Creek Strategy, refer to Chapter 5, *Consultation and Coordination*.

### 1.10.3 Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act

The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661-667e) was enacted in 1934 and amended in 1958 (Public Law 85-624) and provides for equal consideration of wildlife conservation in coordination with other features of water resource development programs. Consultation with USFWS and WDFW would be required during implementation of water resource development portions of the program (e.g., plans to control or modify any stream or other body of water). This consultation is typically conducted concurrently with other regulatory review or permitting processes under NEPA, ESA, and CWA compliance. Also, WDFW is an Icicle Creek Work Group member and part of its role is to ensure consistency with applicable state and federal laws, including the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.

### 1.10.4 Clean Water Act

The CWA (33 USC 1251 *et seq.*) was enacted in 1972 and is the primary federal law regulating discharges of dredged or fill material and pollutants into waters of the United States. The EPA has established water quality standards for the discharges of dredged or fill material and pollutants under the regulatory provisions of the CWA, as summarized below. The CWA is jointly implemented by the EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

#### 1.10.4.1 Section 401, Water Quality Certification

Section 401 of the CWA requires that any project with the potential to result in discharge to waters of the United States obtain a water quality certification permit. In the State of Washington, individual projects with the potential to result in discharge to waters of the United States would require a water quality certification permit from Ecology.

#### 1.10.4.2 Section 402, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

Section 402 of the CWA requires permission for any construction activities resulting in disturbance to 1 acre of land or greater or for any point source discharges from a municipal, industrial, or commercial facility into a surface water of the United States. Permissions must be obtained through the NPDES permit and be consistent with water quality standards set forth by the CWA. NPDES permits are also administered by Ecology in the State of Washington.

#### 1.10.4.3 Section 404 Permit Program

Section 404 of the CWA establishes a program to regulate the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands. An individual permit is required for potentially significant impacts, whereas a general permit, issued on a nationwide, regional, or state basis, may be suitable for discharges that have only minimal adverse effects. Individual projects with the potential to result in the placement of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States, including wetlands, would require a permit from USACE.

# 1.10.5 National Historic Preservation Act

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their actions on cultural resources, including archaeological resources, historic properties, and traditional cultural properties. Federal agencies must undergo a process of consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office and potentially affected federally recognized tribes to ensure the potential for impacts on these resources are appropriately minimized. Individual projects led by a federal agency or requiring a federal permit or approval will undergo Section 106 evaluation. Within the State of Washington, the State Historic Preservation Office is the Washington State Department of Archeological and Historic Preservation (DAHP). Section 106 could apply to any of the projects that receive federal funding or a federal permit, or take place on federal land.

## 1.10.6 Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC 3001-3013) provides a process for federal agencies and museums receiving federal funding to return certain Native American cultural items to lineal descendants, establishes a process for the protection of the inadvertent discovery of Native American cultural items on federal and tribal lands, and provides penalties for noncompliance and illegal trafficking. Individual projects involving federal agency permits or approvals would be required to comply with this law.

## 1.10.7 National Archaeological Resources Protection Act

The National Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC Chapter 1B) governs the excavation of archaeological sites on federal and Native American lands and the removal and disposition of archaeological collections from those sites. Individual projects occurring on federal lands would be required to comply with this law.

### 1.10.8 Executive Order 13007: Indian Sacred Sites

Executive Order 13007 requires federal agencies to promote access to and protection of American Indian sacred sites. Sacred sites can only be identified if tribes or an appropriately authoritative representative of a Native American religion has informed the agency of the existence of a site.

### 1.10.9 Executive Order 11988: Floodplain Management

Executive Order 11988 requires federal agencies to reduce the risk of floodplain loss, minimize the adverse impacts of floods, and restore and preserve the natural functions provided by floodplains. Individual projects involving federal permits or approvals will further ensure consistency with this executive order.

## 1.10.10 Executive Order 11990: Protection of Wetlands

Executive Order 11990 requires federal agencies to ensure their actions minimize the destruction, loss, or degradation of wetlands and preserves or enhances the beneficial

values of wetlands. Any wetland losses associated with individual projects would be addressed through evaluation and permitting consistent with the Clean Water Act.

### 1.10.11 Executive Order 12898: Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898 requires federal agencies to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their actions on minorities and low-income populations. The effects of individual projects involving federal permits or approvals will result in further evaluation of the potential for disproportionate impacts on these populations.

### 1.10.12 Wilderness Act

The Wilderness Act of 1964 created the National Wilderness Preservation System and establishes regulations for the management and use of wilderness areas on federal lands. The Wilderness Act prohibits permanent roads or commercial enterprises, except where they provide for recreation or other purposes of the Act, and generally prohibits the use of motorized equipment; however, certain nonconforming uses are permitted as described within the act, including access to non-federal inholdings and for the maintenance and reconstruction of existing water infrastructure, such as dams.

### 1.10.13 U.S. Forest Service Special Use Permit

The USFS special-use authorization is a legal document, such as a permit, lease, or easement that allows occupancy, use, rights, or privileges on USFS land. The ALWA is jointly administered by the USFS Okanogan-Wenatchee and the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest management.

Upper and Lower Snow Lakes and Nada Lake are owned and operated by USFWS. IPID owns easements that encompass Klonaqua, Square, Colchuck, and Eightmile Lakes. All of these lakes are located in the ALWA. IPID and the USFWS have existing water rights, easements, and access agreements with the USFS that allow the lakes to be used for storage and release of water. These agreements include the right to conduct maintenance activities within the ALWA. Depending on ownership and easement authority at the various lakes, additional special use permits may be required.

### 1.10.14 Governor's Executive Order 05-05

Any state-funded capital construction projects or land acquisition projects for the purpose of capital construction require Governor's Executive Order 05-05 (GEO 05-05) review. This order requires all state agencies to integrate DAHP, the Governor's Office of Indian Affairs, and concerned tribes into the capital improvement project planning process to protect the public interest in historic and cultural sites. Consultation with DAHP is typically conducted by the responsible federal agency; however, this directive ensures coordination for capital improvement projects regardless of federal involvement. GEO 05-05 could apply if any of the projects receive state capital improvement funds.

### 1.10.15 Washington State Archaeological Protection

Washington State law (Revised Code of Washington 27.53.060) requires a permit from DAHP prior to the disturbance of any known archaeological sites and provides for

criminal penalties for activities conducted without having obtained a written permit prior to beginning such activities. Individual projects with the potential to disturb known archeological sites would be required to comply with this law.

# 1.10.16 Hydraulic Project Approval

The WDFW administers the Hydraulic Project Approval (HPA) program under the State Hydraulic Code (Washington Administrative Code 220 - 110), which is specifically designed to protect fish life. Construction projects or other activities in or near state waters require an HPA. Individual projects with the potential to affect state waters and fish will require an HPA.

### 1.10.17 Washington State Department of Natural Resources Aquatic Use Authorization

An Aquatic Use Authorization is required from Washington State Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) for use of state-owned aquatic lands. State-owned aquatic lands are navigable lakes, rivers, streams, and marine waters. WDNR may also require surveys or a legal description of the property, a plan of development/operations, bonds, and insurance. SEPA approval and the HPA need to be completed prior to WDNR issuing the Aquatic Use Authorization. Individual projects requiring an aquatic use authorization will undergo review by WDNR.

### **1.10.18 Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application**

To streamline the environmental permitting process, multiple regulatory agencies have combined their processes into one application called the Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application (JARPA). Relative to the Icicle Creek Strategy, the JARPA can be used to obtain local, state, and federal approvals for compliance with the Shoreline Master Program, Ecology's 401 Water Quality Certification, HPA, the WDNR Aquatic Use Authorization, and the USACE's Section 404 review for individual projects requiring these permits and approvals.

## 1.10.19 Reservoir Storage Permit

A Reservoir Storage Permit issued by the State of Washington is required for any impoundment that is either 10 feet or more in depth or can retain 10 or more acre-feet of water regardless of whether the impounded water is on-channel or off-channel. Reservoir Storage permits are regulated under RCW 90.03.370, and authority to issue Reservoir Storage Permits resides with Ecology. The permitting process is similar to water rights permit application processing in that there is no statutory timeline for a decision by Ecology; permits are processed in order of priority date. Expedited permitting (e.g., cost reimbursement) is an avenue for those seeking accelerated permit processing. Reservoir Storage Permits are often confused with Dam Safety Permits, which are required for construction of dams capable of storing 10 acre-feet of water above natural grade (WAC 173-175-020), and many storage projects require both permits. Similarly, Reservoir Storage Permits are not used in place of water rights permits (permit for beneficial use of water). Separate permit authorization is required for diversion / withdrawal and use of source water.

### 1.10.20 Dam Construction Permit

A Dam Construction Permit is issued by the State of Washington and is required for any impoundment that stores 10 acre-feet of water or more (WAC 173-175-020). The state can exempt some dams that meet this threshold provided they are less than 6 feet tall. Impounded volumes are measured based upon the maximum potential storage volume that could be released in the event of dam failure, and in many instances this volume is dictated by the crest of the dam (rather than spillway) relative to natural grade. Dam Construction Permits are issued by the Dam Safety Office (DSO) of Ecology. The permitting process involves evaluation of dam purpose, operational class, dam size, downstream hazard classification, federal regulatory nexus, and other factors. Once constructed, dams must be operated and maintained in accordance with DSO requirements and are subject to periodic inspection by the state (WAC 173-175-200).

### 1.10.21 Water Right Permit

A Water Right Permit (water right) is issued by the State of Washington and is required in order to use waters of the State. A water right is a legal authorization to use a predefined non-wasteful quantity of public water for a designated purpose that must qualify as a beneficial use (e.g., irrigation, domestic, fire flow, fish propagation, etc.). Water right authorizations may be either a claim, permit, or certificate; however, permits and certificates are the only forms of new authorizations issued. Uses of water below a set quantity or for certain uses may be exempt from permitting. Once a permit is issued, the permittee has a prescribed time window to put their authorized quantity to beneficial use. The quantity put to beneficial use represents the "perfected" quantity that may be certificated. Once certificated, some portions of water rights authorization may be changed, which may be advantageous; however, authorized quantities may also be forfeited (relinquished) because of unexcused periods of non-use. The extent and validity of a water right is triggered when an applicant applies to change a water right, and Ecology investigates whether a water right exists to change. Ecology may also review the extent and validity of a water right when an entity with pre-existing water rights seeks a new water right. Part of Ecology's review of a change to a water right also includes environmental review of potential impacts through a SEPA evaluation. Water rights applications are reviewed and approved in order of priority date—meaning they are processed sequentially based on the date the application is accepted by Ecology. Options for expedited application processing are available. In order for Ecology to issue a Water Right Permit, the proposal must meet a four-part test including: 1) water is available (both legally and physically), 2) the permit is for beneficial use, 3) will not impair other rights, and 4) not contrary to the public interest.

### 1.10.22 County Shorelines Management Act Permit (Shoreline Substantial Development or Conditional Use Permit)

Compliance with the Shoreline Management Act (Chapter 90.58 RCW) is required for development in proximity to water bodies of a certain size. In Chelan County, these water bodies include lakes greater than 20 acres and streams and rivers over 20 cfs. Shoreline Management Act jurisdiction also includes upland areas associated with these

waterbodies—specifically lands within 200 feet of ordinary high water mark, floodways, some floodplains, and associated wetlands. Shoreline permitting applies to new structures (buildings, docks, etc.), grading, and other activities. Unless exempted from permitting under RCW 90.58.030(3), there are three typical shoreline permitting pathways that involve both local jurisdiction (e.g., Chelan County) and Ecology. In incorporated areas, such as City of Leavenworth, city zoning and comprehensive plans regulate shoreline permitting. These are the Substantial Development Permit, Shoreline Conditional Use Permit, and Variance. The Shoreline Substantial Development Permit is issued by Chelan County and is required for any activities that constitute substantial development as defined in the adopted Shoreline Management Program. Substantial Development Permit decisions made by Chelan County are not reviewed by Ecology but are filed by the State. Conditional Use Permits and Shoreline Variances are issued by Chelan County but are also review and approved by Ecology. Conditional Use Permits are issued in circumstances where a particular shoreline use is not preferred or outright allowed but may be permitted based on circumstances. In contrast, Variances are provided in cases when particular use is allowed but an alternative numerical development standard, such as maximum building height, minimum setback, etc., is allowed.

### 1.10.23 Critical Areas Review

Critical areas review is required by the Growth Management Act that establishes standards for use and development of lands based on the existence of critical areas such as critical aquifer recharge areas, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, frequently flooded areas, geologically hazardous areas, and wetlands. Zoning designations that affect critical areas are provided in Chapters 11 and 13 of the Chelan County Code for unincorporated areas. Cities (i.e., Leavenworth), regulate zoning and critical areas through their own zoning regulations and comprehensive plans.

### 1.10.24 Building, Fill, and Grading Permits

Any site improvement (development), including grading and structural improvements, require a County building permit per Chelan County Code Chapter 14 for unincorporated areas. Cities (i.e., Leavenworth), these activities are regulated through zoning and comprehensive plans.

### 1.10.25 Water System Plans

Water system planning is required under Part 2 of Chapter 246-290 WAC for any community public water system meeting certain thresholds set forth in WAC 249-290-100. An update to water system planning documents is required at least once every 10 years or if a system proposes to make infrastructure changes that change the number of connections, expands the service area identified in previous planning documents, or expands the geographic area not previously approved. Water system plans, and water system plan updates, are reviewed and approved by Washington State Department of Health.

### 1.10.26 Instream Flow Rule Amendment

Washington State relies on notice-and-comment rulemaking related to instream flows. Chapters 90.22.010, 90.22.020, and 90.54 RCW provide the framework for establishing or modifying instream flows. Prior to modifying instream flow rules, Ecology must provide public notice and conduct a public hearing in the same county where the water body is located.

### 1.10.27 Construction Stormwater General Permit and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

Coverage under a Construction Stormwater General Permit is required for construction activities that meet certain thresholds. Typically, the threshold for permit coverage includes clearing, grubbing, and excavating activities that disturb 1 or more acres and discharges to waters of the State. Currently, the State of Washington has a Construction Stormwater General Permit through the NPDES that covers all areas of Washington State with the exception of federal operations and Indian Country. This permit was issued on November 18, 2015 and expires on December 31, 2020. Construction site operators with sites subject to minimum thresholds may apply for coverage under the state permit by submitting a Notice of Intent (NOI) to Ecology a minimum of 60 days prior to anticipated discharge. Public notice is also required. Once coverage is obtained, operators must develop a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Control Plan (SWPPP), implement Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs), and perform sampling at discharge monitoring locations. Coverage under the permit requires that monthly Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMR) be submitted to Ecology with the exception that high turbidity discharge events be reported within 24 hours.

### 1.11 Documents Adopted under SEPA

An extensive body of work has been completed to better understand water management issues in the Icicle Subbasin and to explore the feasibility of potential solutions to benefit water users and fish. Pursuant to provisions of the SEPA Rules (WAC 197-11-630), Ecology and Chelan County are adopting the following documents as part of this PEIS to meet a portion of Ecology's responsibilities under SEPA:

- Anchor Environmental, L.L.C., 2007, Preliminary Draft, Needs and Alternatives Analysis, Icicle Creek Sub-Basin Storage Study
- Anchor QEA, 2011, Water Storage Report, Wenatchee River Basin
- Anchor QEA, 2012, IPID Pump Exchange Project Appraisal Study
- Anchor QEA, 2015, Icicle and Peshastin Irrigation Districts Pump Exchange, Summary of Potential Operations and Maintenance Funding Strategies.
- Anchor QEA, 2015, Icicle- Peshastin Irrigation District (IPID) Pump Exchange (Dryden Alternative) Summary of Additional Analyses.
- Anchor QEA, 2015, LNFH Tribal Fishery Analysis, 2015 (draft)
- Anchor QEA, 2017, Cascade Orchards Irrigation Company Conceptual Design Update

- Anchor QEA, 2017, IPID Conservation Plan Full Piping Improvement Option
- Anchor QEA, 2018, IPID Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan
- Anchor QEA/Aspect Consulting, 2015, Eightmile Lake Restoration and Expansion Appraisal Study,
- Aspect Consulting, 2014, Conservation Plan Survey
- Aspect Consulting, 2014, Upper Klonaqua Lake Conceptual Review
- Aspect Consulting/Anchor QEA, 2015, Alpine Lakes Optimization and Automation Appraisal Study, 2015, LNFH Effluent Pump Back Preliminary Assessment.
- Chelan County Natural Resources Department & Anchor Environmental, LLC, 2007, Peshastin Subbasin, Needs and Alternatives Study
- EcoAssets and Associates, 2013, Icicle Creek Boulder Field Fish Passage Assessment,
- Golder Associates, 2005, WRIA 45 Summary of Groundwater/Surface Water Interaction and Groundwater Resource Reference
- Icicle Creek Target Flow Report for Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, 2004, Montgomery Water Group
- LNFH, 2009, Proposed Flow Management Operations for 2009-2014
- Montgomery Water Group, 2004, Water Management Plan for Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery
- Montgomery Water Group, 2006, Multi-Purpose Water Storage Assessment in the Wenatchee River Watershed
- Montgomery Water Group, Pacific Groundwater Group, and EES, 2003, Wenatchee River Basin, Watershed Assessment
- National Marine Fisheries Service Biological Opinion (referred to above in Section 1.6.2)
- Nelson, Mark, Andy Johnsen, and R.D. Nelle, 2009, Seasonal Movements of Adult Fluvial Bull Trout and Redd Surveys in Icicle Creek
- Northwest Power and Conservation Council, 2004, Wenatchee Subbasin Plan
- Ringel, B.K., 2006, Progress Report, Icicle Creek Water Temperatures, November 1, 2005 October 31, 2006.
- Sutton, Ron and Chelsie Morris, 2005, Technical Memorandum, Instream Flow Assessment of Icicle Creek, Washington
- The Watershed Company, 2005, Lower Icicle Creek Reach Level Assessment

- Trout Unlimited/Forsgren Associates, 2014, IPID Instream Flow Improvement Options Analysis, 2014,
- USBOR, 2010, Groundwater Conditions at LNFH
- USBOR, 2017, DRAFT Snow Lake Water Release Control Valve Replacement Environmental Assessment
- USBR, 2012, Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Final Value Analysis
- USBR, 2014, LNFH Groundwater Model Update Technical Memorandum
- USBR, 2014, LNFH Icicle Creek Rapid Geomorphic Assessment
- USDA, 2014, Climate Change Vulnerability and Adaptation in the North Cascades Region
- USFWS, 2006, Biological Assessment for Operations and Maintenance of Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery
- USFWS, 2010, LNFH Low Flow Contingency Plan
- USFWS, 2012 Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Discharge Monitoring Reports
- USFWS, 2013, Icicle Creek Fish Passage Evaluation for LNFH
- USFWS, 2013, Icicle Creek Instream Flow and Fish Habitat Analysis for LNFH
- USFWS, 2015, Biological Assessment of Operation and Maintenance of Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery
- USFWS, 2017, Biological Assessment of Operation and Maintenance of Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery
- USFWS, 2017, Leavenworth Fisheries Complex Implementation Plan, 2017
- Varela and Associates, 2011, City of Leavenworth, Water System Plan
- Varela and Associates, 2018, City of Leavenworth, Water System Plan
- Washington State Department of Ecology & Anchor QEA, LLC, 2010, Draft Feasibility Study, Campbell Creek Reservoir
- Waterfall Engineering et. al., 2016, Icicle Creek Boulder Field Fish Passage Design,
- WDFW, 2017, Alpine Lake Flow Augmentation Pilot Study 2017, Icicle Creek Tributary Monitoring Report
- Wenatchee Watershed Planning Unit, 2006, Wenatchee Watershed Management Plan
- Wenatchee Watershed Planning Unit, 2008, Wenatchee Watershed Planning, Phase IV—Detailed Implementation Plan
# 2.1 Description of Programmatic Proposal

This chapter describes the proposed Icicle Strategy Program Alternatives (Program Alternatives) developed by the IWG to meet the objectives set forth in the Icicle Creek Guiding Principles that were discussed in detail in Chapter 1, Sections 1.5. Each of the five Alternatives described in this document were intended to fully meet the Guiding Principles, using a different combination of projects with individualized costs, benefits, and impacts.

## 2.1.1 Icicle Strategy Overview

As discussed in Section 1.4, the IWG is made up of a diverse set of stakeholders representing local, state, and federal agencies; tribes; irrigation and agricultural interests; and environmental organizations. The IWG developed a set of Guiding Principles that are the objectives for integrated water resource management in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Figure 2-1 provides the Guiding Principles as well as metrics for each, which were discussed in greater detail in Chapter 1. This table is used to help compare how well the five Alternatives and the No-action Alternative evaluated in this PEIS meet or partially meet the Guiding Principles.

A key principle endorsed in the IWG Operating Procedures is that all projects in an Alternative move forward together as a group to ensure that the shared vision of improved water management in Icicle Creek was achieved, as opposed to a fragmented and partial solution that could lead to further conflict. If a particular project that is part of an Alternative becomes unfeasible (e.g. cannot be constructed, permitted, or funded), then the IWG agreed to reconvene and select a substitute project to address the Guiding Principle that suffered the shortfall. Projects can be phased, which will be necessary given funding and permitting constraints. However, the IWG would continue to support later phases of project development even as early project construction begins to show progress in meeting the Guiding Principles.

#### Figure 2-1. Guiding Principles with Metrics<sup>1</sup>

#### Icicle Workgroup Guiding Principles and Metrics

This summary describes the IWG Guiding Principles and how they are quantified for the development of an integrated project list. Full qualitative descriptions of the guiding principles are included in the IWG Operating Procedures. Metrics for guiding principles are subject to feasibility, funding, and permitting.

<b>Guiding Principle</b>	Metric		
Improve Instream	Icicle Creek Historic Channel:	Flow improvement	
Flows	<ul> <li>60 cfs minimum flows (drought years)</li> </ul>	needed (in projects)	
	• 100 cfs minimum flows (non-drought years), short-term goal	to meet total	
	• 250 cfs minimum flows (non-drought years), long-term goal	minimum flows:	
	• 2,600 cfs maximum flow to preserve habitat function	40 cfs <sup>1</sup>	
Improve	• Meet U.S. v. Oregon and other agreements specifying fish prod	duction requirements	
sustainability	• 57 cfs supply protected long-term (at least 20 cfs conservation goal)		
of LNFH	• Diverse source availability (temperature, pathogen-free) to maximize fish health		
	<ul> <li>Structures minimize unintended fish passage impediments</li> </ul>		
Protect Tribal and	Catch per unit of effort (CPUE) improved		
Non-Tribal harvest	Maintain multi-species harvest opportunities		
	• Tribal Impacts Assessment and Adaptive Management Plan be	eing implemented,	
	addressing attraction flows, sediment transport, fish migration, and amenities	straying, site access	
Improve Domestic	• 1,750 acre-feet of reliable year-round supply (2.5 cfs average, 5 cfs peak)		
Supply		1. 1. 11. 2. 1	
Improve Agricultural	Automate / Optimize Alpine Lakes Reservoirs for improved reliability (plus instruction flow here Et)		
Agricultural	instream flow benefit)		
Rendomity	• Restore/repair Eightmile Lake Reservoir up to 2,500 acre-feet (900 ac-ft additional		
	• Current interruptible agricultural users have firm supply in average water years /		
	agriculture water bank (2 to 4 cfs)	hage water years /	
Enhance Icicle	Improve passage in Icicle Creek including to Upper Icicle Cree		
Creek Habitat	Make investments in physical habitat improvement with consideration for high flow		
	habitat and low flow refuge minimize fish passage impediment	ats and improve	
	limiting factor spawning/rearing	no, and improve	
	• Offset project-related terrestrial impacts with land acquisition/	easements	
Comply with State	• Identify and engage regulators in the process		
and Federal Law,	• Environmental review completed (project check)		
and Wilderness	• All projects appropriately permittable (project check)		
Acts	• All diversions (LNFH, IPID, COIC) appropriately screened (p	roject check)	

<sup>1</sup>Based on a review of historic stream gage records, the existing average low flow in historic channel in nondrought years is 65 cfs (16 of the most recent 20 years) and average drought low flows is 20 cfs (2001, 2003, 2005, 2015). To meet Guiding Principle flow targets, approximately 40 cfs in project flow benefit is needed.

> Last Updated April 27, 2017 Original September 16, 2014, Updates on 02/04/2016, 04/14/2016, 02/20/2017, 04/27/2017

 $<sup>^1 \</sup> Reference: \ http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-resources/documents/Planning/icicle_work_group/current-project/Guiding% 20 Principle% 20 Metrics% 2002-04-2016.pdf$ 

### 2.1.2 Identification of Preferred Alterative

Following the comprehensive scoping and public comment for the PEIS discussed in this Chapter, Ecology and Chelan County have selected Alterative 1 as the Preferred Alternative. The co-leads determined that the suite of projects and elements that comprise Alternative 1 have the best chance of meeting the Guiding Principles over time, have the highest likelihood of funding, and have the lowest environmental footprint of the other alternatives considered. Alternative 1 will achieve the following:

- Improve Instream Flows
- Improve Sustainability of LNFH
- Protect Tribal and Non-Tribal Harvest
- Improve Domestic Supply
- Improve Agricultural Reliability
- Enhance Icicle Creek Habitat
- Comply with State and Federal Law
- Comply with Wilderness Acts

There are anticipated environmental impacts from all alternatives considered under the PEIS, but overall Alternative 1 is the environmentally preferred alternative to meet the Purpose and Need of the Icicle Strategy. While the No-action Alternative and Alternative 3 have lower costs and impacts, they cannot fully meet the Purpose and Need. The overall effect of Alternative 1 is expected to be more beneficial than the No-action Alternative for both instream and out-of-stream water supplies while enhancing fish habitat.

# 2.2 Development and Analysis of Alternatives

The alternatives analyzed in this document are the result of ongoing studies and discussions with state and federal regulators on how to best manage water within the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Additionally, discussions with private stakeholders through IWG meetings, outreach meetings, and SEPA scoping helped shape these alternatives. This section explains how the projects and alternatives were selected for inclusion in this PEIS.

The IWG has been working since December 2012 to develop the Guiding Principles and the projects intended to address them. One of the first exercises conducted by the IWG was to assemble a master project list based on conceptual ideas by IWG members,

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

#### PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

projects identified in the Wenatchee Watershed Plan, projects in various funding program queues, and projects in active appraisal or feasibility studies. In the first few months of the IWG (e.g., early 2013), over 60 potential projects had been identified that could assist in meeting the Guiding Principles. Early versions of these master project lists are available on Chelan County's website.

Following identification of potential projects, and concurrent with the IWG's efforts to put numeric standards to the qualitative Guiding Principles established in December 2012, the IWG developed a screening evaluation for projects. The method of evaluation included considering project benefit, water right pedigree,<sup>2</sup> and project costs. Then the IWG went through several iterative exercises where projects were aggregated to meet the Guiding Principles and provide a range of options based on the above listed factors (project benefit, water right pedigree, and project cost).

Figures 2-2 thru 2-5 illustrate this process. The projects are not listed in any specific order, and some project variations listed in these figures are not included in any of the Alternatives evaluated in the PEIS. These figures are for illustrative purposes to show how projects were evaluated and grouped into packages.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Water Right pedigree refers to when water from a particular project will be available. **Guaranteed** water consists of water that will always be available based on permanently placing the water into the state TWRP. **Firm** water refers to water that will be on long-term donation or lease to the state Trust Water Right Program. For these projects, firm water is generally federally owned water and the water is not being permanently transferred to the TWRP because of laws prohibiting a permanent transfer. **Interruptible** water, in this scenario consists of water that may not be available every year for instream flows. This includes water made available for instream flows from the Alpine Lakes Reservoirs Optimization, Modernization, and Automation, because in low water years, when the district needs a larger portion of their water, the water will not be placed in the TWRP.

In Figure 2-2, the red line represents the WUA flow-habitat relationship for the historical channel (see Figure 2-34) and the gray bar represents an average low flow condition of 20 cfs in that reach. The note in the bottom left of the figure presumed a number of projects would also be included that did not provide flow benefit, but would address other Guiding Principles (e.g., screening, tribal fishery protection).

# Figure 2-2. Minimum Flow (less the 20 cfs) and Instream Flow Goals (100 cfs) Overlaid by WUA for Spawning Steelhead in Icicle Creek Historical Channel



#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

In Figure 2-3, the first project in this example was added, which was a potential pump exchange on the Wenatchee River that would provide up to 30 cfs benefit in Icicle Creek. Habitat improvement is tracked (49 percent improvement), cost is tracked (in the green line against the secondary Y-axis), and the pedigree of the water (guaranteed) appears in the stacked bar chart on the far right.





In Figure 2-4, a grouping of projects that would potentially meet the Guiding Principles (dashed vertical blue line) was created. Many combinations of such projects were considered. In each case, there is increasing habitat benefit, cost increases, and the pedigree of the water provided is matched to each project.





#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

In Figure 2-5, and in keeping with the long-term goal of 250 cfs, the IWG considered other projects that could be added beyond the short-term goal to further improve Icicle Creek. This also was evaluated because some projects to the left of the dashed vertical Guiding Principle line may become infeasible, which would necessitate consideration of other replacement projects.



#### Figure 2-5. Comparison of Project Benefits and Costs to Flow and WUA, Step 3

After several months of considering different project packages (or combinations of projects), ultimately the IWG assembled what would become known as the "Base Package," or Alternative 1 in this PEIS, and endorsed it for comment and consideration in environmental review. The IWG's endorsement of Alternative 1 was for the purpose of giving the public a specific set of projects to consider, with an openness for considering other project opportunities that could also meet all of the Guiding Principles.

# 2.2.1 Identification of Alternatives through SEPA Scoping

The IWG advanced their Base Package (Alternative 1) forward for programmatic environmental review by Ecology and Chelan County, who are acting as co-lead agencies. Prior to developing the PEIS, the IWG conducted outreach and scoping to inform the PEIS extent and scope, and to solicit ideas for additional variations to Alternative 1 that would result in reasonable alternatives to meet the Guiding Principles.

SEPA scoping feedback and comments received during a public meeting held by the colead agencies (Chelan County and Ecology) and the IWG helped to shape the alternatives analyzed in this PEIS. Chelan County and Ecology began preparations for SEPA scoping for the Icicle Strategy in January 2016. They prepared an expanded Environmental Checklist, issued a Determination of Significance (DS), and launched Programmatic SEPA Scoping in February 2016. A checklist is sometimes not prepared when a DS is issued, but the co-leads decided a detailed environmental checklist would help the public and agencies understand the scope of the proposal and direct them to resources gathered by the co-leads to help inform the potential benefits and impacts of implementation of the Icicle Strategy.

The IWG held an early outreach meeting to gain other stakeholder perspectives in February 2015 at the Good Shephard Center in Seattle. Their presentation focused on the proposed improvements to instream flows and water supply, and habitat improvements such as groundwater augmentation, new/modified storage, water markets, and fish passage/screening, as well as development of specific projects such as the Alpine Lakes Optimization and Automation and the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration.

On April 20, 2016, the IWG held a public open house at the Leavenworth Fire Hall in Leavenworth, Washington to encourage public participation in the SEPA process. The IWG presented information on their Guiding Principles and the alternatives they evaluated to create the Base Package of projects to meet them. Members of the public submitted comments based on the presentation. The SEPA Comment Period for public input ended on May 11, 2016; however, one late comment was accepted. Copies of the comments can be accessed at the Chelan County website.<sup>3</sup>

The co-lead agencies met and reviewed comments received during SEPA scoping. They reviewed each comment and prepared a comment responsiveness summary. This exercise helped shape the scope of investigations in the PEIS. It also helped inform the co-leads on alternative selection. The co-leads met with the IWG to review four additional alternatives, in addition to the no-action and base package alternatives, that would be considered in the PEIS and received its concurrence. For example, the IWG received several comments regarding projects focused on conservation, some requested having no action in the wilderness area, and others requested increasing storage options in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. To be responsive to these diverse comments and to ensure the best suite of projects was selected, the co-leads developed Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 that are composed of a mix of projects that had been reviewed or studied by the IWG since the inception of the work group.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/pages/icicle-strategy-sepa-comments

### 

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Alternative 5 was developed during the drafting of the EIS based on stakeholder discussion and further study of conservation opportunities in the IPID through their irrigation comprehensive plan. Additionally, with further study and funding opportunities for some projects, the No-action Alternative was modified to include several projects common to other alternatives. However, these projects' focus and benefits would not be the same if action on the Icicle Strategy does not occur.

All action alternatives can meet the objectives of the Guiding Principles, but with different emphases, costs, benefits, and impacts.

A 60-day public comment was provided following the release of this draft PEIS. These comments were considered when developing the final PEIS.

# 2.3 Summary of Alternatives

The Icicle Strategy seeks to improve water resources management in the Icicle Creek Subbasin and achieve the specific metrics outlined in the Guiding Principles. This PEIS evaluates five alternatives that meet the Guiding Principles, along with a No-action Alternative. These alternatives are introduced here and discussed in further detail in Section 2.4. The following Section 2.5 provides a detailed narrative of each project included in the suite of projects used to create the alternatives.

Each action alternative is composed of a variety of several projects developed to help meet the IWG's Guiding Principles. In summary, the five alternatives include:

- **No-action Alternative:** The No-action Alternative is presented to show the impacts of not implementing the Icicle Strategy. Under the No-action Alterative, some projects may be developed on separate and different pathways by proponents other than the IWG, although it is unlikely all would be implemented. Funding for projects would be delayed or less competitive without an integrated solution, resulting in slower implementation of projects that do succeed without IWG support. Project beneficiaries may be different and not focused on meeting guiding principles. Projects that may be implemented, on their own independent timelines, could improve streamflow by approximately 32 cfs and 18,094 acre-feet.
- Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative): The IWG has identified the first alternative as the Base Package, consisting of 12 elements that work in concert to achieve all of the Guiding Principles. The package is a mix of projects, including automating and optimizing reservoir releases at seven Alpine Lakes; efforts to make hatchery, irrigation, and domestic use more efficient; enhancement of habitat, fish passage, and fish screening; and protection of tribal and non-tribal fisheries. The suite of projects proposed under Alternative 1 (listed in Table 2-1) is estimated to cost \$82.0 million, which includes a 25 percent contingency for all projects and an additional 25 percent contingency for projects within the ALWA.

These projects are anticipated to provide 89 cfs and 31,958 acre-feet of total water benefit (instream and out-of-stream), of which 88 cfs and 28,458 acre-feet instream flow benefit. This estimate of instream flow benefit includes reach benefit for out-of-stream uses that would occur downstream.

- Alternative 2: This alternative builds on the foundation of Alternative 1, but replaces the Alpine Lakes Optimization project with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange project. Alternative 2 is estimated to cost \$91.4 million, which includes a 25 percent contingency for all projects and an additional 25 percent contingency for projects within the ALWA. This alternative would provide 84 cfs and 27,978 acre-feet of total water benefit (instream and out-of-stream), of which 83 cfs and 24,478 acre-feet of instream flow benefit. This estimate of instream flow benefit includes reach benefit for out-of-stream uses that would occur downstream.
- Alternative 3: This alternative also builds on the foundation of Alternative 1, but focuses on project selection outside the ALWA through greater reliance on conservation and pump exchange projects. Because supply and demand cannot be matched well without storage, it also includes a legislative change for instream flow impacts that would occur when conserved water is not able to fully meet demand in-time and in-place. This is a requirement given recent Supreme Court clarity in the *Foster/Yelm* case. Alternative 3 is estimated to cost \$89.0 million, which includes a 25 percent contingency. This alternative would provide 71 cfs and 24,378 acre-feet of total water benefit (instream and out-of-stream), of which 70 cfs and 23,578 of instream flow benefit. This estimate of instream flow benefit includes reach benefit for out-of-stream uses that would occur downstream.
- Alternative 4: This alternative provides a greater emphasis on development of water supplies, with enhancements to Eightmile Lake and storage improvements at the Upper Klonaqua and Snow Lakes. This alternative was selected to evaluate the value of greater flexibility in shaping water availability to meet future changes in both supply and demand. The estimated cost, which includes a 25 percent contingency for all projects and an additional 25 percent contingency for projects within the ALWA, is \$87.8 million. However, it does not include cost estimates for the Upper Klonaqua Lakes Storage Enhancement project because costs are unknown at this stage of project development. This alternative would provide 132 cfs and 35,385 acre-feet of total water benefit, of which 131 cfs and 34,585 acre-feet of instream flow benefit. This estimate of instream flow benefit includes reach benefit for out-of-stream uses that would occur downstream.
- Alternative 5: This alternative builds on the foundation of Alternative 1, but provides a greater emphasis on out-of-basin water supplies. Under Alternative 5, the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies element would be replaced with the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange. Under the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange, the IPID diversion would be completely removed from Icicle Creek, and it would be replaced with three pump stations on the Wenatchee River. The estimated cost, which includes a 25 percent contingency, is \$177.3 million. This alternative would provide 196 cfs and 58,958 acre-feet of total water benefit, and 195 cfs and 55,458

### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

#### PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

acre-feet of instream flow benefit to Icicle Creek. This estimate of instream flow benefit includes reach benefit for out-of-stream uses that would occur downstream.

This PEIS evaluates each alternative for probable significant adverse impacts, potential costs and benefits, mitigation measures, and probable required permit approvals at a programmatic level. The alternatives are discussed in further detail in Section 2.4.

Most of these alternatives use several of the same projects to meet the Guiding Principles because scoping did not reveal reasonable alternatives to meet them. For example, there was consensus on Guiding Principles such as screening, hatchery conservation improvements, and protection of tribal and non-tribal fisheries. Therefore, these are included in each of the five Alternatives. Table 2-1 provides a list of all projects by alternative and notes common projects. Sections 2.4 through 2.8 provide a detailed discussion of each alternative.

# 2.3.1 No-action Narrative Description

The No-action Alternative represents what might happen if no integrated, comprehensive strategy for managing water resources in Icicle Creek is adopted and implemented by the IWG to meet the Guiding Principles established by the IWG. Under the No-action Alternative, some projects may still be developed, but projects would be developed on separate timelines and for different purposes than those outlined in the Guiding Principles. Projects would likely be developed independently by members of the IWG or by proponents other than the IWG. Funding for projects would likely be delayed and projects may be less competitive for funding without an integrated strategy. Projects could be delayed or not implemented at all because of the lack of consensus-building at the local level. The No-action Alternative would fail to meet the instream flow Guiding Principle.

It is difficult to predict which of the projects might be constructed, delayed, or not implemented. However, based on the level of study and potential funding available for the various projects at the time of this PEIS, the following projects<sup>4</sup> are likely to implemented in some form under the No-action Alternative.

• Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation modernizes and automates the outlet works and gate infrastructure at seven lakes. Under the Icicle Strategy, this project would be implemented for instream flow benefit. However, if the Icicle Strategy does not advance, it is probable that at some point IPID would implement this project to improve their operations as part of routine reservoir maintenance that all infrastructure owners consider. However, if IPID pursues modernization and automation of the gates on its own, releases for the purposes of benefiting instream flow would not be guaranteed and would more likely be optimized for agricultural use.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Refer to Section 2.5 for full descriptions of projects.

Projecto	Proposed Alternatives					
Projects	No Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
			Conservat	ion		
IPID Irrigation Efficiencies	0	•	•	•	•	
COIC Irrigation Efficiencies (Piping)	•	•	•	•	•	•
Domestic Conservation Efficiencies	0	•	•	•	•	•
LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements	•	•	•	•	•	•
			Pump Exch	ange		
IPID Dryden Pump Exchange	0	0	•			
Full IPID Pump Station						•
COIC Irrigation Efficiencies (Pump Exchange)		•	•	•	•	•
		Mod	ification/Restoration	of Existing Storage		
Alpine Lakes Reservoir Optimization, Modernization and Automation	0	•			•	•
Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration	0	•	•	0	•	•
			New Store	age		
Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement						
Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement					•	
Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement					•	
			Habitat/Fisheries In	nprovements		
Tribal Fishery Protection	0	•	•	•	•	•
Habitat Protection and Enhancement	0	•	•	•	•	•
Fish Passage	•	•	•	•	•	•
Fish Screening	•	•	•	•		
			Legislative/Adminis	trative Tools		
Water Markets		•	•	•		
Instream Flow Rule Amendment	0	•	•	•	•	•
OCPI legislative fix from instream flow impacts						

Table 2-1 Alternatives Being Considered<sup>5</sup>

O Represents projects that might proceed if funding becomes available. However, under the No-action Alternative, project beneficiaries may be different and project timelines are unknown.

• Represents projects that are likely to occur as described, but could be replaced by another project that fulfills the same guiding principles if a design, funding, or permitting fatal flaw is identified.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Projects with a hollow circle are not being proposed by the IWG. However, based on conversations with stakeholders, the co-leads believe these projects could proceed outside the IWG process if not selected as part of the preferred alternative.

#### **ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN**

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies** would likely continue to be explored and implemented if funding were available because IPID has continually worked to improve efficiency within the District. However, funding may be more limited if not included as part of an integrated water resource management strategy, which could limit the scope and magnitude of efficiency projects. Additionally, all water saved through irrigation efficiency upgrades would likely assist IPID in meeting agricultural reliability purposes only, rather than bolstering instream flows, unless funding is used for a specific project that requires a trust water right transfer or some other commitment to instream flows.
- **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange** funding opportunities will likely exist for this project if the Icicle Strategy is not implemented. The COIC project is already proceeding with design and environmental permitting based on the strength of consensus built by the IWG over the last 5 years. Funding for the project is primarily based on the potential benefit the project offers to Icicle Creek. The project would shift the point of diversion for COIC from Icicle Creek to a location near the confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. The project would also improve efficiency. The project would benefit Icicle Creek and assist in providing more reliable service to COIC.
- **Domestic Conservation** would likely continue to be explored and implemented if funding were available because the City of Leavenworth has already invested in conservation in the past and is required to pursue water use efficiency measures as part of conservation planning required by RCW 70-119A.180. The County also has addressed continuing rural conservation options by teaming with local water purveyors on how to incentivize or promote this idea. However, funding may be more limited if not included as part of an integrated water resource management plan, which could limit the magnitude of conservation projects. Regardless, water saved under the No-action Alternative would benefit the domestic uses in a similar manner as although potentially to a lesser degree than would occur for the other alternatives.
- Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration will occur because IPID has a long-term responsibility to maintain its infrastructure to provide reliable water service to its irrigation customers, while protecting public safety of those downstream of their dams. While the Eightmile Lake Dam is in need of repair, the District has prioritized other capital improvements over this project in recent years, including conservation and other dam maintenance, in part to allow for this project to be evaluated in more detail by the IWG. However, the need to make improvements has become more urgent because the outlet is collapsing and losing capacity. In addition, a fire in 2017 burned to the shoreline of the lake, likely changing the hydrology of inflow to the lake and raising concerns about the condition and safety of the dam. IPID declared an emergency on March 13, 2018, as a result of the 2017 fire and is actively coordinating with local, state, and federal agencies

on this project. If not implemented or funded as part of an integrated strategy, IPID would not be obligated to release any of this water for instream flow or domestic benefit as envisioned under multiple Alternatives considered in this PEIS. Instead that water would be retained for agricultural reliability and drought resiliency.

- Habitat Protection and Enhancement may occur at a reduced level. Prior to the IWG, Chelan County has worked on habitat improvements in lower Icicle Creek. This would likely continue, although funding may be more limited if not included as part of an integrated water resource management plan project and the extent of the habitat protection and enhancement could be lower.
- **Instream Flow Rule Amendment** may be sought if other required projects are completed (e.g., LNFH improvements and habitat enhancement), as envisioned under the original rule language in WAC 173-545-090. However, this may occur over a longer timeline.
- LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements focuses on projects to reduce surface water use and improve access to groundwater. Projects required in the Biological Opinion would continue without the Icicle Strategy. These include consideration of water reuse, groundwater augmentation, and a pump back that would allow for changing operations at Structure 2 and the division of water between the historic and hatchery channels.
- **Fish Screen Compliance** upgrades will likely continue if the Icicle Strategy is not implemented. These upgrades are required by law, and grant funding has already been expended on the design of screening improvements for the City of Leavenworth and IPID diversions. Screening for COIC is included in the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies project, while screening for LNFH is required under the BiOp and will be the subject of NEPA environmental review. However, implementation may occur on a slower timeline based on funding and would not necessarily occur in a way that would benefit other projects included in the Icicle Strategy, such as Habitat Protection and Enhancement.
- **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange** may be implemented under the No-action Alternative. However, the project would likely be rescaled and focused, at least initially, on reducing diversions from Peshastin Creek and improving the reliability of water supply to the Peshastin Irrigation District (PID) Main Canal, which could result in no benefit or less benefit in Icicle Creek.

# 2.3.2 Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative) Narrative Description

Alternative 1, also referred to as the Base Package, meets all the objectives defined in the IWG's Guiding Principles. These projects have been agreed to and moved forward by the IWG for review in this PEIS. While IWG members have reserved a final recommendation on Alternative 1 until resolution of the PEIS and consultation with the co-leads in 2018, this alternative represented the best recommendation available after 4 years of study by IWG members.

Alternative 1 includes the following projects<sup>6</sup>:

- Alpine Lakes Reservoirs Optimization, Modernization, and Automation modernizes and automates the outlet works and gate infrastructure at seven lakes. The intent is to improve management and releases of stored water at seven lakes in the Icicle Creek Subbasin based on changing conditions to meet the Subbasin's needs. It increases streamflow for fish and improves reliability and operation of stored water for agricultural use and the LNFH. (GP1; GP5)<sup>7</sup>
- **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies** explores options to improve irrigation delivery and on-farm efficiencies. Projects may include canal piping or lining and on-farm efficiency upgrades, which would improve drought resiliency and reliability to district users. Additionally, the IWG would work with IPID to voluntarily move water from users that do not use or need as much water to users that need additional water. This project also benefits fish by increasing streamflow. (GP1; GP5)
- **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange** proposes to change COIC's point of diversion from its existing location at RM 4.5 on Icicle Creek to a location on the right bank of the Wenatchee River near its confluence with Icicle Creek or on the left bank of Icicle Creek near its confluence with the Wenatchee River and implement other water saving measures, such as piping the delivery system. The augmented streamflow has the potential to improve reliability of water supply for agriculture, benefit fish passage and habitat, and maintain treaty and non-treaty harvests. (GP1; GP5)
- **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies** focuses on conservation projects in the City of Leavenworth and Chelan County and implements municipal and rural water efficiency projects such as a lawn buyback program that could incentivize reducing the amount of lawn homeowners irrigate, leak detection and repair, meter installation, and water use conservation to improve domestic supply. (GP4)
- **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration** rebuilds the Eightmile Lake dam to restore usable storage to the historical and permitted high water storage elevation. This

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Taken from Icicle Strategy SEPA Checklist: http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-

resources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/SEPA/Icicle%20Strategy%20SEPAChecklist%20Si gned.pdf

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> GP = Guiding Principal. See explanation in Table 2-2.

would increase streamflow for fish and meet the domestic water needs of the City of Leavenworth and surrounding rural areas in Chelan County and improves the reliability and drought resiliency for agricultural users (GP1; GP4; GP5). Additional water for the City of Leavenworth would be preferentially pursued on the Wenatchee River to reduce impacts to Icicle Creek, although in emergencies water could be supplied from Icicle Creek instead to meet the City's service obligations.

- **Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries** ensures that projects and actions taken do not have negative effects on tribal fishery activity in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. It monitors fishery effectiveness and implements actions for improvement, while protecting Tribal Treaty and federally protected harvest rights and non-tribal harvest at all times. (GP2)
- **Habitat Protection and Enhancement** identifies and implements stream restoration and protection projects such as riparian plantings, engineered log jams, and conservation easements to improve stream habitat and ecosystem health. (GP6)
- **Instream Flow Rule Amendment** modifies the instream flow rule's interim domestic reservation of 0.1 cfs to a final level of 0.5 cfs. This helps meet domestic water needs through 2050. As described in Chapter 173-545 WAC, the rule amendment requires instream flow and habitat restoration. This will improve domestic supply in the Icicle Creek subbasin. (GP4)
- LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements focuses on projects to reduce surface water use and improve access to groundwater. These projects may include onsite reuse, an effluent pump back, and wellfield enhancements for year-round benefits. It would also increase streamflow for fish and improve access to reliable water for the hatchery's operations. These projects also improve water quality in Icicle Creek. (GP1; GP2)
- **Fish Passage** improves passage by assessing and removing barriers, so fish have better access to healthy habitats. This could include improved operation at Structure 2 and modification of channel morphology at the Boulder Field. Improved passage will increase the amount of habitat fish can access within the subbasin. (GP6)
- **Fish Screening** upgrades fish screens on diversions to meet current standards. This will bring the major diverters on Icicle Creek into compliance with Washington State and NMFS screening requirements and bring LNFH into compliance with the screening requirements set in the Biological Opinion (NMFS, 2015). These projects reduce fish mortality, which ultimately improves fish passage. (GP6; GP7)
- Water Markets creates an Icicle Water Market and seeds it with an initial 1,000 acre-feet of water for agriculture use in the Icicle Creek Subbasin and Wenatchee River Basins during shortages. (GP4)

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Additional projects may be pursued outside of the Icicle Strategy if Alternative 1 is selected as the preferred alternative, such as the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange. However, project beneficiaries may be different and project timelines are unknown.

Table 2-2 shows how the projects included in Alternative 1 addresses the IWG's Guiding Principles. This suite of projects is expected to cost \$82 million, provides 89 cfs and 31,958 acre-feet of total water benefit (88 cfs and 28,458 acre-feet of instream benefit).

Guiding Principle	Guiding Principles	How the Alternative 1 Meets the
GP1	Improve Instream Flow	Meets goals of 100 cfs in average years and 60 cfs in drought years. Anticipated flow improvement is 88 cfs, in addition to base flows.
GP2	Improve Sustainability of LNFH	Meets goal of source redundancy and improved fish rearing and capacity, allowing LNFH to meet fish production goals. Also, improves water quality, and passage in Icicle Creek.
GP3	Protect Tribal and Non-Tribal Harvest	Meets goal of instream flow improvement balanced with preservation of fishery with adaptive management strategy in place, and potential amenity and access increases.
GP4	Improve Domestic Supply	Meets peak 2050 domestic demand
GP5	Improve Agricultural Reliability	Meets goal of 1,000 acre-feet for agricultural interruptible water rights.
GP6	Enhance lcicle Creek Habitat (includes fish passage and fish screens)	Meets goal of additional habitat improvement.
GP7	Comply with State and Federal Laws and Wilderness Acts	Meets goal by requiring project checks on all permits and an environmental review.

 Table 2-2

 How Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative) Meets Guiding Principles

Because Icicle Creek experiences low flows most acutely in the late summer/early fall (see Section 3.3), it is insufficient to consider the instream flow Guiding Principle met if the annual quantities meet "average" drought or non-drought year conditions. Rather, it is appropriate to consider performance of the Alternatives on a weekly time-step and to consider both actual flows in an indicator drought and non-drought year, as well as how average conditions fair.

A representative year approach and weekly average flows were used to determine performance of the alternatives in meeting the instream flow goal. 2015 was selected as a representative drought year and 2014 as a representative non-drought year. Weekly average flows in all non-drought years (50 percent exceedance) and drought years (80 percent exceedance) over the last 20 years was also used. Based on these criteria, there were four drought years during the 20-year record (2001, 2003, 2005, and 2015)

Weekly flows in the historic channel were shown along with additional water supply made available from projects in each Alternative to compare to the Guiding Principles. Some projects provide a constant or fixed weekly flow benefit in proportion to their savings (e.g. conservation), while others are adaptive (e.g. storage). Where adaptation was possible, greater flow benefit is achieved by targeting releases to late summer/early fall. Both Alpine Lakes Reservoirs Optimization, Modernization, and Automation and Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration can be managed adaptively, and releases would be managed based on annual flow conditions. In the following figures, the gray bars represent flow and the colored stacked bars represent projected contributions of each project to streamflow.

Figures 2-6, 2-7, 2-8, and 2-9 illustrate streamflow benefits in average drought and nondrought years, as well as the 2015 and 2014 water years with the Alternative 1 projects added. Under all these scenarios, the 100 cfs short-term non-drought and 60 cfs drought year flow restoration goals are met. Additionally, the purple line on the averaged flow charts represents the lowest weekly flow during the 20-year record for each weekly timestep. In the DPEIS this purple line was the same for drought and non-drought years. The FPEIS was revised so this line represents the lowest weekly average flows during non-drought years on the non-drought year graph and the lowest weekly average flows during drought years on the drought year graphs.

#### **ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN**

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT



#### Figure 2-6. Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative) Weekly Time Step, 2015 (Drought Year)<sup>8</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Represent 2015 flows in Icicle Creek with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 1 implementation



#### Figure 2-7. Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative) Weekly Time Step, 2014 (Non-Drought Year)<sup>9</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Represent 2014 (46% exceedance) flows in Icicle Creek with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 1 implementation.

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT





<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Represents averaged dry year flows (80% exceedance) in Icicle Creek with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 1 implementation.



#### Figure 2-9. Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative) Weekly Time Step, Non-Drought Scenario <sup>11</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Represent average flows in Icicle Creek during "non-drought" years (50% exceedance) with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 1 implementation.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

## 2.3.3 Alternative 2 Narrative Description

The IWG developed Alternative 2 in response to SEPA scoping comments that requested examination of pump station options and omission of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation project. This alternative includes most of the projects from Alternative 1—with the exception of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation—and adds the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange project.

Alternative 2 includes the following projects:

- **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange** would install a pump station on the right bank of the Wenatchee River near Dryden and a delivery pipeline that would extend through private orchards and driveways to the IPID canals. Water pumped from the Wenatchee River would allow for a corresponding reduction in diversions from Icicle and Peshastin Creeks, which would improve streamflow. The augmented streamflow has the potential to improve reliability of water supply for agriculture, benefit fish passage and habitat, and maintain treaty and non-treaty harvests. (GP1; GP5)
- IPID Irrigation Efficiencies (GP1; GP5)
- COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange (GP1; GP5)
- Domestic Conservation Efficiencies (GP4)
- Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration (GP1; GP4; GP5)
- Tribal Fisheries Protection (GP3)
- Habitat Protection and Enhancement (GP7)
- Instream Flow Rule Amendment (GP4)
- Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements (GP2)
- Fish Passage (GP6)
- Fish Screening (GP6; GP7)
- Water Markets (GP5)

Additional projects may be pursued outside of the Icicle Strategy if Alternative 2 is selected as the preferred alternative, such as the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange. However, project beneficiaries may be different and project timelines are unknown.

Table 2-3 shows how Alternative 2 addresses the IWG's Guiding Principles. This suite of projects is expected to cost \$91.4 million, provides 84 cfs and 27,978 acre-feet of total water benefit (instream and out-of-stream).

Guiding Principle Number	Guiding Principles	How Alternative 2 Meets the Guiding Principles
GP1	Improve Instream Flow	Meets goals of 100 cfs in average years and 60 cfs in drought years. Anticipated flow improvement is 83 cfs, in addition to base flow.
GP2	Improve Sustainability of LNFH	Meets goal of source redundancy and improved fish rearing and capacity, allowing LNFH to meet fish production goals. Also, improves water quality, and passage in Icicle Creek.
GP3	Protect Tribal and Non-Tribal Harvest	Meets goal of instream flow improvement balanced with preservation of fishery with adaptive management strategy in place, and potential amenity and access increases.
GP4	Improve Domestic Supply	Meets peak 2050 domestic demand
GP5	Improve Agricultural Reliability	Meets goal of 1,000 acre-feet for agricultural interruptible water rights.
GP6	Enhance Icicle Creek Habitat (includes fish passage and fish screens)	Meets goal of additional habitat improvement with adaptive management.
GP7	Comply with State and Federal Laws and Wilderness Acts	Meets goal by requiring project checks on all permits and an environmental review.

 Table 2-3

 How Alternative 2 Meets Guiding Principles

As shown in Table 2-3, the suite of projects proposed under Alternative 2 meets streamflow restoration goals established in the Guiding Principles. Figures 2-10, 2-11, 2-12, and 2-13 illustrate streamflow benefits in 2015, 2014, average drought (80 percent exceedance) and average non-drought (50 percent exceedance) years for Alternative 2. These figures show that the short-term instream flow goal of 100 cfs in non-drought years and 60 cfs in drought-years would be met under both scenarios.

Some projects provide a constant or fixed weekly flow benefit in proportion to their savings (e.g. conservation), while others are adaptive (e.g. storage). Where adaptation was possible, greater flow benefit is achieved by targeting operation in late summer/early fall. Both IPID Dryden Pump Exchange and Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration can be managed adaptively, and releases would be managed based on annual flow conditions.

#### **ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN**

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT





<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Represent 2015 flows in Icicle Creek with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 2 implementation.



#### Figure 2-11. Alternative 2 Weekly Time Step, 2014 (Non-Drought Year)<sup>13</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Represent 2014 (46% exceedance) flows in Icicle Creek with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 2 implementation.

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 2-12. Alternative 2 Weekly Time Step, Drought/Low Water Year Scenario<sup>14</sup>



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Represents averaged dry year flows (80% exceedance) in Icicle Creek with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 2 implementation.



#### Figure 2-13. Alternative 2 Weekly Time Step, Non-Drought Scenario <sup>15</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Represent average flows in Icicle Creek during "non-drought" years (50% exceedance) with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 2 implementation.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

# 2.3.4 Alternative 3 Narrative Description

Alternative 3 is a response to SEPA scoping comments that expressed a desire for an alternative that excluded projects within the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area. Alternative 3 includes most of the projects from Alternative 1, with the exception of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation and the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration. It calls for a legislative change to waive impacts to instream flows when conservation and pump-exchange-based supplies cannot perfectly meet demand required to provide domestic reliability. For example, conservation supplies are available from April to October in this Alternative, but the Guiding Principle for domestic reliability requires year-round supplies. Because instream flows are at times not met from November to March, this would impair instream flows if legislative approval was not provided. Ecology no longer has the authority to waive these kinds of impacts through an Overriding Consideration of the Public Interest (OCPI) determination under RCW 90.54.020 given clarity from the Supreme Court in cases like *Swinomish* and *Foster/Yelm*.

Alternative 3 includes the following projects:

- IPID Dryden Pump Exchange (GP1; GP5)
- IPID Irrigation Efficiencies (GP1; GP5)
- COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange (GP1; GP5)
- Domestic Conservation Efficiencies (GP4)
- Tribal Fisheries Protection (GP3)
- Habitat Protection and Enhancement (GP6)
- Instream Flow Rule Amendment (GP4)
- Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements (GP2)
- Fish Passage (GP6)
- Fish Screening (GP6; GP7)
- Water Markets (GP5)
- Legislative Change for Instream Flow Impacts. Under this project, the IWG would seek a legislative change that would allow impairment to the Instream Flow Rule when increased flow from conservation do not line up temporally with demand. (GP4)

Additional projects may be pursued outside of the Icicle Strategy if Alternative 3 is selected as the preferred alternative, such as the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project. However, project beneficiaries may be different and project timelines are unknown.

Table 2-4 shows how Alternative 3 addresses the IWG's Guiding Principles.

Guiding Principle	Guiding Principles	How Alternative 3 Meets the Guiding
GP1	Improve Instream Flow	Meets goals of 100 cfs in average years and 60 cfs in drought years. Anticipated instream flow improvement is 70 cfs in addition to base flow.
GP2	Improve Sustainability of LNFH	Meets goal of source redundancy and improved fish rearing and capacity, allowing LNFH to meet fish production goals. Also, improves water quality, and passage in Icicle Creek.
GP3	Protect Tribal and Non- Tribal Harvest	Meets goal of instream flow improvement balanced with preservation of fishery with adaptive management strategy in place, and potential amenity and access increases.
GP4	Improve Domestic Supply	Meets domestic needs through legislation.
GP5	Improve Agricultural Reliability	Meets goal of 1,000 acre-feet for agricultural interruptible water rights.
GP6	Enhance Icicle Creek Habitat (includes fish passage and fish screens)	Meets goal of additional habitat improvement with adaptive management.
GP7	Comply with State and Federal Laws and Wilderness Acts	Meets goal by requiring project checks on all permits and an environmental review; Would require legislative action to comply with Instream Flow Rule.

Table 2-4How Alternative 3 Meets Guiding Principles

As shown in Table 2-4, the suite of projects proposed under Alternative 3 meets streamflow restoration goals established in the Guiding Principles. Figures 2-14, 2-15, 2-16, and 2-17 illustrate streamflow benefits in 2015, 2014, average drought, and average non-drought years for Alternative 3. These figures show that the short-term instream flow goal of 100 cfs in non-drought years and 60 cfs in drought-years would be met under both scenarios.

Some projects provide a constant or fixed weekly flow benefit in proportion to their savings (e.g. conservation), while others are adaptive (e.g. storage). Where adaptation was possible, greater flow benefit is achieved by targeting operation in late summer/early fall. IPID Dryden Pump Exchange can be managed adaptively, and releases would be managed based on annual flow conditions. However, depending on district operations and water year, the adaptability of this project may be limited in some year.

#### **ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN**

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT





<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Represent 2015 flows in Icicle Creek with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 3 implementation.



#### Figure 2-15. Alternative 3 Weekly Time Step, 2014 (Non-Drought Year)<sup>17</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Represent 2014 (46% exceedance) flows in Icicle Creek with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 3 implementation.

### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 2-16. Alternative 3 Weekly Time Step, Drought/Low Water Year Scenario<sup>18</sup>



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Represents averaged dry year flows (80% exceedance) in Icicle Creek with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 3 implementation.



#### Figure 2-17. IWG Alternative 3 Weekly Time Step, Non-Drought Scenario <sup>19</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Represent average flows in Icicle Creek during "non-drought" years (50% exceedance) with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 3 implementation.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

# 2.3.5 Alternative 4 Narrative Description

Alternative 4 was created as a response to SEPA scoping comments that requested increased storage in the Icicle Creek Subbasin as an adaptive measure to climate change uncertainty and to better react to changes in future demand. This alternative has all the same projects as Alternative 1, but calls for increasing storage at Eightmile Lake to above the historical high water mark and enhancing storage and release at Upper Klonaqua and Upper Snow Lakes. Conservation was not reduced over that identified in Alternative 1 because it was necessary to meet other Guiding Principles (e.g., LNFH hatchery reliability, agricultural reliability).

- Alpine Lakes Reservoirs Optimization, Modernization, and Automation (GP 1; GP5)
- **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement** differs from the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration project included in Alternatives 1, 2, and 5. It calls for increasing the useable storage to approximately 3,500 acre-feet by rebuilding the dam to raise the high-water storage elevation and increasing the available draw down. (GP1; GP4; GP5)
- Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement takes advantage of potential storage in Upper Klonaqua Lake by installing infrastructure to draw down the lake. Options for draw down include tunneling, pumping, and siphon. Bathymetry suggests up to 2,448.2 acre-feet of water could be available for release. (GP1; GP4)
- Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement would raise the dam on Upper Snow Lake to increase storage capacity by 1,079 acre-feet. (GP1; GP4)
- IPID Irrigation Efficiencies (GP1; GP5)
- COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange (GP1; GP5)
- Domestic Conservation Efficiencies (GP4)
- Tribal Fisheries Protection (GP3)
- Habitat Protection and Enhancement (GP6)
- Instream Flow Rule Amendment (GP4)
- Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements (GP2)
- Fish Passage (GP6)
- Fish Screening (GP6; GP7)
- Water Markets (GP5)

Additional projects may be pursued outside of the Icicle Strategy if Alternative 4 is selected as the preferred alternative. However, project beneficiaries may be different and project timelines are unknown.
Table 2-5 shows how Alternative 4 addresses the IWG's Guiding Principles.

Guiding Principle Number	Guiding Principles	How Alternative 4 Meets the Guiding Principles		
GP1	Improve Instream Flow	Meets goals of 100 cfs in average years and 60 cfs in drought years. Anticipated flow improvement is up to 131 cfs.		
GP2	Improve Sustainability of LNFH	Meets goal of source redundancy and improved fish rearing and capacity, allowing LNFH to meet fish production goals. Also, improves water quality, and passage in Icicle Creek.		
GP3	Protect Tribal and Non-Tribal Harvest	Meets goal of instream flow improvement balanced with preservation of fishery with adaptive management strategy in place, and potential amenity and access increases.		
GP4	Improve Domestic Supply	Meets peak 2050 domestic demand		
GP5	Improve Agricultural Reliability	Meets goal of 1,000 acre-feet for agricultural interruptible water rights.		
GP6	Enhance Icicle Creek Habitat (includes fish passage and fish screens)	Meets goal of additional habitat improvement with adaptive management.		
GP7	Comply with State and Federal Laws and Wilderness Acts	Meets goal by requiring project checks on all permits and an environmental review.		

Table 2-5How Alternative 4 Meets Guiding Principles

As shown in Table 2-5, the suite of projects proposed under Alternative 4 meets streamflow restoration goals established in the Guiding Principles. Figures 2-18, 2-19, 2-20, and 2-21 illustrate streamflow benefits in 2015, 2014, average drought, and average non-drought years for Alternative 4. These figures show the short-term goal set in the Guiding Principle of 100 cfs would be met in drought and non-drought years.

Some projects provide a constant or fixed weekly flow benefit in proportion to their savings (e.g. conservation), while others are adaptive (e.g. storage). Where adaptation was possible, greater flow benefit is achieved by targeting operation in late summer/early fall. Alpine Lakes Reservoirs Optimization, Modernization, and Automation and storage enhancement projects can be managed adaptively, and releases would be managed based on annual flow conditions.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT





<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> Represent 2015 flows in Icicle Creek with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 4 implementation.



#### Figure 2-19. Alternative 4 Weekly Time Step, 2014 (Non-Drought Year)<sup>21</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Represent 2014 (46% exceedance) flows in Icicle Creek with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 4 implementation.

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 2-20. IWG Alternative 4 Weekly Time Step, Drought/Low Water Year Scenario<sup>22</sup>



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Represents averaged dry year flows (80% exceedance) in Icicle Creek with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 4 implementation.



#### Figure 2-21. IWG Alternative 4 Weekly Time Step, Non-Drought Scenario <sup>23</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> Represent averaged flows in Icicle Creek during "non-drought" years (50% exceedance) with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 4 implementation.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

## 2.3.6 Alternative 5 Narrative Description

The IWG developed Alternative 5 in response to continued stakeholder input that suggested completely removing IPID's diversion from Icicle Creek to the Wenatchee River. As part of its irrigation comprehensive plan update, IPID completed a very cursory review of a project that would replace the IID and PID canal systems with a pressurized pipe delivery system supplied by pump stations on the Wenatchee River at three locations, referred to herein as the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project. Alternative 5 includes the same projects as Alternative 1, except the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies project is replaced by the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project. This alternative would not eliminate the need for operation and management of storage within the ALWA. IPID would need to continue to store and release water from reservoirs within the ALWA to ensure water was available in the Wenatchee River for their use because instream flows are insufficient on both Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River in the summer to meet IPID out-of-stream uses without storage. Alternative 5 would provide up to 195 cfs of instream flow benefit in Icicle Creek in both drought and non-drought years.

Alternative 5 includes the following projects:

- **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange** would fully replace the IPID canal systems with a pressurized pipe delivery system. Three intake and pump station facilities would be constructed on the Wenatchee River to supply the new system. The existing surface water diversion facilities on Icicle Creek and Peshastin Creek would be removed. This project would increase stream flow in Icicle Creek by up to 117 cfs, improve reliability of water supply for agriculture, benefit fish passage and habitat, and maintain treaty and non-treaty harvests. (GP1; GP5)
- Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation (GP1; GP5)
- COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange (GP1; GP5)
- Domestic Conservation (GP4)
- Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration (GP1; GP4; GP5)
- Tribal Fishery Preservation and Management (GP2)
- Habitat Protection and Enhancement (GP6)
- Instream Flow Rule Amendment (GP4)
- Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements (GP1; GP2)
- Fish Passage (GP6)
- Fish Screen Compliance (GP6; GP7)
- Water Markets (GP4)

Table 2-6 shows how Alternative 5 addresses the IWG's Guiding Principles.

Guiding Principle Number	Guiding Principles	How Alternative 5 Meets the Guiding Principles			
GP1	Improve Instream Flow	Meets goals of 100 cfs in average years and 60 cfs in drought years. Anticipated flow improvement is 195 cfs.			
GP2	Improve Sustainability of LNFH	Meets goal of source redundancy and improved fish rearing and capacity, allowing LNFH to meet fish production goals. Also, improves water quality, and passage in Icicle Creek.			
GP3	Protect Tribal and Non-Tribal Harvest	Meets goal of instream flow improvement balanced with preservation of fishery with adaptive management strategy in place, and potential amenity and access increases.			
GP4	Improve Domestic Supply	Meets peak 2050 domestic demand			
GP5	Improve Agricultural Reliability	Meets goal of 1,000 ac-ft for agricultural interruptible water rights.			
GP6	Enhance Icicle Creek Habitat (includes fish passage and fish screens)	Meets goal of additional habitat improvement with adaptive management.			
GP7	Comply with State and Federal Laws and Wilderness Acts	Meets goal by requiring project checks on all permits and an environmental review.			

 Table 2-6

 How Alternative 5 Meets Guiding Principles

As shown in Table 2-6, the suite of projects proposed under Alternative 5 meets streamflow restoration goals established in the Guiding Principles. The main benefit Alternative 5 adds is much higher streamflow benefit than provided in the other alternatives, albeit at a much higher cost, which is discussed in more detail in Section 2.9. Figures 2-22, 2-23, 2-24 and 2-25 illustrate streamflow benefits in 2015, 2015, average drought, and average non-drought years for Alternative 5. These figures show that the short-term instream flow goal of 100 cfs in non-drought years and 60 cfs in drought-years would be met under both scenarios.

Some projects provide a constant or fixed weekly flow benefit in proportion to their savings (e.g. conservation), while others are adaptive (e.g. storage). Where adaptation was possible, greater flow benefit is achieved by targeting releases to late summer/early fall. Both Alpine Lakes Reservoirs Optimization, Modernization, and Automation and Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration can be managed adaptively, and releases would be managed based on annual flow conditions.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT





<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Represent 2015 flows in Icicle Creek with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 5 implementation.



#### Figure 2-23. Alternative 5 Weekly Time Step, 2014 (Non-Drought Year)<sup>25</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Represent 2014 (46% exceedance) flows in Icicle Creek with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 5 implementation.

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 2-24. IWG Alternative 5 Weekly Time Step, Drought/Low Water Year Scenario<sup>26</sup>



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> Represents averaged dry year flows (80% exceedance) in Icicle Creek with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 5 implementation.



#### Figure 2-25. IWG Alternative 5 Weekly Time Step, Non-Drought Scenario <sup>27</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> Represent averaged flows in Icicle Creek during "non-drought" years (50% exceedance) with estimated flow benefit achieved from Alternative 5 implementation.

## 2.3.7 Previous Studies for Developing the Alternatives

Since the creation of the IWG, several studies have been conducted and used to develop the projects identified in the alternatives, along with those no longer under consideration.

The IWG conducted focused evaluations on key elements of the Guiding Principles. Past studies that contributed to the creation of the projects that compose the Alternatives are provided in Section 1.11 of this document.

# 2.4 No Action Alternative

The No-action Alternative represents the likely results expected if an integrated approach to water resource management does not continue in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Under the No-action Alternative, projects could be developed independent of the other projects identified as part of one or more of the alternatives evaluated by this PEIS. However, there would be no coordinated, integrated effort to better manage and improve water resources in the Icicle Creek Subbasin.

The IWG's collaboration with local and state agencies addresses some of the ongoing issues affecting water flow and quality in the Icicle Creek watershed. Without the participation of the IWG and a coordinated effort to implement projects developed as part of the Icicle Strategy, these partnerships would be weakened, and any enhancements developed by the efforts of a single entity may not be as effective as if they were implemented and managed with multiple projects in an adaptive and coordinated manner with stakeholder input. The No-action Alternative has the potential to further complicate the following issues or leave them unresolved.

**Instream Flows Goal Will Not Be Met**: Under the No-action Alternative, the instream flow goals of 100 cfs during non-drought years, and 60 cfs during drought years would not be met and there would be no coordinated effort to achieve these goals. While some projects that provide instream flow benefit would likely continue toward implementation, most of the projects would not be developed with instream flow benefit as a primary goal. Projects would likely focus on other beneficial purposes, like water supply reliability, or may be marketed to out-of-stream or out of basin uses. The maximum anticipated instream flow increase under the No-action Alternative is estimated to be 31.9 cfs, based primarily on the assumption that LNFH and COIC projects would move forward and provide instream flow improvements.

**Resumption of Leavenworth v. Ecology:** The City of Leavenworth filed a declaratory judgement action in Chelan County Superior Court seeking a determination of the maximum annual quantity of surface water diversion from Icicle Creek. The City of Leavenworth claims their surface water certificate states their diversion should be 1,085

acre-feet per year. Ecology maintains that the City of Leavenworth agreed to a limit of 275 acre-feet per year based on a prior settlement. The Court ruled partially in favor of Ecology in 2012, and the City of Leavenworth appealed. This case is currently on hold while the City of Leavenworth and Ecology try to resolve this issue through the IWG. The IWG's Guiding Principles address the City of Leavenworth and surrounding area's domestic supply concerns and calls for 2,300 to 4,100 acre-feet of reliable year-round supply. Under the No-action Alternative, projects designed to improve domestic supply, mainly Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration or Legislative Changes to OCPI, would likely not be implemented or would be implemented without providing benefit for domestic supply. Without the projects that would increase domestic water supply, the City's diversion amount will remain in contention.28

Losing benefit from IPID participation: IWG member IPID manages water storage and releases from Klonaqua, Square, Colchuck, and Eightmile Lakes, and has shared storage in the Snow Lake system (Upper and Lower Snow Lake, and Nada Lake). Several of the projects proposed in the Alternatives include optimization and storage restoration or enhancement efforts on these lakes to increase instream flow benefits for the entire watershed. If these projects are implemented independent of the Icicle Strategy, there is not a guarantee that IPID would manage lake releases for instream flow enhancement. Additionally, the IWG will not have the opportunity to influence the design or aesthetics of any future updates or improvements that IPID may make to its dams and outlet facilities at these Alpine Lakes.

LNFH loses State partnership: The LNFH is actively collaborating with Ecology and WDFW as part of the Icicle Strategy to assess hatchery operations and look for ways to improve and enhance the infrastructure to make it more sustainable, increase instream flow, improve water quality, and benefit fish health and habitat. Synergy will be lost in this process if the collaboration ends and projects are not addressed under the Icicle Strategy. Implementing the Guiding Principles as part of this strategy also has the potential to resolve issues around water quality and quantity that have been the cause of past and ongoing litigation for the LNFH. Although the litigants of past and ongoing court cases involving the LNFH are not active participants in the IWG, improved hatchery operations, improved instream flow in the historical channel, screen compliance, and improved habitat are all litigation issues that would likely persist to a greater extent (or on a slower pathway to compliance) under the No-action Alternative. However, even if the benefits of the IWG partnership are lost, LNFH is still responsible for implementing projects agreed to in the Biological Opinion, which is described in Section 1.5.2, and improvements at LNFH are still expected to occur under the No-action Alternative.

**Restricted long-term growth in the City of Leavenworth and Icicle Subbasin:** One of the IWG's priorities is to meet current and future domestic water supplies for the City of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wr/cwp/images/pdf/LeavenworthvEcology.pdf

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Leavenworth and surrounding basin through 2050. Without a sustainable plan for addressing growth in the City of Leavenworth and rural Chelan County, there is no guarantee that the water supply will keep up with demand as the population rises. Past water planning efforts were focused on near-term growth. Without an integrated strategy, projects aimed at increasing domestic supplies would likely not be implemented or would be implanted to a lesser extent, and water resource planning needed to address long-term growth would be less coordinated and not as effective at meeting future water supply needs.

**Reduced or delayed improvement to agricultural reliability:** Several of the projects proposed by the IWG have an added benefit of improving agricultural reliability. If the Icicle Strategy does not move forward, it is unlikely the Water Markets Project would be implemented. The 56 interruptible water users in the basin would continue to face hardship when low streamflows prevent them from irrigating. IPID and COIC may see improvements to their water supply and delivery system reliability if improvements to those systems are implemented independent of a coordinated Icicle Strategy, but it is anticipated that these improvements would proceed at a slower pace.

**Possible fish screening process delays:** The Icicle Strategy includes upgrading fish screens at major surface water diversions along Icicle Creek to comply with current fish passage requirements. The City of Leavenworth, IPID, and LNFH/COIC have diversions that are in need of screen upgrades. These upgrades would likely need to happen whether any other projects presented in the IWG's alternatives are implemented as a comprehensive Icicle Strategy or not. Under the partnership of the IWG, these entities and others have an established connection to WDFW to assist in screen design, and a means to find funding that would help offset costs associated with new screens. Without the IWG and a coordinated Icicle Strategy, each entity would have to go through the fish screen design and implementation process independently, creating the potential for a more expensive and lengthy implementation process.

This No-action Alternative is presented as a means of comparing the impacts of the Icicle Strategy to those of continuing on without an integrated strategy and the benefits of the IWG partnership.

Short- and long-term effects of the No-action Alternative are presented in Chapter 4.

# 2.5 Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)

This section provides a project-by-project summary of the elements of the Alternative 1 with references to previous planning documents and studies where greater detail can be found.

# 2.5.1 Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization and Automation

This project is designed to change operations at existing dams to make water available for instream flow and more reliable for irrigation district users. The project would increase the frequency of lake draw down, but minimum reservoir water levels would remain the same. In non-drought years, this project would provide 30 cfs and 5,465 acre-feet for instream flow benefit. The following section describes the project background and implementation in greater detail.

IPID and USFWS operate seven alpine lakes in the Icicle Creek Subbasin to augment water supply for irrigation and fish propagation. IPID operates Klonaqua, Square, Eightmile, and Colchuck Lakes, and the USFWS manages Upper and Lower Snow Lakes and Nada Lake. The reservoirs are all enhanced natural lakes with small dams and other control infrastructure at their outlets. These dams and associated infrastructure, such as control gates or valves and low-level outlet pipes or tunnels, were installed in the 1920's though 1940's, allowing IPID and the USFWS to capture and store additional runoff during the winter and spring for release during the late summer low-flow period. Flows released from Square, Klonaqua, Eightmile, and Colchuck Lakes allow IPID to maintain irrigation diversions during the late summer low-flow period on Icicle Creek. Flows released from the Snow Lakes and Nada Lake supply water to LNFH and allow the USFWS to meet instream flow obligations. Nada Lake and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes are operated primarily for water supply to LNFH and to maintain instream flows. IPID also has storage rights in Upper and Lower Snow Lakes for irrigation. Storage and release of water from the Alpine Lakes are authorized by state-issued water rights. Table 2-7 provides a summary of the water rights for IPID and USFWS.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Water Source	Certificate Number	Certificate Holder	Priority Date	Cert Qi (cfs)	Cert Qa (afy)	Adj Qi (cfs)	Adj Qa (afy)
lcicle & Snow Creek	S4-35002JC	liD	1910 (Class 2)	1.7525		83.33	
lcicle & Snow Creek	S4-*35002ABBJ	IID/PID	1910 (Class 2)	81.577		83.33	
Icicle Creek	1082	PID	1919 (Class 5)	34.38		34.38	
Icicle Creek	1824	USBR	1942	42			2,500
Klonaqua Lake	1227	IID	1926 (Class 5)	25		25	2,500
Eightmile Lake	1228	IID	1926 (Class 5)	25		50	2,500
Colchuck Lake	1229	IID	1926	50		NA	NA
Square Lake	5527	IID	1926	10	2,000	NA	NA
Snow Lake	1591	IID	1926	25		NA	NA
Snow Lake	1592	IID	1926		1,000	NA	NA
Snow Lake	1825	USBR	1942		16,000	NA	NA

Table 2-7 IPID and USFWS/USBR Storage and Diversion Rights, Icicle Creek Subbasin

Notes:

Cert - quantities documented on the certificate

Adj - additional information contained in the adjudication record

Qi - instantaneous quantity

Qa - annual quantity

cfs - cubic feet per second

afy – acre feet per year IID – Icicle Irrigation District

PID – Peshastin irrigation District

USBR - United States Bureau of Reclamation

--- none listed

NA - not applicable, these rights were not subject to the 1927 adjudication

<sup>1</sup> Right confirmed for 83.33 cfs through adjudication. The right was subsequently split and a change to place of use was completed for 1.7525 cfs

<sup>2</sup> Documented total storage constructed at Snow Lake is 12,000 acre-feet, shared by USFWS and IPID. Under a separate agreement, IPID is entitled to 750 acre-feet of the Snow Lake storage

These storage water rights and dams were developed many decades prior to the establishment of the ALWA in 1974. IPID held deed to lands associated with Eightmile, Colchuck, and Klonaqua Lakes. The USFS identified these lands for acquisition shortly after the establishment of the wilderness area. IPID and USFS entered into a land exchange agreement in 1986, which culminated with transferring the properties to USFS in 1990. As part of that exchange, IPID received the following easement, which pertains to Eightmile, Klonaqua and Colchuck Lakes:

"a nonexclusive, perpetual easement across, through, along, and upon the property described herein for the purposes of maintenance, repair, operation, modification, upgrading and replacement of all facilities presently located in or upon the property described herein, together with a nonexclusive right of ingress to and egress from all such facilities for all such purposes, in accordance with Rules and Regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, 36 CFR 251.17 and 251.18, attached hereto and made a part hereof, in such manner as not unreasonably to interfere with its use by the United States, its authorized users or assigns, or cause substantial injury thereto.

The Grantor [IPID] may exercise the rights hereunder by any means reasonable for the purposes described, including but not limited to the use of motorized transportation and equipment, or aircraft. These rights include the right to regulate water level of all facilities located upon the property described herein. In performing maintenance, repair, operation, modification, upgrading, and replacement of facilities located in or upon the property described herein, the Grantor will not without prior written consent of the Forest Service, which consent shall not unreasonably be withheld, materially increase the size or scope of the facilities."

Additionally, the USFS issued agriculture irrigation and livestock watering easements for Square Lake and those portions of Colchuck Lake that were not covered by the easement described above. These easements grant IPID the right to operate and maintain their water facilities with consultation and concurrence from the USFS. Before the issuance of these easements, Square Lake was operated under a special use permit, after it was determined Square Lake was not under the jurisdiction of Washington State DNR because of navigability criteria. IPID easements and an easement map are available in Appendix F.

The USFWS maintains ownership of the lakes they operate (Upper Snow, Lower Snow, and Nada Lakes). In 1939, USBR acquired portions of Section 17 and 19, Township 23 North, Range 17 East W.M., adjacent to Snow and Nada Lakes. In 1930, IPID acquired an easement from the State of Washington to overflow the bed and shores of Snow Lake. That easement was transferred to USBR in 1941, and then to USFWS in 1949. Ownership of these properties were never transferred to the USFS. However, the USFS owns lands adjacent to the shoreline of Upper and Lower Snow Lakes located in Section 18 and 20 of Township 23 N, Range 17 East W.M. Figure 2-26 shows USFWS lands in green and USFS lands in blue.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Figure 2-26. Ownership of Lands Adjacent to Upper and Lower Snow Lakes and Nada Lake



Source: Provided by USFWS

The Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation project would improve instream flows and provide reliable irrigation water supply by automating releases and allowing for more frequent, optimized releases from the lakes than historical operations. Water released from the Alpine Lakes would enhance instream flows in tributaries to Icicle Creek, Icicle Creek itself, and the Wenatchee River to the confluence with the Columbia River.

Currently, gates or valves on reservoir outlets are operated manually to release stored water and are accessed by hiking in or by helicopter. Therefore, the gate or valve openings are set infrequently, and reservoir releases are not optimized to meet water demands. For example, all the lakes currently operate by gravity and flow release volumes change as the lake level drops. If IPID requires an additional 10 cfs from a lake in July, they may set the initial release to 15 cfs, and by the time they return to re-adjust it, it may have diminished to 5 cfs. Initially, that extra water is surplus to IPID's need, and as the lake draws down, IPID's needs are under-supplied.

In non-drought water years, one lake is typically drawn down by IPID on a rotational basis for maintenance purposes, with each lake being drawn down approximately once every three to five years. Maintenance activities include clearing debris (e.g., logs, rocks) from inlet and outlet pipes, burning encroaching brush, exercising and inspecting valves and gates, repairing dam surfaces from erosion or spalling, and other activities. In drought years, all lakes are drawn down to supplement IPID's irrigation supply. Depending on the severity of the drought, IPID may augment its supplies from a combination of some or all of the five lakes in which it has water rights.

The current infrastructure can be seen in Figures 2-27 through 2-33. Proposed changes are illustrated in Figure 2-34 and discussed in detail later in this section.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 2-27. Automation Impacts – Eightmile Lake





Figure 2-28. Current Alpine Lakes Infrastructure, Eightmile Dam (2015)

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 2-29. Automation Impacts – Klonaqua Lake



#### Figure 2-30. Automation Impacts – Colchuck Lake



PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 2-31. Automation Impacts – Square Lake





Figure 2–32. Current Alpine Lakes Infrastructure, Square Lake Dam

Under the proposed project, instead of lakes augmenting water supply on a rotational basis (one per year), all lakes would be drawn down to normal low-pool elevations annually, thus creating additional instream flow benefits. Operational lake levels would not be altered under this project. Flow in Icicle Creek near LNFH would be monitored, and before flows drop below a Guiding Principle target (e.g., 60 cfs or 100 cfs depending on water year), water from the lakes would be released to maintain the target flow.

Existing control gates and valves would be upgraded or replaced to allow for automated control rather than hiking or flying into the lakes to operate them. Basic monitoring equipment would be installed (e.g., lake level monitoring, outlet flow release monitoring). Telemetry systems would also be installed to allow for remote monitoring and operation.<sup>29</sup> Figure 2-34 provides an example of what this telemetry and monitoring equipment might look like based on current operations by LNFH at Nada Dam. Where warranted, the gate or valve at the lake outlet would be replaced. The control gate or valve at each lake would be retrofitted with a motorized actuator that would operate the gate or valve automatically. A solar panel and batteries would also be installed to allow for remote communication and control of the actuator by IPID or USFWS. Some provision to winterize the equipment would also be made. This project would use radio repeaters located on either Wedge Mountain or Icicle Ridge, both of which are outside the Wilderness Area.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> Taken from: http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-

 $resources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/SEPA\% 20 Open\% 20 House/Handouts/AlpineLakes\_final\_reduced.pdf$ 

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 2-33. Automation Impacts – Snow Lakes







#### PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The IWG previously evaluated whether these releases would adversely affect future IPID supplies under drought and climate change scenarios. IPID was initially concerned that if it released water from all the lakes, and if the following year was a drought year, then its supplies in the next water year would be diminished. Based on the appraisal study, an additional 5,465 acre-feet would be available for release into Icicle Creek for instream flow benefit with 100 percent refill reliability in Colchuck, Eightmile, Klonaqua, and Square Lakes. The usable storage volume would not increase, but the amount released during a typical year would increase (e.g., future normal years would mimic historical IPID drought year operations). The estimated instream flow benefits of 5,465 acre-feet could be managed as 30 cfs over 92 days, or some different combination of rate and time depending on the type of water year and when the fish needed the water. Under this project, Nada and Snow Lakes refill reliability would drop from 97 percent to 93 percent, for a slightly increased risk in future drought years.

The estimated project costs for study and construction are \$784,519 (Aspect, 2015), and updated to 2018 dollars using the RS Means Historical Cost Index. The estimated cost per acre-foot is \$144.

More specific details about this project are available in the *Alpine Lake Optimization and Automation Appraisal* (Automation Appraisal Study) (Aspect, 2015) and the *Icicle Creek Flow Augmentation Pilot Study and Alpine Lakes Automation Feasibility Study* (Flow Augmentation and Automation Feasibility), (Aspect, 2017), and the Alpine Lakes Optimization and Automation Feasibility Study (Appendix D).

## 2.5.2 IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project

The IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project includes traditional irrigation efficiency upgrades, such as canal lining or piping of irrigation ditches. The IWG anticipates that 10 percent water savings or 10.1 cfs (3,000 acre-feet annually) could be achieved from implementing efficiency upgrades that will be identified in the IPID Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan. Comprehensive Water Conservation Plans were prepared for Icicle and Peshastin Irrigation Districts in 1993 (Klohn Leonoff, Inc. 1993). An integrated update to both district's plans, known as the IPID Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan, was completed in 2018 and provides specific conservation options (Anchor QEA, 2018).

IPID provides irrigation to 8,065 acres in the Wenatchee Basin. Of this acreage served, approximately 80 to 90 percent is in orchard, less than 5 percent is rotational crops or hay, and approximately 5 to 10 percent provides outdoor irrigation water for residential land (Aspect, Icicle Conservation Summary, 2014). IPID's system is a gravity fed canal with points of diversion located on Icicle Creek at RM 5.7 and on Peshastin Creek. A large portion of the canal is lined or piped, although there are several partially lined or unlined sections in the upper reaches of the canal system. IPID's diversionary water rights from Icicle Creek total approximately 117 cfs. See Figure 2-35 for additional explanation of the IPID irrigation efficiencies.

#### Figure 2-35. Irrigation Efficiencies



IPID has implemented several efficiency projects in the last 20 years:

**Canal to Pipeline Conversion.** The project converted 9,900 linear feet of unlined canal into a piped system and was completed in 2011. The piped section includes the end of the Peshastin Irrigation District Canal from Brender Creek to the downstream end near Pioneer Street in Cashmere. The project was partially funded by Ecology's Office of the Columbia River with a total project cost of \$2 million. The project has resulted in an estimated savings of 1.2 cfs and 360 acre-feet of water savings from Peshastin Creek.

**On-Farm Efficiencies.** Presently, on-farm efficiency is nearly maximized throughout IPID. In order to live within the narrow allotment of 6.75 gpm per acre and remain competitive with their crops, the majority of water users have converted to micro-spray or drip systems that result in extremely high water use efficiencies. Per Ecology Guidance Document 1210 (Ecology, 2011), application efficiencies for micro-spray and drip systems average 85 and 88 percent, respectively. Some farmers have implemented soil moisture sensors in attempts to further reduce on-farm water use; however, there are some farmers that have complained this has led to poor crop results and can be difficult to manage.

**Canal Lining.** IPID has a long history of lining their canals and repairing leaking portions of already lined canals. Presently, only a small portion of their canals remain unlined.

IPID's Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan was recently updated. The purpose of a Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan is to identify opportunities for conservation, improve the operation of the system, and increase efficiency. The previous Icicle Irrigation District Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan and the Peshastin Irrigation District Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan were over 20 years old. The updated IPID Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan identifies new opportunities for irrigation efficiency upgrades and infrastructure improvements to reduce water diversions from Icicle Creek.

Conservation projects that might be identified in the IPID Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan and implemented to improve efficiency include additional canal lining or piping and on-farm efficiency upgrades. Based on preliminary estimates, it is anticipated that IPID could achieve up to a 10 percent water savings, which equates to approximately 10 cfs (3,000 acre-feet annually). Additionally, the IWG would work with IPID to voluntarily move water from users that do not use or need as much water to users that need additional water. This program could be used to target individuals who are using irrigation water for residential lawns and on-farm efficiency upgrades. While IPID already has a mechanism to move water within the district through their board of equalization, the goal of this program would be to expend knowledge of this program and help improve participation through incentives. Additionally, some commenters in the PEIS suggested that lawn irrigation was not the highest and best use of water in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Creating a program where lawn irrigation is converted and restored to agricultural production assists in meeting the agricultural reliability Guiding Principle. Cost for conservation improvements are expected to be approximately \$7.5 million. The cost of improvements will be further estimated as part of the update to the IPID Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan. The total cost per acre-foot is estimated at \$2,543.<sup>30</sup>

## 2.5.3 COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project

The COIC Irrigation Efficiencies Project consists of installing a piped and pressurized system, and replacing the current gravity fed point of diversion with a pump station downstream on the Wenatchee River or Icicle Creek near their confluence. The COIC project would restore 11.9 cfs (3,640 acre-feet annually) to lower Icicle Creek.

COIC currently shares a point of diversion with LNFH on Icicle Creek at RM 4.5. It provides water to irrigators in the lower reaches of the Icicle Creek Subbasin, near the confluence of Icicle Creek with the Wenatchee River. Proposed conservation measures in COIC's irrigation system, subject to COIC shareholder approval, would add up to 11.9 cfs and 3,640 acre-feet per year to the lower 4.5 miles of Icicle Creek. Implementation of this project would also allow for a smaller screen at the LNFH diversion. See Figure 2-36 for additional explanation of the COIC irrigation efficiencies.

COIC is exploring the option of moving their point of diversion to the right bank of the Wenatchee River just upstream of its confluence with Icicle Creek or to the left bank of Icicle Creek just upstream of its confluence with the Wenatchee River, which would leave more water in the lower 4.5 miles of Icicle Creek. Improvements would also include replacement of the open ditch system with a closed-pipe canal and laterals to improve efficiency. COIC recently completed an alternatives analysis to explore various conservation project options, including the following:<sup>31</sup>

**Option 1:** Option 1 would result in construction of a pressurized delivery system supplied by a pump station near the confluence of the Wenatchee River and Icicle Creek. COIC's portion of the diversion facilities shared with LNFH on Icicle Creek would no longer operate. Saved water from the existing diversion to the new diversion would be put into the State's trust water rights program. The alternative would benefit the critical reach of Icicle Creek by moving COIC's diversion and associated water right downstream. If diversions up to the limit allowed by the water right were moved to the new point of diversion, the benefit to flows in Icicle Creek would be as much as 11.9 cfs.

<sup>30</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-

 $resources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/SEPA\%20Open\%20House/Handouts/IPID\%20Conservation\_final\_reduced.pdf$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> Details taken from http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-

resources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/SEPA%20Open%20House/Handouts/COIC\_final\_reduced.pdf

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 2-36. COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange



In addition to leaving flow in lower Icicle Creek, the improvements would also increase the efficiency of the COIC system. A range of design capacities, from 4 cfs to 8 cfs, were evaluated for this alternative to cover the range of potential future water needs. It is likely that a pressurized system would need to be sized to deliver a flow rate near the middle of that range. This efficiency measure would reduce the historical diversion quality by 4 to 8 cfs.

The Opinion of Probable Costs developed in the *COIC Alternatives Analysis Study* (Anchor QEA, December 2015) indicates that total project costs for a 6 cfs capacity system would be approximately \$2.5 to \$2.8 million. The costs have since been updated for an 8 cfs system at \$4.7 million dollars.

During May-June of 2016, an 6-8 cfs pump station was chosen by over 70 percent of the vote from COIC shareholders. The advisory group recommended additional contingencies, including an additional shareholder vote to approve selection of a preferred pump station site. In January of 2017, COIC shareholders gave preliminary approval to up to 3 alternatives for a pump station site.

**Option 2:** Option 2 would evaluate COIC's current water use patterns to identify efficiency improvement opportunities, landscaping changes, irrigation timing, or other conservation measures that could create savings and that might make water available for future uses at COIC or be marketed for municipal and/or mitigated uses. This alternative is not intended to be a stand-alone alternative; Option 2 would be considered in addition to Option 1.

Option 2 was calculated by estimating annual consumptive quantities of existing crops and associated irrigation practices from Ecology Guidance Document 1210 (Ecology, 2011) and Policy 1120. Assuming total irrigated area within COIC is close to the 419 acres of potential irrigation shown in the analysis, up to 733 acre-feet of consumptive use is occurring at COIC. Additional research will be required to assess actual consumptive use, type of water application systems used in each parcel, and more refined data on actual transpiration using precise measurements from tensiometers and associated technology.<sup>32</sup>

The COIC shareholders approved the project sponsor to identify locations for a pump station and implement system improvements that are generally consistent with those identified for Option 1. Potential pump station sites have been evaluated and narrowed to three locations, as follows:

• On the right bank of the Wenatchee River approximately 0.8 miles upstream of the confluence with Icicle Creek near the Icicle Road Bridge.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> Alternative summaries from Anchor QEA, 2016, Alternatives Evaluation Study – Public Release version – Cascade Orchards Irrigation Company, prepared for Cascade Orchards Irrigation Company, December 2015

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- On the right bank of the Wenatchee River approximately 0.3 miles upstream of the confluence with Icicle Creek.
- On the left bank of Icicle Creek approximately 0.7 miles upstream of the confluence with the Wenatchee River.

COIC is working with project sponsor, Washington Water Trust, to further study the feasibility of these sites and determine the best approach for implementing the proposed efficiency project. In June 2017, a conceptual design report was completed to further analyze the project and evaluate potential options (Anchor, 2017).

## 2.5.4 Domestic Conservation

The Domestic Conservation Project focuses on implementing conservation for domestic users within the City of Leavenworth and rural areas of the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Based on primary estimates, the IWG anticipates savings of 0.5 cfs and 400 acre-feet, all of which would go toward domestic supply. See Figure 2-37 for additional explanation of domestic efficiencies.

**City of Leavenworth:** The City of Leavenworth provides domestic water for citizens, visitors, and commercial uses from Icicle Creek and City wells. The City of Leavenworth currently provides water to 2,981 units, with the average Equivalent Residential Use at 304 gallons per day. Over the past 20 years, the City of Leavenworth has reduced water use while increasing the number of connections it serves. To accomplish this water savings, Leavenworth has spent \$3.6 million dollars on capital improvements and implemented several voluntary conservation programs. Combined, these efforts have yielded 56 million gallons in water savings (171.86 acre-feet).

Future conservation projects identified by the IWG include a lawn buyback program that could incentivize reducing the amount of lawn homeowners irrigate, leak detection and repair or replacement of leaky water mains, replacing residential meters, evaluating a conservation-oriented rate structure, expand conservation education and xeriscape programs, and rebates for efficient residential fixtures. Additionally, City of Leavenworth is exploring opportunities for reclaimed water.

**Rural Water Users:** Other residents of the Icicle Creek Subbasin outside the City of Leavenworth rely on domestic wells to supply their water. Under a rural water conservation program, Chelan County would implement conservation education, xeriscaping programs, and rebates for permanent conservation efforts (e.g., lawn buyback programs or efficient residential fixture retrofits).

Figure 2-37. Domestic Conservation Efficiencies



PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The estimated cost of the city and rural project is \$1 million for pipe replacement and rural conservation, which would save 400 acre-feet of water. Additionally, there would be approximately \$1 million for new meters and conservation-oriented rate structures. This is anticipated to produce additional savings; however, behavior change based on price of water is difficult to predict, so those water savings are not included in this prediction. The estimated cost per acre-foot for domestic conservation is \$2,500.<sup>33</sup>

This municipal and domestic project's efforts would increase water conservation and help supply water for the population projections in the area through 2050 and meets Guiding Principles to improve domestic supply.

## 2.5.5 Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration

Eightmile Lake is one of four Alpine Lakes managed by IPID. A small dam, gate, and low-level outlet pipeline constructed in the 1920s at the lake outlet allow for controlled releases. IPID releases water from Eightmile Lake and the other managed Alpine Lakes in the late summer low-flow period to provide additional flows in Icicle Creek for irrigation.

The small dam structure consists of a rock masonry and concrete structure abutting an earth and rock embankment. Erosion of the embankment portion of the dam has reduced the controlled release volumes from Eightmile Lake to less than 1,400 acre-feet, although in some years approximately 1600 acre-feet is released if Eightmile Lake releases are prioritized ahead of the other lakes due to continued leaks from the reservoir. IPID has water rights that allow for storage of 2,500 acre-feet annually. Other existing operation challenges include damage to and deterioration of the outlet gate, which has made operation of the gate very challenging, and collapse of a portion of the low-level outlet pipeline, which has significantly reduced capacity of the pipeline in recent years. The reduction in the capacity of the low-level outlet pipeline is an urgent concern for IPID, because a loss of release capacity at Eightmile Lake could impair IPID's ability to meet late summer irrigation demands.

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project (Figure 2-38) would replace the dam, low-level outlet pipeline, and controls. The new rebuilt/restored dam would restore the amount of water impounded and the new low-level outlet would allow for additional draw down below current levels. Cumulatively, this new infrastructure these would restore the usable storage capacity of the lake to the volume that was available historically and allowed by IPID's water right (2,500 acre-feet). The project would also allow for automation and optimization of releases from the lake. This would provide 12.6 cfs and 900 acre-feet (out of the 2,500 acre-feet stored) of additional volume for controlled release. Project beneficiaries are instream flow and domestic, and releases

<sup>33</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-

resources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/SEPA%20Open%20House/Handouts/ConservationEfficiencies\_final.pdf
#### Figure 2-38. Eightmile Lake Restoration



### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

### PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

could be managed year-round based on flow and weather conditions. Because releases will be utilized to mitigate consumptive domestic use when the instream flow rule is not met, the quantity made available for domestic use will be stretched to 3,600 acre-feet when accounting for natural flow availability.

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project includes the following construction activities:

- Rebuild and restore the dam at Eightmile Lake with a spillway/high water surface elevation that matches the historical spillway/high water surface elevation (approximately 4,671 feet)
- Extend the new low-level outlet pipeline into the lake to facilitate operational draw down for access of the full volume allowed by IPID's water right of 2,500 acre-feet.<sup>34</sup> The low level-outlet pipe would operate as a siphon as the lake draws down and would allow for a maximum draw down to an elevation of just under 4,621 feet.

More specific detail on this project is provided in the *Eightmile Lake Restoration Feasibility Study* provided in Appendix C of this document.

The estimated project cost for this option is \$1.6 million, or \$1,422 per acre-foot.

Shortly before the release of the draft PEIS, IPID declared a state of emergency on March 13, 2018, due to potential failure of the Eightmile Dam. Concern's regarding potential failure were raised by Ecology's Dam Safety Office and the USFS following the Jack Creek fire during the summer of 2017. The Jack Creek fire intensely burned a vast area of the Eightmile watershed. Because of the intensity of the fire, hydrophobic soils have developed within the watershed, which may lead to a significant increase in runoff. This could lead to increased erosion on the earth portion of the dam, which could undermine the structure. A dam failure could contribute an addition 15,000 cfs to Icicle Creek during a natural high flow event (approximately 10,000 cfs). This would result in flooding and pose a potential risk to the approximately 200 people who reside downstream near the Icicle Island area.

Because of the timing of IPID's emergency declaration, the PEIS does not contemplate this action's impacts on the proposed alternatives. This may be evaluated further in the project-level environmental review, as negotiations between IPID, USFS, and Ecology's Dam Safety Office are ongoing regarding future construction at the dam. It was also suggested in comments received on the draft PEIS that IPID may not have the right to restore Eightmile Lake. Adequate permitting and compliance with local, State, and Federal Laws and Wilderness Acts is a cornerstone of compliance with the Guiding

<sup>34</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-

 $resources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/SEPA\%20Open\%20House/Handouts/EIGHTMILE\_final\_reduced.pdf$ 

Principles. The IWG has a process in place to adapt to any project that is unfeasible following selection of a Preferred Alternative at the programmatic environmental review stage.

### 2.5.6 Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement

Yakama Nation and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation exercise federally protected fishing rights on Icicle Creek. From early May through mid-July of each year, Yakama and Colville tribal members fish near the LNFH at several locations, including the plunge pool at the base of the spillway to the hatchery channel. The purpose of this project is to ensure that other projects implemented as part of the Icicle Strategy do not have negative effects on the tribal fisheries and protect federally protected tribal treaty harvest rights and non-tribal fishing. See Figure 2-39 for additional explanation of Tribal fishery protection and enhancement.

To accomplish this, the IWG commissioned a report analyzing the impacts of increasing flow in the historical channel and reducing flow in the Hatchery Channel (Anchor QEA, 2015). This report found that:

- When the radial gates at Structure 2 are fully opened, water backs up into the Hatchery Channel when the flow in Icicle Creek is approximately 300 cfs.
- When the radial gates at Structure 2 are fully opened, water does not spill over the Hatchery Channel Spillway until the flow in Icicle Creek is approximately 990 cfs.
- If the LNFH closed one of the gates at Structure 2, the flows at which water would back up into the Hatchery Channel and begin to spill over the Hatchery Channel spillway would be roughly half of what would be required with both gates fully opened. Keeping one of the gates closed allows the Hatchery Channel to remain full for several more weeks during a typical year. Since this study, independently controlled radial gates were installed.
- The LNFH uses Structure 5 to control water levels and restrict upstream migration of fish in the historical channel during the May 15 to July 17 harvest period when the fish count above this structure is greater than 50 Chinook. However, in recent years fish counts above Structure have not exceeded 50 fish. This operation is discussed in greater detail in Section 3.7.
- Scour in the pool downstream of the spillway is primarily initiated during peak flow events, such as those that would occur during a flood with a return period of 2 years or more. Scour would occur at flows as low as the 2-year flow and the scour pools downstream of the Hatchery Channel would be maintained.

#### Figure 2-39. Tribal and Non Tribal Fisheries



- The restrictions on gate operation at Structure 2 are primarily intended to limit flows to the Hatchery Channel during low-flow periods. It is the current understanding that the gates at Structure 2 have typically remained open during peak flows when the Hatchery Channel fills and overflows with the gates fully opened. Consequently, the peak flows and corresponding conditions that cause scour at the bottom of the Hatchery Channel spillway are not likely to be impacted by the current restrictions.
- Bedload sediment in Icicle Creek (based on a subsurface gravel bar sample having a D50 of 11.5 mm) will be transported at the 10-year event downstream of the spillway. The coarser surface gravel bar sediment sample (D50 of 63.3 mm) will be transported when flows reach approximately a 100-year event.
- Because the restrictions on gate operation at Structure 2 are primarily intended to limit flows to the Hatchery Channel during low-flow periods and sediment transport primarily occurs during peak flow events, sediment transport downstream of the spillway will not likely to be impacted by the current restrictions.
- The integrated list of projects being evaluated by the IWG are intended to maintain a minimum flow during non-drought years in Icicle Creek of at least 100 cfs. Increasing the flow to 100 cfs in Icicle Creek during the late summer low-flow period should not affect scour and sediment transport through the pool downstream of the Hatchery Channel spillway because scour and sediment transport are initiated by peak flows that occur earlier in the year.
- Turbulence and air entrainment are caused by the strength of the hydraulic jump that occurs when flow exits the spillway. It appears that flow rates in excess of 500 cfs in the spillway provide the largest water surface fluctuations and air entrainment, and are the conditions noted by LNFH staff where air bubbles and turbulence provide some cover for salmon.

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

#### PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Figures 2-40 and 2-41 provide examples of cover provided by turbulence and air entrainment at the plunge pool during two different flow scenarios, 700 cfs and 1,700 cfs. These photos illustrate how turbulence increases, providing improved cover from predators for fish, as flow increases.

### Figure 2-40. 700 cfs at Plunge Pool



Figure 2-41. 1,700 cfs at Plunge Pool



If flows in the Hatchery Channel are too low to generate turbulence and air entrainment, LNFH may wish to evaluate other methods for inducing turbulence or air entrainment. Potential methods may include the following:

- Diverting flows around or through the spillway with a pipe or pipes that could discharge into the pool downstream at a high enough elevation to cause air entrainment from the falling water
- Creating a bubble curtain with a mechanical device
- Discharging effluent or pump back water at the head of the spillway or into an elevated pipe to increase turbulence and air entrainment
- Using sprinklers or spray jets to cause turbulence at the head of the scour pool

These kinds of improvements will be further evaluated during the next phase of study, which would include development of an adaptive management plan. The plan would provide further study on data gaps and potential improvements identified in the Tribal Fisheries Analysis report, and would develop alternatives for attraction and retention of fish in tribal fishing areas during the harvest periods that is coordinated with changing operations at LNFH and increased flow. Fishery effectiveness monitoring would also be a key component of the project, as well as access and amenity improvements. It may also be possible to improve fishing access, the fishing experience, or CPUE through further study. Continued monitoring of the scour pool through additional periodic bathymetry monitoring could also help clarify potential impacts of increased instream flow.

This project fulfills the IWG's Guiding Principle to protect tribal treaty and federally protected harvest rights at all times by maintaining or improving the tribal fisheries on Icicle Creek.

The estimated cost for this project is \$500,000.35

### 2.5.7 Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The IWG is planning habitat improvement projects throughout Icicle Creek. This element is intended to improve ecological function within the Icicle Creek Subbasin, and provide mitigation for project impacts in each Alternative (including short-term construction impacts) identified during project level review. Figure 2-42 provides detail of potential habitat protection and enhancement actions within the subbasin. IWG worked with USFWS, WDFW and Chelan County to assess geomorphic, hydrologic, and hydraulic conditions at sites along the creek and identified potential improvements for each. These include:

**Lower Reach:** Potential projects include side channel enhancement and floodplain connection.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-resources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/SEPA 20Open 20House/Handouts/TribalFisheries\_final\_reduced.pdf



#### Figure 2-42. Habitat Protection and Enhancement

**Near LNFH Structure 5:** Potential projects include engineered log jams, riparian plantings, and using rock or large woody debris to reinforce the existing island, develop a thalweg, and reduce overall channel width.

**Historical Channel:** Potential projects include thinning out trees and then placing whole trees with root wads into the channel.

**Near LNFH Structure 2 (head gate dam):** Potential projects include placing large rock structures downstream of the dam to induce and/or maintain existing scour holes.

Past projects within the area include acquisitions and conservation easements, planting projects undertaken with private landowners, and reconnecting an historical channel as a side channel habitat.

More recently, Chelan County commissioned a report to provide the scientific basis for identification and development of stream restoration and protection actions for Icicle Creek from RM 0.0 to RM 4.3 (NSD, 2017). This study examined channel incision, sediment supply and transport, the current role of wood, and habitat for juvenile and adult salmonids. This study resulted in recommendations for habitat improvements, including protection of floodplain habitat, reconnecting the floodplain with off-channel habitat, removing lateral constraints on the channel, increasing instream wood loading, and restoring riparian habitat. Table 2-8 provides a list of recommended restoration and protections actions from this report.

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Table 2-8	
Recommended Restoration and Protections Actions by Biological Benefit	

Biological Benefit	Location	Action	Feasibility	Prioritization & Sequencing Rationale
High	RM 0.0 – 1.0	Floodplain protection; Establish a stream corridor; Land acquisition	High	Provides long-term benefits associated with preventing human disturbance to floodplain habitats over a combined 150 acres of active floodplain; allows for increasing floodplain flooding and channel migration without risk to human structures and property; increases ability to implement instream actions adjacent to the properties with less risk to private property.
Medium	RM 1.3 – 2.0	Floodplain protection; Establish a stream corridor; Remove bank armoring; Acquisition	Moderate	Provides long-term benefits associated with preventing human disturbance to a combined 22 acres of floodplain habitats; allows for increasing floodplain flooding and channel migration without risk to human structures and property; increases ability to implement instream actions adjacent to the properties with less risk to private property.
High	RM 0.0/ Confluence	Reconnect Floodplain and off- channel habitat; Large woody material placement	Moderate	Provides immediate benefits addressing key off-channel habitat needs within 2,800 linear feet of existing channel. Can be implemented in conjunction with adjacent protection and riparian actions, such as installing Large woody material.
High	RM 3.0 – 4.3/LNFH Channel	Reconnect floodplain and off- channel habitat; Large woody material placement	Moderate	Install large wood structure within the historical channel. Wood installation will provide immediate improvements for cover, complexity, and pool formation. This action is appropriate given potential actions to increase flow and/or for full channel realignment.
Medium	RM 0.0 – 3.0	Large woody material placement	Moderate	Provides immediate instream habitat and floodplain benefits. Implement in association with riparian restoration efforts and with efforts to reduce channel confinement.

#### CHAPTER 2.0 ALTERNATIVES

Biological Benefit	Location	Action	Feasibility	Prioritization & Sequencing Rationale
High	RM 1.1	Reconnect floodplain and off- channel habitat; Large woody material placement	Moderate	Small off-channel area (3 acres) with existing pond and channel features. Restoration can be paired with in-channel wood loading to improve site hydraulics and increase cover.
Medium	RM 1.0	Large woody material placement; Riparian restoration; Remove bank armoring	Moderate	Repair of degraded meander can be completed in conjunction with Protection actions. Install large wood structure, remove relict bank protection, and establish floodplain riparian community.
High	RM 3.0 – 4.3 LNFH	Reconnect floodplain and off- channel habitat; Flow improvement	Low	Actions to improve flow into the historical channel include modifications to Structure 2 and/or full channel reconnection. This will require direct coordination with LNFH operations, tribal fishery interests, and adjacent private landowners. This is likely a long-term and low feasibility action with high benefits.
Medium	RM 0.4	Reconnect floodplain and off- channel habitat	Moderate	Off-channel area (8.5 acres) will required either floodplain excavation or in-channel wood placement to improve inundation regime. Restoration can be paired with Protection and Riparian Restoration actions.
Medium	RM 0.1 – 0.3	Riparian restoration	High	Actions can be paired with Lower Icicle Protection actions. Action should be implemented with instream large woody material (LWM) loading to protect plantings and with irrigation to improve planting performance.
Medium	RM 2.1 – 2.6	Riparian restoration	High	Actions will require willing private landowners. Action should be implemented with instream LWM loading and irrigation to improve planting performance.

Biological Benefit	Location	Action	Feasibility	Prioritization & Sequencing Rationale
Medium	RM 2.7	Reconnect floodplain and off- channel habitat; Large woody material placement	Moderate	Small off-channel area (3 acres) will required either floodplain excavation or in- channel wood placement to improve inundation regime. No existing pond or off- channel features.
Low	RM 0.0 – 1.0	Reconnect floodplain and off- channel habitat; Install culverts within East Leavenworth Road	Low	Requires additional analysis of effects to adjacent landowners; likely difficult to greatly increase inundation regime because of elevated floodplain even with new culverts in East Leavenworth Road. Need to combine with Protection Act

The IWG plans to coordinate land acquisition projects with the Upper Wenatchee Community Land Plan (UWCLP) to protect land within the Icicle Creek Subbasin. The UWCLP is a community driven plan to conserve forest lands throughout the Upper Wenatchee Basin. Throughout the UWCLP study area, the Lands Plan identified 99,657 acres as high priority land for conservation, with 45,164 acres of that being high priority wildlife land, 11,786 acres of high priority recreation land, and 20,160 acres of high priority working lands. For the habitat protection projects, lands would be selected that are adjacent to the Icicle Creek Subbasin, which could expand habitat connectivity or access for wildlife. Additionally, this action could increase recreational access to the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Figure 2-43 provides a view of priority landscapes identified in the Icicle Creek area. This is a combined, equal-weighted priority map that includes various landscape priorities, include wildlife habitat, recreational opportunities, and sustainable forest and working landscapes.

#### Figure 2-43. Combined Landscape Priorities for the Icicle Creek Area



Source: Upper Wenatchee Community Lands Plan, September 2016

This project meets and advances the objectives set out in the Guiding Principles to enhance the Icicle Creek habitat by improving instream habitat and ecosystem health, and conserve land in the upper reaches of the Icicle Creek Subbasin.

Approximately \$2.5 million would be budgeted for instream habitat and land acquisition projects.<sup>36</sup> Specific decisions on habitat protection and enhancement projects will be made after selection of the preferred alternative, so that projects can be tailored to mitigation needs for the selected alternative.

### 2.5.8 Instream Flow Rule Amendment

Amending the Wenatchee Instream Flow Rule Chapter 173-545 WAC would provide an additional 0.4 cfs and 400 acre-feet for domestic supply.

The Wenatchee Instream Flow Rule, which establishes an instream flow water right and sets reserves for the Wenatchee River and each of its major tributaries, including Icicle Creek, was established based on the recommendations of the Wenatchee Watershed Planning Unit and public input received during the rule-making process. Within the Wenatchee Instream Flow Rule a reservation of water was established for future domestic use in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Currently, the reserve is set at 0.1 cfs, but to supply projected demand this reserve needs to be increased. The Wenatchee Instream Flow Rule provides for a reserve increase of up to 0.5 cfs in the Icicle Creek Subbasin so long as it is within the limitation of the 4.0 cfs reserve for the Wenatchee Basin (WAC 173-545-090(d)(iv)). To increase the Icicle Creek Subbasin reserve, instream flow and habitat improvement projects must be implemented in Icicle Creek.

This project is being coordinated with instream flow and habitat projects, and is intended to amend the reserve to meet demand projected through 2050. To increase the Icicle reserve a formal rule amendment must occur.

An amendment to the instream flow rule fulfills the Guiding Principle to improve domestic supply by making water available to meet demand projections through 2050. The estimated cost for this project is \$50,000. <sup>37</sup>

<sup>36</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-

resources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/SEPA%20Open%20House/Handouts/Habitat\_final.pdf <sup>37</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-

 $resources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/SEPA\%20Open\%20House/Handouts/InstreamFlow Rule\_final.pdf$ 

### 2.5.9 Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements Project

The LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements Projects will provide 20 cfs and 14,454 acre-feet year-round in Reach 4 for instream flows.

The LNFH relies on both a surface water diversion from Icicle Creek at RM 4.5 (42 cfs) and groundwater wells located near the hatchery canal (14.9 cfs) to produce the water necessary for their fish production year-round. The hatchery also relies on 16,000 acrefeet of storage to supplement surface water diversion during low-flow periods (July through early October). To maintain groundwater supplies in LNFH's shallow wells, flows from Icicle Creek are diverted to the Hatchery Channel for groundwater recharge. These flows are controlled by LNFH Structure 2.

The Leavenworth Fisheries Complex Planning Report (McMillen Jacobs, 2016) investigated a range of alternatives for improving operations and meeting fish production targets at three hatcheries, including the LNFH. It included an evaluation of the LNFH site, assessing land issues, water quality and quantity, biological risks and benefits, and policy and socioeconomic considerations. From this assessment, the study identified alternatives for cost-effective, viable improvements to the existing fish production facilities that develop the water supply to fully utilize and preserve existing water rights, modernize or replace aging/obsolete infrastructure, and develop fish culture technologies to increase fish health, efficiency of fish production energy, and water use. See Figure 2-44 for additional explanation on LNFH improvements.

The report's recommended plan for LNFH identifies high-priority projects over the next 10 years, with \$2.5 to \$5 million per year expenditures. The high-priority projects include:

- Modify or replace existing surface water intake screen that incorporate NOAA-compliant screens.
- Implement short-term phosphorous management measures.
- Repair or replace failing surface water transmission pipes.
- Construct a new surface water filtration and disinfection facility to treat a portion of incoming surface water supply. Installation of a water chiller is scheduled for spring of 2017.
- Replace outdated spawning facilities.
- Provide back-up power to Wells No. 1, 2, 3, and 7 to ensure continuous supply for the critical incubation and rearing.
- Construct new rearing vessels with roof covers.
- Install an effluent pump-back system to pump water into the Hatchery Channel and recharge the wellfield. The results would be a reduction of water currently diverted from Icicle Creek for that purpose.

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 2-44. Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery



The IWG has investigated several improvements identified in *The Leavenworth Fisheries Complex Planning Report* (LNFH Planning Report) (USFWS, 2016), including upgrading screens and intake piping at the LNFH point of diversion (more information provided in the screening section below), groundwater augmentation, effluent pump back, and circular reuse tanks to achieve water conservation and quality goals established in the Guiding Principles.

To better understand groundwater augmentation options, geophysical investigation of the LNFH property and an adjacent Chelan County-owned parcel was completed in 2014 and 2015 as an initial step to identify areas for potential groundwater supply development (Aspect, 2015). These investigations found good conditions for groundwater collectors, such as shallow depth to groundwater, saturated coarse gravel and cobbles, and nearby surface water to recharge and maintain water levels. Additionally, a pump test of a drilled well on Hatchery Island indicated the well could provide sustainable yields. Developing groundwater sources could reduce surface water diversions and support a sustainable LNFH by providing cool, pathogen-free water for fish propagation. The groundwater supply development goal identified in the Leavenworth Fisheries Complex Planning Report is 8 cfs of additional capacity, with project development costs estimated at \$3 million, with implementation occurring over the next 10 years (McMillen Jacobs, 2016). Figure 2-45 provides an overview of the geophysical investigation conducted.





Source: Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Groundwater Investigation Memo. Aspect Consulting, 2015.

In 2015, historical low flows in Icicle Creek led LNFH to run an emergency effluent pump back pilot program. Effluent pump back involves effluent water from the hatchery back into the Hatchery Channel to recharge the shallow groundwater wells that provide water to the hatchery. Under prior operating conditions, the gates at Structure 2 were lowered to divert water from Icicle Creek into the Hatchery Channel. The water in the Hatchery Channel recharges shallow groundwater wells that are a critical part of the LNFH groundwater supply. When the Hatchery Channel is not wetted, the shallow groundwater wells run dry.

Due to low flows and high water temperatures in 2015, LNFH implemented an emergency pilot of a pump back operation that uses the clean, run-through water to keep the Hatchery Channel wetted. Under the 2015 pilot program, temporary pumps were installed at the bottom of the fish ladder, adjacent to the spillway, where effluent water is discharged to Icicle Creek and pumped into the Hatchery Channel. The results of the pilot program found that the pump back increased groundwater levels in the adjacent aquifer, prevented Reach 4 from being a "losing reach," and decreased total phosphorous discharge at the outfall (Anchor QEA, 2016; McMillen Jacobs, 2016). If effluent pump back were implemented on a permanent basis, project costs are estimated at between \$839,000 and \$998,000 (Anchor QEA, 2016). The *Leavenworth Fisheries Complex Planning Report* calls for implementation to occur between 2017 and 2018 (McMillen Jacobs, 2016). Figure 2-46. is a photo from the pilot program. The photo on the left is the temporary piping from the fish ladder to the Hatchery Channel. The photo on the right is of the Hatchery Channel from near the top of the fish ladder.

Figure 2-46. Effluent Pump Back Pilot Program



### 2.5.9.1 Circular Tanks

Circular tanks offer several advantages over the current LNFH raceways. This includes improved water quality and controllable swimming velocities that may increase fish fitness and survival. Additionally, circular tanks reuse water, significantly reducing water demand. The estimated cost of installing new circular tanks at LNFH is \$4.5 to \$6.4 million depending on the alternative selected, with implementation scheduled between 2019-2023 (McMillen Jacobs, 2016). LNFH completed a circular tank/water reuse feasibility study in Spring of 2017. Figure 2-47 illustrates how circular tanks operate.

### Figure 2-47. Circular Tanks for Fish Rearing



These improvements meet the IWG's Guiding Principles to improve instream flow, support a sustainable LNFH, and enhance Icicle Creek habitat and fish passage. It has instream flow benefits of up to 20 cfs in Icicle Creek and provides a reliable water supply for hatchery operations.

The hatchery is prepared an implementation plan to meet requirements set in the 2015 Biological Opinion and implement improvements identified in the planning report (NMFS, 2015; UWFWS, 2017). Some of these projects are not part of the improvement projects put forward by the IWG, and are not considered in this report.

Cumulatively, IWG sponsored projects are estimated to cost \$20 million dollars, or \$1,383 per acre-foot.  $^{38}$ 

<sup>38</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-

resources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/SEPA%20Open%20House/Handouts/LNFH\_final.pdf

### 2.5.10 Fish Passage

The IWG has identified the need for fish passage improvements at LNFH and in Upper Icicle Creek. They have proposed several potential projects that would improve upstream fish passage at these locations.

The historical channel suffers from passage issues during low-flow conditions because of channel morphology. When flows drop below 200 cfs, passage is limited for fluvial bull trout. When flows drop below 120 cfs, passage is limited for mid-size fish, such as steelhead. When flows drop below 30 to 40 cfs, passage is limited for juvenile salmonids.

The IWG seeks to improve passage in the historical channel (Reach 4) by increasing streamflow. With the long-term goal of increasing minimum streamflow in the historical channel to 250 cfs, passage through this reach would be provided for these species at various life stages. Habitat improvement, described above, is also designed to improve passage by improving channel conditions throughout this reach and lower reaches. See Figure 2-48 for additional explanation of fish passage improvements.

Structure 5 at LNFH is also a structural fish barrier. However, this barrier is by design and is an operational requirement for LNFH to collect broodstock. Additionally, the operation of Structure 5 enhances the tribal fishery. During broodstock collection, pickets are placed in Structure 5 to prevent large fish from migrating upstream, but allows small and juvenile fish passage. Structure 5 is operated for broodstock collection from mid-May through June. In addition to the intentional barrier provided by Structure 5, Icicle Creek's channel is wide at this point, so low flows can lead to shallow conditions that pose a passage barrier. Channel changes or restricting flow with Structure 5 could help increase stream depth during low-flow events, improving passage.

LNFH Structure 2 is a headgate located at RM 3.8 designed to control flow into the Hatchery Channel. Because of the design of this structure, the velocity of water moving through the structure can prevent upstream migration. When both gates are open, this structure does not provide passage for juvenile salmonids; limits passage for rainbow trout, bull trout, and lamprey when flow is above 64 cfs; and limits steelhead and salmon passage when flow is above 512 cfs. Independently operated radial gates have been installed on Structure 2, which improves passage issues. The IWG proposes to improve Structure 2 (or replace with a passive structure) to allow for improved fish passage while retaining the ability to split flows between the hatchery canal and the historical channel in a way that maintains the existing tribal fishery conditions at the plunge pool, improves ecosystem health of the historical channel, and meets the LNFH's operational needs. Figure 2-49 shows Structure 2.

#### Figure 2-48. Fish Passage and Fish Screening



#### Figure 2-49. Structure 2



Source: The Leavenworth Fisheries Complex Planning Report (McMillen Jacobs, 2016).

In addition to operational and infrastructure changes the LNFH, modifications to the boulder field located at RM 5.6 would provide passage and access to approximately 26 miles of upstream, mainstem habitat. The boulder field has been identified as having anthropogenic origin (EcoAssets, 2013). Primary passage concerns include gaps between boulders being filled by smaller sized substrate and woody debris that blocks passage and affects surface and subsurface flow and velocity (EcoAssets, 2013). A passage assessment at the boulder field has been completed and passage improvement locations identified. Passage improvements at the boulder field can be broken into two categories-middle boulder field and upper boulder field. Options considered for the middle boulder field passage include a channel profile adjustment, installing a roughened channel, installing vertical slot fishways, or installing a low-flow pool and weir fishway. Options considered for upper boulder field passage include a pool and chute fishway and constructed riffle. Costs for the various passage measures range from \$260,000 to \$1 million (EcoAssets, 2013). The preferred alternatives recommended in the EcoAssets study were the channel profile adjustment for the middle reach and a pool and chute fishway in the upper reach, with estimated costs of \$770,000 and \$258,000, respectively. Figure 2-50 provides an example of a pool and chute fishway.



Figure 2-50. Example of pool and chute fishway

Source: Icicle Creek Boulder Field Fish Passage Assessment (EcoAssets, 2013).

Trout Unlimited, a IWG member leading the boulder field passage project, is currently working on design options. NEPA will be required for this project, and will likely result in an Environmental Assessment with the Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) acting as lead agency. Chelan County Community Development will act as SEPA lead agency. Those environmental review documents are expected to evaluate potential impacts on the tribal fishery that could result from increased passage attraction above LNFH. Currently, many fish that migrate upstream of Structure 2 return downstream to the scour pool for harvest because of unsuitable upstream habitat.

Improving fish passage meets the Guiding Principles of enhancing Icicle Creek habitat and passage, and supporting a sustainable LNFH.

The estimated costs of implementing these projects is approximately \$6 million.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>39</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-

 $resources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/SEPA\%20Open\%20House/Handouts/PassageImprove\_final.pdf$ 

### 2.5.11 Fish Screen Compliance

There are three large diversions on Icicle Creek with screens that do not meet current requirements. The IWG is recommending upgrades to these screens to comply with current NMFS and state standards. These screening projects will help decrease fish mortality in Icicle Creek.

The LNFH and COIC have a shared diversion located at RM 5.4. The Biological Opinion for LNFH requires this diversion's screen be upgraded to meet current fish passage requirements. LNFH and COIC are considering various operational changes that would reduce screen sizing, and LNFH is exploring water reuse options. COIC is considering moving their point of diversion to a location near the confluence of the Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River and implementing other efficiency upgrades. The COIC completed an Alternatives Analysis in March 2015 (Anchor QEA, WWT, 2015) to evaluate potential changes to their supply. New diversion facilities for COIC would be designed with screens meeting current NMFS standards. If COIC moves forward with improvements that change the location of their diversion, COIC would no longer share a diversion with LNFH and LNFH would then size and design diversion improvements to meet only meet the needs of LNFH.

Depending on screen size and other intake structure improvements made to the LNFH diversion, cost estimates range from approximately \$5.2 to \$12.4 million. The implementation schedule for this project depends on environmental review and implementation of water efficiency upgrades. However, the 2015 Biological Opinion required screening within 8 years of the Biological Opinion date (MNFS, 2015).

In addition to upgrading the screens, the Icicle Strategy includes improvements the intake structure at LNFH. As part of this project, dilapidated sections of intake piping would be replaced. This will improve operations at LNFH and help facilitate the screen upgrade. USFWS is pursuing additional intake structure upgrades, descriptions of which are available in the *Leavenworth Fisheries Complex Planning Report* and the anticipated Leavenworth Fisheries Complex Implantation Plan. Figure 2-51 is a photo of the current screening facilities for LNFH and COIC.



Figure 2-51. LNFH/COIC Fixed Plate Screen (left) and COIC Bypass Screen (right)

The City of Leavenworth and IPID points of diversion are both located at RM 5.7, across Icicle Creek from one another. IPID owns and operates a small diversion structure that spans the creek at that location. The IPID diversion facilities are on the right bank (looking downstream) and include a diversion channel, operational spillways, a flow measurement flume, paddle wheel-driven rotating drum fish screens, and a bypass spillway. The facilities do not meet current NMFS standards and have potential to result in stranding or injury to fish.

The City of Leavenworth operates a diversion on the left bank (looking downstream) just upstream of the IPID diversion structure. City of Leavenworth facilities consist of a reinforced concrete diversion structure with a vertical, fixed plate screen. These facilities also have potential to cause injury and mortality to fish associated with stranding or entrainment in existing diversion facilities.

These projects are associated with the boulder field fish passage projects. Currently, only limited opportunistic passage occurs through the boulder field. The proposed fish passage improvements would enhance passage for anadromous and resident migratory species, including ESA-listed steelhead and bull trout. The IWG has identified the need to bring the IPID and City of Leavenworth screening facilities into compliance with current NMFS standards prior to improving passage through the boulder field. Screening upgrades have been identified as a potential early action item for the IWG, but would have to be coordinated with boulder field passage projects. Both the City of Leavenworth and IPID have been working with WDFW on securing funding for screen design. The current project estimate for screening these two diversions is approximately \$5 million. However, improved estimates are expected later this year.

This project decreases fish mortality and brings major diversions up to current screening standards. In keeping with the Guiding Principles, it supports a sustainable LNFH and ensures compliance with state and federal laws.

The screening improvements cost estimate range from 10.4 to 17.6 million, with additional costs for upgrading the intake structure.

### 2.5.12 Water Markets

There are 56 agricultural water users in the Icicle and Wenatchee Basins that are curtailed in water-short years. Under this project, the IWG would create a voluntary Icicle Water Market to improve agricultural reliability for these water users, providing 3.4 cfs and 1,000 acre-feet to irrigators with interruptible water rights in the Icicle and Wenatchee basins.

Water markets allow people and farms who face water use restrictions to purchase mitigation credits to allow water use. Water banks and markets are part of the critical portfolio of tools needed to help address the complexities of water management—including drought risk, surface water-groundwater interactions, and legal and regulatory disputes and restrictions over water markets—thereby allowing scarce water resources to be allocated more efficiently. Figure 2-52 provides an overview of the water banking process.

### Figure 2-52. Water Banking Process Overview



The overall goal of a water market is to facilitate water transfers using market forces. These goals include:

- Making water supplies available when and where needed during times of drought;
- Improving streamflows and preserving instream values during fish critical periods;
- Reducing water transaction costs, time, and risk to purchaser;
- Facilitate fair and efficient reallocation of water from one beneficial use to another;

<sup>40</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-

 $resources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/SEPA\%20Open\%20House/Handouts/ScreenImprovements\_final\_reduced.pdf$ 

- Providing water supplies to offset impacts related to future development and the issues of new water rights;
- Facilitating water agreements that protect upstream community values while retaining flexibility to meet critical downstream water needs in times of scarcity

In Washington, water markets are generally established through purchasing a water right and placing the water right into the Trust Water Rights Program (TWRP), where it can offset impacts of new users. After a water right is placed in the TWRP for mitigation and instream flow enhancement, a Trust Water Right Agreement (TWRA) is developed that specifies where and how new uses can be mitigated by the trust water right. Once the TWRA is developed, mitigation credits can be issued for new water users as specified by the TWRA.

Rather than providing mitigation for new uses, the Icicle Water Market would allow water to be moved to existing interruptible agricultural farms during water-short years. The Water Market would be seeded through a purchase of 1,000 acre-feet of senior irrigation water rights. These senior water rights would be enrolled in the TWRP, and Ecology would enter into a TWRA with the bank manager, likely Chelan County, to establish where, when, how, and what quantity of the trust water right could be used as mitigation. This would also include the development of a suitability map. Once the TWRA is established, Chelan County would develop its own business rules about price and restrictions. These business rules would be based on interviews with the 56 potential program participants regarding interest in the program and price points.

The estimated project cost is \$3 million, or \$3,000 per acre-foot.<sup>41</sup>

# 2.5.13 Costs and Benefits for Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)

The purpose of this section is to describe the costs and benefits of the projects that make up Alternative 1. This is not a cost-benefit analysis, but rather a summary of the predicted costs and benefits of Alternate 1. Cumulatively, these projects meet all of the Guiding Principles.

Alternative 1 has a total project benefit of 89 cfs and 31,958 acre-feet of total water (instream and out-of-stream water). The estimated cost is \$65.6 million, \$82.0 million when including a 25 percent contingency. With the contingency, the price per acre foot is estimated at \$2,567per acre-foot. The average cost per acre-foot of water developed by

<sup>41</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/natural-

resources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/SEPA%20Open%20House/Handouts/WaterMarkets.pdf

the Office of Columbia River is approximately \$500/acre-foot. Table 2-9 provides a breakdown of each project by describing the benefits and costs associated with each. These costs are subject to change as projects progress through feasibility and design, and a more complete picture of costs are developed.

Project	Tota Dev	al Water veloped	Project Cost (\$ M)	Cost (per ac- ft)	Instream Flows (cfs)	LNFH	Fish Harvest	DM Supply	Ag Reliability	Habitat	Comply with Laws
	cfs	ac-ft			. ,						
Alpine Lakes Optimization & Automation	30	5,464	0.98	179	30				x		x
IPID Irrigation Efficiencies	10	3,000	7.50	2,500	10				x		x
COIC Irrigation Efficiencies & Pump Exchange	12	3,640	4.50	1,236	12				x		x
Domestic Conservation	0.5	400	1.00	2,500	-			x			x
Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration	13	3,600	2.00	556	13			х	x		x
Tribal & Non- tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement	-	-	0.50	-	-		x				x
Habitat Protection & Enhancement	-	-	2.50	-	-					х	x
Instream Flow Rule Amendment	0.4	400	0.05	125	-			х			x
LNFH Conservation & Water Quality Improvements	20	14,454	20.00	1,384	20	x					x
Fish Passage	-	-	6.00	-	-					х	x
Fish Screen Compliance	-	-	17.60	-	-					х	x
Water Markets	3	1,000	3.00	3,000	3				х		x
Totals	89	31,958	65.6	2,054	88	x	x	x	x	x	x
Contingency			82.0	2,567							

	Table 2-9	
Summary of	Alternative 1 Costs	and Benefits <sup>42</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup> An additional 25 percent contingency was added to projects within the ALWA in response to comments on the draft PEIS to account for additional costs that might be incurred for construction and mitigation measures. This is in addition to project contingencies already calculated and discussed. Project costs will likely be refined as project planning and design progress.

### 2.5.14 Timeline

The proposed timeline to implement Alternative 1 is below.

- Spring 2016 Programmatic SEPA Scoping
- Summer 2016-Summer 2018 Programmatic EIS Development
- Summer 2018 Draft PEIS
- Winter 2018/2019 Final PEIS, Preferred Alternative Selection
- Winter 2018-Spring 2019 Project Level Environmental Review Scoping and NEPA Integration (Depending on Alternative Selected), Applicable design or feasibility studies on projects
- Summer 2019-Summer 2020 Project Level Environmental Review (if applicable)
- Spring 2019-Fall 2028 Project Construction/Implementation

There was a 60-day public comment period following the release of the draft PEIS, from May 31 to July 30, 2018. If it is determined that project-level SEPA scoping is necessary, there will also be opportunities for public comment during the scoping and following release of the draft and final project EIS.

# 2.6 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 was developed in response to SEPA scoping comments and includes a mix of projects that meet the Guiding Principles. It includes many of the projects included in Alternative 1—with the exception of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation project—and adds the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange project. The projects included in Alternative 2 are described below.

### 2.6.1 IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange project would supply a portion of IPID water from the Wenatchee River as opposed to Icicle and Peshastin Creeks. This project would provide an average water savings of 25 cfs and 1,484 acre-feet.

In December 2012, Anchor QEA submitted an *Appraisal Study of the Peshastin Irrigation District Pump Exchange* (Anchor QEA, 2012) project to Ecology and Chelan County Natural Resources. The Pump Exchange project sought to find ways to increase flow in Peshastin Creek downstream of the IPID diversion on Peshastin Creek to improve late summer fish passage, spawning, and rearing conditions in lower Peshastin Creek. The Appraisal Study evaluated five pump exchange options that would divert water

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

through a pump station on the right bank (looking downstream) of the Wenatchee River near Dryden, Washington.

An options comparison was presented to IPID and a preferred option was selected that would include a pump station on the right bank of the Wenatchee River near the Highway 2 bridge, immediately west of Dryden and a delivery pipeline that would extend through private orchards and driveways to the PID and IID canals. Based on the review of project options with IPID, this location was selected as the preferred project because of more favorable hydraulic conditions at the proposed diversion location, a lower projected project cost, and the potential for improving the reliability of the IPID system by providing an alternate source of supply downstream, of the most vulnerable part of the system.

Additional alternatives for pump exchange projects were evaluated by Trout Unlimited, with the assistance of Forsgren Associates, in 2014, as part of the *Icicle Irrigation District Instream Flow Improvement Options Analysis Study* (Forsgren Associates 2014). These included options for pumping directly to the Icicle Irrigation District Canal from the Wenatchee River. A memorandum titled, Icicle and Peshastin Irrigation Districts Pump Exchange Summary of Additional Analysis (Anchor QEA 2015) compared the various alternatives that had been considered by IPID and provided a detailed description of the preferred alternative identified by IPID. The other alternatives considered by IPID were not moved forward in this PEIS, as described in Section 2.10. See Figure 2-53 for additional explanation of the IPID Dryden pump exchange.

#### Figure 2-53. IPID Dryden Pump Exchange



#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The current concept for the proposed pump exchange, as identified in the 2015 memorandum, would include the following:

- A pump station located on the right bank of the Wenatchee River, just southwest (upstream) of U.S. Highway 2, approximately 7,250 feet downstream of the confluence of Peshastin Creek with the Wenatchee River (approximately RM 16.5)
- Four vertical turbine pumps, each designed to deliver approximately 12.5 cfs at a total dynamic head (TDH) of 246 feet (500 horsepower each)
- A 1,240-foot, 42-inch-diameter delivery pipeline that would extend south and east through an existing orchard, and then south and west up a steep hillside to the PID Canal
- A delivery structure at the PID Canal approximately 19,560 feet downstream of the diversion at Peshastin Creek
- Replacement of approximately 2,350 feet of the existing PID Canal downstream of the delivery structure with a 48-inch-diameter gravity pipeline to increase the conveyance capacity of the canal to at least 50 cfs
- Construction of a 15.5-acre-foot re-regulation pond with a high water surface elevation of 1,144 feet at a bend in the PID Canal approximately a 1/2 mile east of the proposed delivery structure
- Construction of a pump station on the east bank of the re-regulation pond to deliver flows to the IID Division 3A Canal
- Two vertical turbine pumps, each designed to deliver approximately 12.5 cfs at a TDH of 195 feet (400 horsepower each)
- A 1,300-foot, 30-inch-diameter delivery pipeline that would extend south and east through an existing orchard and up an existing access road to the IID Division 3A Canal
- A delivery structure at the IID Division 3A Canal approximately 200 feet downstream of the siphon outlet

The intent of the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project is to meet multiple goals of the IWG's Guiding Principles. This project has the potential to:

- Augment streamflow in Icicle Creek below the IID diversion at RM 5.7 by as much as 40 cfs during the late summer, with the average flow increase in Icicle Creek of 25 cfs. The project also has the potential to augment streamflow in Peshastin Creek below the IPID diversion at RM 2.4.
- Improve the reliability of water supply for agriculture.
- Benefit fish passage and habitat and treaty and non-treaty harvest.

The total estimated project implementation cost, including the items listed above, is \$8.5 million, including a 30 percent contingency to account for project elements that are not

understood or have not been well defined at this early stage in the planning process. Long-term costs for operations and life cycle replacement of project elements were also estimated. IPID has indicated that for the project to move forward, long-term operating and life-cycle replacement costs would need to be paid for through grant funding as part of the overall cost of the project because the only beneficiary is instream flows. The present value of the long-term operating and replacement costs were estimated at approximately \$5.7 million to \$8.8 million, depending on the duration of pumping (estimated from 15 days to 90 days). The resulting total project, including implementation cost and present value of long-term operating and replacement costs, would range from approximately \$14.2 million to \$17.3 million. O&M costs and the lack of a permanent funding are issues for this project. IPID is continuing to work with Chelan County to develop the pump exchange project concept and has secured funding for a preliminary design evaluation of a portion of the project that would initially target delivering flows to the Peshastin Irrigation District Canal through a pump station on the Wenatchee River near Dryden. One issue that was identified but not incorporated into this programmatic level environmental review is the cost of power costs for projects like Dryden Pump Exchange (or the pump exchange in Alternative 5). Converting gravity diversions to pump stations will consume power indefinitely, and was a factor in considering alternatives.

### 2.6.2 IPID Irrigation Efficiencies

The IPID irrigation efficiencies for this alternative are the same as is described in Section 2.5.2.

### 2.6.3 COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange

The COIC irrigation efficiencies and pump exchange for this alternative are the same as is described in Section 2.5.3.

### 2.6.4 Domestic Conservation

The domestic conservation alternative is described in Section 2.5.4.

### 2.6.5 Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration is described in Section 2.5.5.

### 2.6.6 Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement

The tribal fishery preservation and enhancement alternative is described in Section 2.5.6.

### 2.6.7 Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The habitat protection and enhancement alternative is described in Section 2.5.7.

### 2.6.8 Instream Flow Rule Amendment

The instream flow rule amendment alternative is described in Section 2.5.8.

### 2.6.9 Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

The LNFH conservation and water quality improvements alternative is described in Section 2.5.9.

## 2.6.10 Fish Passage

The fish passage alternative is described in Section 2.5.10.

# 2.6.11 Fish Screen Compliance

The fish screen compliance alternative is described in Section 2.5.11.

## 2.6.12 Water Markets

The water market alternative is described in Section 2.5.12.

### 2.6.13 Costs and Benefits for Alternative 2

The costs and benefits for Alternative 2 are described in Table 2-10. However, this is not a cost-benefit analysis, but rather a summary of the predicted costs and benefits of Alternate 2. Cumulatively, these projects meet all of the Guiding Principles by improving streamflow, LNFH sustainability, protecting tribal and non-tribal fishers, improving domestic supply and agricultural reliability, and enhancing Icicle Creek habitat.

Alternative 2 has a total project benefit of 84 cfs and 27,978 acre-feet of total water (instream and out-of-stream water). The current cost estimate is approximately \$91.44 million, including a 25 percent contingency. This amounts to \$3,268 per acre-foot. As noted above, the average cost per acre-foot of water developed by the Office of Columbia River is approximately \$500/acre-foot. Table 2-9 provides a breakdown of each project in Alternative 2 and the benefits and costs associated with each. These costs are subject to change as projects progress through feasibility and design, and a more complete picture of costs are developed.

Project	Total Water Developed		Project Cost (\$	Cost (per ac-	Instream Flows	LNFH	Fish	DM	Ag	Habitat	Comply with
	cfs	ac-ft	M)	M) ft)	(cfs)		Haivesi	Suppry	Reliability		Laws
IPID Dryden Pump Station	25	1,484	8.50	5,728	25				x		x
IPID Irrigation Efficiencies	10	3,000	7.50	2,500	10				х		x
COIC Irrigation Efficiencies & Pump Exchange	12	3,640	4.50	1,236	12				x		x
Domestic Conservation	0.5	400	1.00	2,500	-			x			x
Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration	13	3,600	2.00	556	13			x	x		x
Tribal and Non-Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement	-	-	0.50	-	-		x				x
Habitat Protection and Enhancement	-	-	2.50	-	-					x	x
Instream Flow Rule Amendment	0.4	400	0.05	125	-			x			x
LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements	20	14,454	20.00	1,384	20	x					x
Fish Passage	-	-	6.00	-	-					x	x
Fish Screen Compliance	-	-	17.60	-	-					x	x
Water Markets	3	1,000	3.00	3,000	3				х		x
Totals	84	27,978	73.15	2,615	83	x	x	x	x	x	x
Contingency			91.44	3,268			•	•	•	•	•

 Table 2-10

 Summary of Alternative 2 Costs and Benefits43

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> An additional 25 percent contingency was added to projects within the ALWA in response to comments on the draft PEIS to account for additional costs that might be incurred for construction and mitigation measures. This is in addition to project contingencies already calculated and discussed. Project costs will likely be refined as project planning and design progress.

### 2.6.14 Timeline

The proposed timeline to implement the projects that compose Alternative 2 is below.

- Spring 2016 Programmatic SEPA Scoping
- Summer 2016-Summer 2018 Programmatic EIS Development
- Summer 2018 Draft PEIS
- Winter 2018/2019 Final PEIS, Preferred Alternative Selection
- Fall 2018-Spring 2019 Project Level Environmental Review Scoping and NEPA Integration (Depending on Alternative Selected), Applicable design or feasibility studies on projects
- Summer 2019-Summer 2020 Project Level Environmental Review (if applicable)
- Spring 2019Fall 2028 Project Construction/Implementation

There was a 60-day public comment period following the release of the draft PEIS, from May 31, to July 30, 2018. If it is determined that project-level SEPA scoping is necessary, there will also be opportunities for public comment during the scoping and following release of the draft and final project EIS.

# 2.7 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 focuses on areas outside of the ALWA. It includes most of the projects from Alternative 1, with the exception of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation project and the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration. It also calls for legislative action to allow an OCPI to address domestic use and instream flow impacts.

It should be noted that while Alternative 3 does not include projects within the ALWA, maintenance and construction activities needed for IPID's management of the lakes will continue but water would not be released to meet the Guiding Principles (mainly instream flow).

The projects in Alternative 3 are described below.
# 2.7.1 IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

The Peshastin Irrigation District pump exchange alternative is described in Section 2.6.1.

# 2.7.2 IPID Irrigation Efficiencies

The IPID irrigation efficiencies for this alternative are the same as is described in Section 2.5.2.

# 2.7.3 COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange

The COIC irrigation efficiencies and pump exchange for this alternative are the same as is described in Section 2.5.3.

# 2.7.4 Domestic Conservation

The domestic conservation alternative is described in Section 2.5.4.

# 2.7.5 Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement

The tribal fishery preservation and enhancement alternative is described in Section 2.5.6.

# 2.7.6 Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The habitat protection and enhancement alternative is described in Section 2.5.7.

# 2.7.7 Instream Flow Rule Amendment

The instream flow rule amendment alternative is described in Section 2.5.8.

# 2.7.8 Leavenworth national Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

The LNFH conservation and water quality improvements alternative is described in Section 2.5.9.

# 2.7.9 Fish Passage

The fish passage alternative is described in Section 2.5.10.

# 2.7.10 Fish Screen Compliance

The fish-screen compliance alternative is described in Section 2.5.11.

# 2.7.11 Water Markets

The water market alternative is described in Section 2.5.12.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

# 2.7.12 Legislative Change to OCPI

In order to meet the domestic supply Guiding Principle under Alternative 3, there would need to be a legislative change to waive impacts to instream flows when conservation and pump-exchange-based supplies cannot perfectly meet demand required to provide domestic reliability. For example, conservation supplies are available in April to October in this Alternative, but the Guiding Principle for domestic reliability requires year-round supplies. Because instream flows are at times not met from November to March, this would impair instream flows if legislative approval was not provided. Ecology no longer has the authority to waive these kinds of impacts through an OCPI determination under RCW 90.54.020 given clarity from the Supreme Court in cases like *Swinomish* and *Foster/Yelm*.

A legislative change would include having a bill introduced and passed by the state legislature that would allow for impacts to the instream flow rule when domestic demand and flow improvement projects cannot be timed perfectly.

This would provide enough water for Icicle Creek Subbasin and City of Leavenworth population growth through 2050. The project costs would be approximately \$25,000. Additional water for the City of Leavenworth would be pursued on the Wenatchee River to reduce impacts to Icicle Creek.

# 2.7.13 Costs and Benefits for Alternative 3

The purpose of this section is to describe the costs and benefits of this alternative. However, this is not a cost-benefit analysis, but rather a summary of the predicted costs and benefits of Alternate 3. Cumulatively, these projects meet all of the Guiding Principles by improving streamflow, LNFH sustainability, protecting tribal and non-tribal fishers, improving domestic supply and agricultural reliability, and enhancing Icicle Creek habitat.

Alternative 2 has a total project benefit of 71 cfs and 24,378 acre-feet of total water (instream and out-of-stream water). Currently, costs are estimated at approximately \$89.0 million, including a 25 percent contingency. This amounts to \$3,650 per acre-foot. As noted above, the average cost per acre-foot of water developed by the Office of Columbia River is approximately \$500/acre-foot. Table 2-11 provides a breakdown of each project by describing the benefits and costs associated with each. These costs are subject to change as projects progress through feasibility and design, and a more complete picture of costs are developed.

Project	Tota Dev	l Water eloped	Project Cost	Cost (per	Instream Flows	LNFH	Fish	DM	Ag	Habitat	Comply
-	cfs	ac-ft	(\$ M)	ac-ft)	(cfs)		Harvest	Suppry	Reliability		with Laws
IPID Pump Exchange	25	1,484	8.50	5,728	25				х		x
IPID Irrigation Efficiencies	10	3,000	7.50	2,500	10				х		x
COIC Irrigation Efficiencies	12	3,640	4.5	1,236	12				x		x
Domestic Conservation Efficiencies	0.5	400	1.00	2,500	-			x			x
Tribal Fishery Protection	-	-	0.50	-	-		x				x
Habitat Protection and Enhancement	-	-	2.50	-	-					x	x
Instream Flow Rule Amendment	0.4	400	0.05	125	-			x			x
LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements	20	14,454	20.00	1,384	20	x					x
Fish Passage	-	-	6.00	-	-					х	x
Fish Screening	-	-	17.60	-	-					x	x
Water Markets	3	3,000	3.00	3,000	3				x		x
Legislative Change to OCPI	-	-	0.03	-	-			x			x
Totals	71	24,378	71.2	2,919	70	x	x	x	x	x	x
Contingency			89.0	3,650							

 Table 2-11

 Summary of Alternative 3 Costs and Benefits44

# 2.7.14 Timeline

The proposed timeline to implement the projects that compose Alternative 3 is below.

- Spring 2016 Programmatic SEPA Scoping
- Summer 2016-Summer 2018 Programmatic EIS Development
- Summer 2018 Draft PEIS

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>44</sup> Project costs will likely be refined as project planning and design progress.

### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- Winter 2018/2019 Final PEIS, Preferred Alternative Selection
- Fall 2018-Spring 2019 Project Level Environmental Review Scoping and NEPA Integration (Depending on Alternative Selected), Applicable design or feasibility studies on projects
- Summer 2019-Summer 2020 Project Level Environmental Review (if applicable)
- Spring 2019-Fall 2028 Project Construction/Implementation

There was a 60-day public comment period following the release of the draft PEIS, from May 31 to July 30, 2018. If it is determined that project-level SEPA scoping is necessary, there will also be opportunities for public comment during the scoping and following release of the draft and final project EIS.

# 2.8 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 was developed in response to SEPA scoping comments expressing a desire for increased storage in the Icicle Creek Subbasin to improve reliability of water supply and resiliency against climate change. This alternative includes many of the same projects included in Alternative 1. It also includes rebuilding control facilities at Eightmile Lake Reservoir to increase storage beyond its historical capacity, enhancing storage and releases from Upper Klonaqua, and rebuilding control facilities at Upper and Lower Snow Lakes to increase storage available from those lakes. The projects included in Alternative 4 are described below.

# 2.8.1 Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization and Automation

The Alpine Lakes optimization, modernization and automation alternative is the same as is described in Section 2.5.1.

# 2.8.2 Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement project proposes to replace the existing dam, lowlevel outlet pipeline, and controls at Eightmile Lake with facilities that would increase the useable storage capacity to 3,500 acre-feet, which represents a 1,000-acre-foot increase over the volume that can currently be captured and released under IPID's water right. The project would increase the useable storage by increasing the dam height and draw down level. This project would provide up to 17.9 cfs and 1,900 acre-feet of water for instream flow and domestic use. IPID would continuing using up to 1,600 acre-feet of water from Eightmile Lake. See Figure 2-54 for additional information on the Eightmile Lake storage enhancement.

### Figure 2-54. Eightmile Reservoir Enhancements



#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The IWG evaluated four storage scenarios at Eightmile Lake as part of the *Appraisal Study, Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration.* These scenarios included installing a siphon to increase draw down, rebuilding the dam to restore the maximum water surface elevation to its historical level, and rebuilding the dam to increase storage. These project alternatives would provide 2,000 acre-feet, 2,500 acre-feet, and 3,500 acre-feet, respectively, of usable storage. The IWG proposed restoration to 2,500 acre-feet as part of its Base Package of projects, which would include restoration of the dam to allow water to be stored at the historical spillway/high water surface elevation, and extension of the low-level outlet pipe into the lake to facilitate draw down to an elevation of 4,621 feet. This Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration project is included in Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and Alternative 5; it is described in Section 2.5.5.

The Eightmile Lake Enhancement project included in Alternative 4 would increase usable storage to 3,500 acre-feet, and would include the following improvements:

- Rebuild the dam at Eightmile Lake with a spillway/high water surface elevation of 4,682.0 feet, or 11 feet higher than the historical spillway/high water surface elevation (4,671.0 feet).
- Extend the new low-level outlet pipeline into the lake to facilitate operational draw down of the water surface elevation to minimum elevation of 4,619.0 feet.

These improvements would increase the volume available for release and allow for an additional release of 17.9 cfs over a 60-day period.

The maximum inundation area, approximately 91.1 acres, would be larger than the historical maximum inundation area. Most of the newly inundated area would be along the existing, relatively steep shoreline. The water surface area at the new maximum draw down elevation would be approximately 25.7 acres, which is approximately 18.4 acres less than the water surface area at the current minimum water surface elevation.

The Eightmile Lake Enhancement project meets many of the Guiding Principles adopted by the IWG. Instream and out-of-stream flow improvements would benefit ecosystem health and habitat. It also has the potential to benefit operations at the LNFH if the lake was managed to allow for winter low-flow period releases. The enhancements and improvements create over 1,900 acre-feet of new supply for instream flow and municipal use, and automates and optimizes releases to improve reliability for agricultural use and stream flows. Compliance with state and federal laws, including Wilderness Act of 1964 and the Alpine Lakes Area Management Act of 1976, would be required for project permitting and construction.

The cost to implement the Eightmile Lake Enhancement is \$3.9 million (Anchor QEA, 2015), as updated using the RS Mean Historical Cost Index. This cost equates to \$2,053 per acre-foot of additional storage created. The long-term costs to operate and maintain the new facilities, including regular maintenance, repairs, servicing and inspections, and on-site start-up and shut-down each season, is approximately \$18,500 per year.

# 2.8.3 Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

The Upper Klonaqua Storage Enhancement project proposes to draw down Upper Klonaqua Lake and would provide up to 20 cfs and 2,448 acre-feet<sup>45</sup> of water for instream flow and domestic benefit.

Upper Klonaqua Lake is located just west of Lower Klonaqua Lake in the Icicle Creek Subbasin of WRIA 45 (Wenatchee Basin) and is used, along with several other area lakes, to augment water supply for the IPID. Both the Upper and Lower Klonaqua Lakes are managed by the IPID, and flows released from both lakes allow the IPID to maintain irrigation diversions and meet instream flow obligations. Access to waters stored in Upper Klonaqua Lake may help to provide more reliable instream flows during critical times of year such as late summer/fall.

Bathymetry and topographic surveys were completed at Upper Klonaqua Lake in September and October 2014 by Gravity Consulting to better understand the volume of water stored in Upper Klonaqua Lake. The survey measured the water surface elevation difference between Upper and Lower Klonaqua Lakes at approximately 115.8 feet. The survey estimated the difference in high water surface elevations between the two lakes at approximately 97 feet.

Releases from Lower Klonaqua Lake are controlled by a gate through a low-level outlet pipeline, which is operated by an actuator at the crest of the existing embankment dam. During the years when Klonaqua Lakes are actively managed, IPID personnel hike more than 10 miles (one way) to the Lower Klonaqua Lake to open the gate in July. IPID personnel return to close the gate in late September or October when the lake is drawn down and the irrigation season is over.

Three conceptual options are under consideration by IPID for allowing access to water stored in Upper Klonaqua Lake that is conveyed to Lower Klonaqua Lake and from there through the existing system to Icicle Creek and IPID uses:

**Tunneling.** A tunnel option would involve drilling and blasting through the bedrock outcrop between the upper and lower lakes. The tunnel could then be equipped with an automated gate valve to control releases to the lower lake. Based on the bathymetry survey, the preferred location for tunneling would be along the southern portion of the bedrock ridge, where the slope of the lakebed is steep and is not affected by the high bedrock that is apparent in the northeast portion of the lake.

**Siphoning**. Siphoning would involve the use of a pipe for hydraulic conveyance over an intermediate high point by gravity using differential pressure between a

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup> Five release volumes were calculated in the *Bathymetry and Topographic Survey of upper Klonaqua Lake and Conceptual Release Options memorandum* (Aspect, 2014). 2,448 acre-feet represents water possibly made available under the largest draw down scenario of 50 feet.

reservoir surface and an outlet. While it may be possible to implement a siphon to achieve some additional draw down potential, the maximum siphon lift at the high lake elevations would be limited and is likely on the order of 10 to 15 feet. Siphoning would also have inherent operational and maintenance issues associated with initiating and maintaining a siphon. Appropriate infrastructure, including a priming or vacuum pump and generator, would be some of the considerations for a detailed feasibility study and design of a siphoning option.

**Pumping.** Pumping would involve the installation of either a permanent or semipermanent facility at the lake to lift the water over the land between the two lakes. Submersible pumps or vertical turbine pumps could provide the greatest potential draw down but would require on-site power generation (likely a diesel generator). End-suction, engine driven pumps could also be utilized, but would allow for lesser draw down (similar to siphon limitations) and would provide limited benefit beyond submersible pump or siphoning options. Fuel consumption with a pumping option would be a significant consideration. For example, a 10 cfs pumping system with 50-foot lift capacity may require a 60-kW diesel generator. A generator this size would have a fuel consumption of over 100 gallons of diesel per day. Other fairly significant potential environmental impacts would need to be considered and evaluated with this option, including noise, emissions, spill/leak potential, etc. Physical operation of the pump, including labor, would also need to be considered.

Any of the above options would require detailed feasibility studies, and design and permitting analyses. See Figure 2-55 for additional information on Upper Klonaqua Lake storage enhancement. Release of additional storage from Upper Klonaqua Lake could help meet the Guiding Principles adopted by the IWG, such as additional instream flow augmentation and additional domestic/municipal supply. This project has the potential to increase storage to 2,448 acre-feet, and provide between 5 and 20 cfs of flow benefit. This project is at the conceptual stages and no cost estimates have been developed.

# 2.8.4 Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement

The Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement project would increase available storage in the Snow Lakes System, providing up to 18 cfs and 1,079 acre-feet for instream flow and domestic benefit.

### Figure 2-55. Upper Klonaqua Storage Enhancement



#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Upper and Lower Snow Lakes are situated within the ALWA of the Icicle Creek Subbasin with a combined surface area of approximately 189.3 acres, maximum water surface elevations of 5,420 feet (Upper Snow Lake) and 5,415 feet (Lower Snow Lake), and a tributary basin area of 3,060 acres. The USFWS manages both lakes, and flows released from them supply water to the LNFH (operated by USFWS) and meet instream flow obligations. The combined existing active, useable storage capacity in these lakes is estimated at 12,900 acre-feet, 750 acre-feet of which is released for IPID. Water released from Upper Snow Lake is conveyed through a tunnel to Nada Lake.

The lakes are operated jointly to increase late summer flows in Snow Creek, which is a tributary to Icicle Creek. The increased flows to Icicle Creek help supply the LNFH's operational requirements (approximately 40 cfs between June and October) and supplement flow in Icicle Creek.

The *Water Storage Report, Wenatchee River Basin* (Anchor QEA, Feb. 2011) provided results of a preliminary feasibility analysis of the potential for increasing water storage in the Snow Lakes. Increasing the storage capacity would allow for additional releases during the late summer or during dry years to improve flows in Icicle Creek and the lower Wenatchee River. The additional storage would also improve operations of fish rearing facilities at the LNFH.

The Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement project would combine some of the recommendations made as part of the feasibility analysis to increase storage available for release from these lakes. The project would also automate releases from the Snow Lakes by making use of additional water storage capacity (within the existing water rights) by improving infrastructure to allow for more water to be captured and released. This would be achieved by implementing additional improvements identified in the *Water Storage Report, Wenatchee River Basin* (Anchor QEA, 2011) to increase storage and automate releases from the Snow Lakes, including:

- Replace Upper and Lower Snow Lake dams and increase the dam crest elevation by 5 feet at both locations. The dam structures at Upper and Lower Snow Lakes would be replaced as described in the *Water Storage Report, Wenatchee River Basin* (Anchor QEA, 2011). The new dams would have a crest elevation 5 feet higher than the existing structures.
- Install a new low-level outlet at Lower Snow Lake that would allow for 3 additional feet of draw down. The low-level outlet pipe at Lower Snow Lake would be installed 3 feet lower than the existing low-level outlet to increase storage.
- **Replace the low-level outlet pipes and gates at both lakes.** The low-level outlet pipe at both Upper and Lower Snow Lakes would be replaced. A new flap gate would be installed at the inlet to the low-level outlet at Upper Snow Lake to allow water to flow only from Lower Snow Lake to Upper Snow Lake when Upper Snow Lake has been drawn down and is lower than Lower Snow Lake. A new slide gate would be installed on the inlet to the low-level outlet pipe at Lower Snow Lake and

the gate would be automated and connected to telemetry to allow for remote control and optimization of releases.

- Automate the low-level outlet gate at Lower Snow Lake and the existing valve on the penstock that discharges water from Upper Snow Lake to Nada Lake. This includes installation of motorized actuators on release gates and valves, installation of solar panels and battery packs as power supply for motorized actuators, installation of controls and communications equipment at each actuator, and weatherproof enclosures.
- **Install telemetry to allow for remote operation of the automated gate and valve.** This includes using radio telemetry and repeater stations to remotely control water releases.

The preliminary evaluation determined that raising the existing dams or constructing new dams to raise the water levels in Upper and Lower Snow Lakes by 5 feet and drawing down Lower Snow Lake by 3 feet would increase the total storage capacity of the two lakes by approximately 1,079 acre-feet. The additional storage, combined with improvements designed to provide remote control of the outlet valve, would allow for the release of an additional 18 cfs for 30 days or 9 cfs for 60 days to Icicle Creek via Snow Creek to support LNFH operations and increase instream flows in Icicle Creek and the Lower Wenatchee River. See Figure 2-56 for additional information on the Upper Snow Lake storage enhancement.

The overall cost of the project was estimated to be \$1.4 million (Anchor QEA, 2011) as update with the RS Means Historical Cost Index, approximately \$1,297 per acre-foot of additional storage.

# 2.8.5 IPID Irrigation Efficiencies

The IPID irrigation efficiencies for this alternative are the same as is described in Section 2.5.2.

# 2.8.6 COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange

The COIC irrigation efficiencies and pump exchange for this alternative are the same as is described in Section 2.5.3.

# 2.8.7 Domestic Conservation

The domestic conservation alternative is described in Section 2.5.4.

# 2.8.8 Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement

The tribal fishery preservation and enhancement alternative is described in Section 2.5.6.

# 2.8.9 Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The habitat protection and enhancement alternative is described in Section 2.5.7.

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

### Figure 2-56. Upper Snow Storage Enhancement



# 2.8.10 Instream Flow Rule Amendment

The instream flow rule amendment alternative is described in Section 2.5.8.

# 2.8.11 Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

The LNFH conservation and water quality improvements alternative is described in Section 2.5.9.

# 2.8.12 Fish Passage

The fish passage alternative is described in Section 2.5.10.

# 2.8.13 Fish Screen Compliance

The fish screen compliance alternative is described in Section 2.5.11.

# 2.8.14 Water Markets

The water market alternative is described in Section 2.5.12.

# 2.8.15 Costs and Benefits for Alternative 4

The costs and benefits for Alternative 4 are described in Table 2-12. However, this is not a cost-benefit analysis, but rather a summary of the predicted costs and benefits of Alternate 4. Cumulatively, these projects meet all of the Guiding Principles by improving streamflow, LNFH sustainability, protecting tribal and non-tribal fishers, improving domestic supply and agricultural reliability, and enhancing Icicle Creek habitat.

This alternative would provide an estimated by 132 cfs and 35,385 acre-feet of total water (instream and out-of-stream) and cost approximately \$87.8 million (including a 25 percent contingency). The estimated cost per ac-ft is \$2,482. However, this cost estimate does not include the potential costs of the Upper Klonaqua Storage Enhancement project because cost estimates have not been produced for this project. The average cost per acrefoot of water developed by the Office of Columbia River is approximately \$500/acrefoot. Table 2-12 provides a breakdown of each project in Alternative 4 and the benefits and costs associated with each. These costs are subject to change as projects progress through feasibility and design, and a more complete picture of costs are developed.

### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Project	Tota Deve	I Water Iopment	Project Cost (\$M)	Cost (per Flows (cfs	Instream Flows (cfs)	LNFH	Fish Harvest	DM Supply	Ag Reliabilitv	Habitat	Comply with Laws
	cfs	ac-ft		ac-ft)	(						
Alpine Lakes Automation	30	5,464	0.98	179	30				x		х
IPID Irrigation Efficiencies	10	3,000	7.50	2,500	10				x		х
COIC Irrigation Efficiencies	12	3,640	4.50	1,236	12				x		x
Domestic Conservation Efficiencies	0.5	400	1.00	2,500	0			x			x
Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement	18	3,500	4.9	1,393	18			x	x		x
Snow lake Storage Enhancement	18	1,079	1.75	1,622	18			x	x		x
Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement	20	2,448	unknown	-	20			x	x		x
Tribal Fishery Protection	-	-	0.50	-	0		x				x
Habitat Protection and Enhancement	-	-	2.50	-	0					x	x
Instream Flow Rule Amendment	0.4	400	0.05	125	0			x			x
LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements	20	14,454	20.00	1,384	20	x					x
Fish Passage	-		6.00	-	0					x	x
Fish Screening	-		17.60	-	0					x	х
Water Markets	-	1,000	3.00	3,000	3				x		x
Totals	132	35,385	70.3	1,985	131	х	x	x	x	x	x
Contingency			87.8	2,482							

 Table 2-1246

 Summary of Alternative 4 Costs and Benefits

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> An additional 25 percent contingency was added to projects within the ALWA in response to comments on the draft PEIS to account for additional costs that might be incurred for construction and mitigation measures. This is in addition to project contingencies already calculated and discussed. Project costs will likely be refined as project planning and design progress.

# 2.8.16 Timeline

The proposed timeline to implement the projects that compose Alternative 4 is below.

- Spring 2016 Programmatic SEPA Scoping
- Summer 2016-Summer 2018 Programmatic EIS Development
- Summer 2018 Draft PEIS
- Winter 2018/2019 Final PEIS, Preferred Alternative Selection
- Fall 2018-Spring 2019 Project Level Environmental Review Scoping and NEPA Integration (Depending on Alternative Selected), Applicable design or feasibility studies on projects
- Summer 2019-Summer 2020 Project Level Environmental Review (if applicable)
- Spring 2019-Fall 2028 Project Construction/Implementation

There was a 60-day public comment period following the release of the draft PEIS from May 31, to July 30, 2018. If it is determined that project-level SEPA scoping is necessary, there will also be opportunities for public comment during the scoping and following release of the draft and final project EIS.

# 2.9 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 was developed following further study on piping and conservation options for IPID and based on ongoing discussions with stakeholders about the potential for reducing diversions from Icicle Creek. This alternative includes all projects proposed under Alternative 1, except the IPID Dryden Irrigation Efficiencies project would be replaced by the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project. The IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project. The IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project would replace the IPID canal systems with a pressurized pipe delivery system. Three intake and pump station facilities would be constructed on the Wenatchee River to supply the new system. The existing surface water diversion facilities on Icicle Creek and Peshastin Creek would be removed. Even though the diversion would be completely removed from Icicle Creek, IPID would still need to store and release water from their lakes within the ALWA to ensure that water was available in the Wenatchee River for its use. Without releases from the lakes, water supply shortages to IPID would exist in both average and drought years, and these shortages would increase with climate change. The projects included in Alternative 5 are described below.

# 2.9.1 IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project

The IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange would eliminate the surface water diversions on Icicle Creek and Peshastin Creek by constructing of three surface water intake and

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

pumping facilities on the Wenatchee River and fully piping and pressurizing the IPID delivery system. System updates proposed for this project are summarized in Table 2-13. The conceptual configuration would place the new piping infrastructure in the existing canal easements, mostly within existing canal alignments. However, other configurations would need to be evaluated to optimize the efficiency and cost of the system. The conceptual configuration described in Table 2-13 is illustrated in Figure 2-57.

Characteristic	Pump Station A	Pump Station B	Pump Station C
Existing Infrastructure Replaced	IID Diversion 1, 2, 4, and 5 Canals, Gibbs Ditch	IID Diversion 3A Canal and PID Canal	IID Diversion 3B Canal
Pump Station Location	Wenatchee River, Near Leavenworth Siphon	Wenatchee River, Upstream of Dryden Dam	Wenatchee River, Near Cashmere WWTP
Capacity <sup>1</sup>	52 cfs	57 cfs	24 cfs
Pumping Head	372 feet	257 feet	574 feet
Booster Station	No	Yes	No
Re-regulating Pond Location	No	In bend in PID Main Canal, near Dryden	No
Re-regulating Pond Size	N/A	15.5 acre-feet	N/A
Pipe Sizing	12-inch to 36-inch	8-inch to 48-inch	20-inch to 30-inch

# Table 2-13 Summary of Improvement Concept Evaluated for IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange

Notes:

 The capacity was determined by estimating the number of shares served by each system and multiplying by 6.75 gpm per share, which is the maximum amount of IPID delivers to its customers at each customer turnout. A 5-percent allowance was added on to the calculated flow rate to allow for leakage and loss in the distribution system.

**BPS: Booster Pump Station** 

Cfs: Cubic Feet per second

IID: Icicle Irrigation District

PID: Peshastin irrigation District

**PS: Pump Station** 

WSEL: Water Surface Elevation

WWTP: Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Each system shown in Figure 2-57 would consist of a surface water intake and pump station that would deliver water through a network of pressurized delivery pipelines to water users. System B would pump water into a re-regulation pond at the elevation of the existing PID Canal and two booster pump stations would be constructed to lift the water to the elevation of the IID Canal. The current IPID points of diversion on Icicle Creek and Peshastin Creek would be removed.

A total of more than 39 miles of pressurized pipeline would be installed to replace the open ditches that IPID currently operates. This would result in a more efficient system, with reduced evaporative loss, seepage, and operational spills.

The project would result in one customer on the IID Diversion 1 Canal to be converted to an individual well system because it would take a long length of dead-end pipe to reach that customer.

A concept-level opinion of probable costs was developed in the *IPID Conservation Plan -Full Piping Improvement Option Memorandum* (Anchor, 2018). This included construction costs and long-term O&M costs. The estimated construction cost, including contingency costs to account for project elements that are not understood or have not been defined at this stage, is between \$72.5 million and \$83.7 million. Annual O&M, is estimated at between \$775,000 and \$821,000.

The IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange estimated water savings is 117 cfs and 30,000 acre-feet.

#### **ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN**

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 2-57. IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange



# 2.9.2 Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization and Automation

The Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization and Automation project is the same as is described in Section 2.5.1.

# 2.9.3 COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange

The COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange for this alternative are the same as is described in Section 2.5.3.

# 2.9.4 Domestic Conservation

The Domestic Conservation project is described in Section 2.5.4.

# 2.9.5 Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration project is described in Section 2.5.5.

# 2.9.6 Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement

The Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement project is described in Section 2.5.6.

# 2.9.7 Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The Habitat Protection and Enhancement project is described in Section 2.5.7.

# 2.9.8 Instream Flow Rule Amendment

The Instream Flow Rule Amendment project is described in Section 2.5.8.

# 2.9.9 Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

The LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements project is described in Section 2.5.9.

# 2.9.10 Fish Passage

The Fish Passage project is described in Section 2.5.10.

# 2.9.11 Fish Screen Compliance

The Fish Screen Compliance project is described in Section 2.5.11.

# 2.9.12 Water Markets

The Water Market project is described in Section 2.5.12.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

# 2.9.13 Costs and Benefits for Alternative 5

The costs and benefits for Alternative 5 are described in Table 2-14. However, this is not a cost-benefit analysis, but rather a summary of the predicted costs and benefits of Alternate 5. Cumulatively, these projects meet all of the Guiding Principles by improving streamflow, LNFH sustainability, protecting tribal and non-tribal fishers, improving domestic supply and agricultural reliability, and enhancing Icicle Creek habitat.

Alternative 5 is expected to result in a total of 196 cfs and 55,458 acre-feet of instream and out-of-stream water. The current cost estimate is approximately \$177.3 million, including a 25 percent contingency. This amounts to \$3,007 per acre-foot. As noted above, the average cost per acre-foot of water developed by the Office of Columbia River is approximately \$500/acre-foot. Table 2-14 provides a breakdown of each project in Alternative 5 and the benefits and costs associated with each. These costs are subject to change as projects progress through feasibility and design, and a more complete picture of costs are developed.

# 2.9.14 Timeline

The proposed timeline to implement the projects that compose Alternative 5 is below.

- Spring 2016 Programmatic SEPA Scoping
- Summer 2016-Summer 2018 Programmatic EIS Development
- Summer 2018 Draft PEIS
- Winter 2018/2019 Final PEIS, Preferred Alternative Selection
- Fall 2018-Spring 2019 Project Level Environmental Review Scoping and NEPA Integration (Depending on Alternative Selected), Applicable design or feasibility studies on projects
- Summer 2019-Summer 2020 Project Level Environmental Review (if applicable)
- Spring 2019-Fall 2028 Project Construction/Implementation

There was a 60-day public comment period following the release of the draft PEIS from May 31, to July 30, 2018. If it is determined that project-level SEPA scoping is necessary, there will also be opportunities for public comment during the scoping and following release of the draft and final project EIS.

Project	Total Water Developed		Project Cost/ Instream Cost (ac- Flows Li	LNFH Fish	DM Supply	Ag Reliability	Habitat	Comply			
	cfs	ac-ft	(\$ M)	ft)	(cfs)		naivesi	Suppry	Reliability		with Laws
IPID Full Piping & Pump Exchange	117	30,000	83.7	2,790	117				x		x
Alpine Lakes Optimization and Automation	30	5,464	0.98	179	30				x		x
COIC Irrigation Efficiencies & Pump Exchange	12	3,640	4.50	1,236	12				х		x
Domestic Conservation	0.5	400	1.00	2,500	-			х			x
Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration	13	3,600	2.00	556	13			x	х		x
Tribal and Non- Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement	-	-	0.50	-	-		x				x
Habitat Protection and Enhancement	-	-	2.50	-	-					x	x
Instream Flow Rule Amendment	0.4	400	0.05	125	-			x			x
LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements	20	14,454	20.00	1,384	20	x					x
Fish Passage	-	-	6.00	-	-					x	x
Fish Screen Compliance	-	-	17.60	-	-					x	x
Water Markets	3	1,000	3.00	3,000	3				х		x
Totals	196	58,958	141.8	2,406	195	x	x	x	x	x	x
Contingency			177.3	3,007							

 Table 2-14

 Summary of Alternative 5 Costs and Benefits47

# 2.10 Pairing and Phasing

Some projects evaluated in this PEIS have received considerable evaluation to date, while others are at the conceptual or preliminary stages. In some cases, project proponents had already been working on projects that were then integrated into an alternative considered

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> An additional 25-percent contingency was added to projects within the ALWA in response to comments on the draft PEIS to account for additional costs that might be incurred for construction and mitigation measures. This is in addition to project contingencies already calculated and discussed. Project costs will likely be refined as project planning and design progress.

### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

### PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

in the PEIS (e.g., pump exchanges, Alpine Lake automation, boulder field passage). In other instances, investments parallel to the PEIS process seemed appropriate because the projects had broad consensus and support (e.g., COIC Irrigation Efficiency and Pump Exchange) and were included in all the alternatives. As the PEIS process concludes, the co-leads and the IWG will meet to determine how best to phase and pair projects to meet Guiding Principles. Several factors are likely to play into such decisions include:

- Project level environmental review and the level of additional analysis required prior to project permitting.
- Whether there is a federal nexus for the project that necessitates NEPA compliance.
- Whether funding is available for the project.
- Permitting timelines.
- Whether there is balance in the projects being moved forward so all Guiding Principles show progress.

# 2.11 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Study

During development of the Icicle Strategy, the IWG considered numerous options to address water resources management in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. As their work progressed, it became apparent some of the projects under evaluation did not adequately meet or were in direct conflict with the Guiding Principles. There were also options that did not receive consensus-based support from the IWG members, and per the group's Operating Procedures, were not pursued further.

Initially the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange was not considered in any of the alternatives in this PEIS because it did not receive consensus-based support based on O&M cost estimates. However, based on stakeholder input and further study, an alternate configuration was developed. This, along with hopes to find funding support of O&M costs, moved the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange into further consideration, resulting in the development of Alternative 5.

The following sections describe the projects that have been eliminated from consideration.

# 2.11.1 Reservoir Removal

During the SEPA scoping, some commenters recommended removing all of the reservoirs within the Icicle Creek Subbasin to restore the area to a more natural state. The IWG did not further consider this proposal in the PEIS for several reasons.

The reservoirs in the Alpine Lake Wilderness Area support LNFH and IPID operations. IPID serves approximately 85 percent of the irrigated land in the Wenatchee Valley from Cashmere up to the Cascade Range (USFS, 1981). These lands are primarily in commercial orchard production and are the foundation of the local economy. Without the drought year supply provided by these reservoirs, orchard production would likely be significantly impacted. Additionally, this proposal does not align with the Guiding Principles. Removing the reservoirs from the Alpine Lakes Wilderness would reduce streamflow, decrease domestic and agricultural reliability, and would make meeting the Guiding Principles nearly impossible in the future as climate change predictions call for less snowfall and more rainfall in the Icicle Subbasin. Additionally, taking away private property rights would not align with the Guiding Principle that calls for complying with state and federal laws.

# 2.11.2 Water Right Relinquishment

Some PEIS commenters suggested creating an alternative that would pre-judge previously adjudicated and valid water rights, suggesting some portion of IPID's water rights or the major diversionary rights are relinquished and no longer valid. The disposition of the water rights of IPID, COIC, the City or any other water right holder is generally determined during a water right permitting action by Ecology. Water right relinquishment is not determined during a programmatic environmental review. Water Resources POL 1120 was developed by Ecology based on State case law and describes when an extent and validity analysis occurs on a water right. An extent and validity analysis occurs when Ecology tentatively determines the past beneficial use of a water right, whether sufficient causes for non-use provided in RCW 90.14.140 apply and determines the portion of the water right that remains valid. In Washington State, only the superior court can make a final determination on the extent and validity of a water right.

If any project is infeasible during project-level environmental review, permitting, feasibility, or funding, then processes exist to replace projects to ensure Guiding Principles are met.

# 2.11.3 Removing Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery

Removing the LNFH was also suggested by commenters during the SEPA scoping period. This option was also not explored further by the IWG as it lacked broader support from area stakeholders and does not align with the Guiding Principles. LNFH was constructed in the 1940s to provide mitigation for the loss of natural fish production as a result of the construction and operation of Grand Coulee Dam. The USFWS and USBOR recently conducted an alternatives analysis to determine the best possible method for meeting fish production targets. This included analyzing whether to relocate or upgrade existing facilities. The analysis concluded that upgrading LNFH rather than removing it was the best alternative based on costs and production. Removing LNFH would not align with the Guiding Principles to protect tribal harvest and improve sustainability at LNFH.

# CHAPTER 3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

# 3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes environmental resources within the project area, as defined in Section 1.4.2 of this document. Descriptions of environmental resources are organized by sub-regions:

- The Alpine Lakes sub-region encompasses the mountainous region southwest of Leavenworth. The sub-region includes Square, Klonaqua, Eightmile, Colchuck, and Snow/Nada Lakes and the tributaries that connect these lakes with Icicle Creek;
- The Icicle Creek sub-region consists of the mainstem Icicle Creek floodplain and valley walls from the mouth of Leland Creek near the Icicle Creek headwaters at RM 26 to the confluence with the Wenatchee River; and
- The Wenatchee River Corridor sub-region lies within the Wenatchee River Valley and covers the Wenatchee River and adjacent areas from just upstream of the confluence of Icicle Creek to the confluence with the Columbia River.

Additionally, where applicable, an overview of resources for the entire area is provided in addition to the focused, sub-region descriptions.

# 3.2 Earth

This section describes Earth elements present in the project area, and conditions affecting proposed alternatives including topography, geology and soils, and geological hazards. Earth elements of the project area are first described in a regional context and followed by a detailed description by sub-region.

# 3.2.1 Regional Geology

The Icicle project area is located in the central and eastern portions of the Cascade Mountain Range. The Cascades were tectonically uplifted beginning in the late Eocene epoch (approximately 37 million years ago) as a result of the offshore collision of tectonic plates at the Cascadia subduction zone (CSZ). Coincident volcanism emplaced igneous rocks, including intrusives, lava flows, and ash, throughout the Cascades, which continues to modern times. Continued uplift of the region resulted in erosion and deposition of sedimentary rocks. More recent erosion from alpine glaciers and streams shaped the landscape to its current form while depositing unconsolidated sediments in low-lying areas. Figure 3-1 presents a geologic map of the Icicle project area based on mapping published online by Washington Department of Natural Resources (2017).

### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

### Figure 3-1. Surficial Geology



#### CHAPTER 3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

### Figure 3-1. Surficial Geology (Legend)

S Basin Boundary	Qls/Qta Quaternary mass-wasting deposits
Faults (WA DNR)	Quaternary eolian deposits, loess
Dip-Slip Movement	Qad Pleistocene alpine glacial drift
Normal fault - Identity and existence certain location accurate. Bar and ball on downthrown block	Ofg/Ofs Pleistocene outburst flood deposits
	Quaternary-Tertiary Rocks
-1 – Normal fault - Identity or existence questionable, location approximate. Bar and ball on downthrown block	QMs Quaternary-Tertiary sedimentary rocks and deposits
•	Tertiary Rocks
Normal fault - Identity and existence certain, location inferred. Bar and ball on downthrown block	PLMaoc Tertiary sedimentary rocks and deposits
	Eib/ OEian Tertiary intrusive rocks
••••• Normal fault - Identity and existence certain, location concealed. Bar and ball on downthrown block	Mesozoic Rocks
	JTRhm Mesozoic heterogeneous metamorphic rocks
Thrust fault - Identity and existence certain, location accurate. Sawteeth on upper plate	Kigb/Kigd/ Rig/Kit
- Thrust fault - Identity and existence certain, location inferred. Sawteeth on upper plate	JTRu/ Ju Mesozoic ultramafic rocks
• ♥• • Thrust fault - Identity and existence certain, location concealed. Sawteeth on upper plate	Kid Mesozoic volcanic rocks
Strike-Slip Movement	Precambrian Rocks
Right-lateral strike slip fault - Identity and existence certain location inferred. Arrows show relative motion	pCgn Precambrian heterogeneous metamorphic rocks
	Water
•••• Right-lateral strike-slip fault - Identity and existence certain, location concealed. Arrows show relative motion	Water
	lce lce
Movement Unknown	Folds (WA DNR)
Fault, unknown offset - Identity and existence certain, location accurate	*
Fault, unknown offset - Identity and existence certain, location inferred	Anticline - Identity and existence certain, location accurate
•••• Fault, unknown offset - Identity and existence certain, location concealed	- 🕂 - Anticline - Identity and existence certain, location concealed
Surficial Geologic Units (WA DNR)	
Quaternary Rocks and Deposits	
Quaternary bog, marsh, swamp, or lake deposits	
QgI Pleistocene bog, marsh, swamp, or lake deposits	Syncline - Identity and existence certain, location concealed
Qa/Qt/ Qaf Quaternary alluvium	
25 Pelly Tryanjeck (Oxekolourly, SAR)/side, Oxek, Wale, Meregenent, 12004): Delivered (PEDS, 3 Lagend - Geologi of the Pellet Jave and	007

### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

### 3.2.1.1 Major Geologic Units

The oldest rocks in the Icicle project area are Mesozoic gneisses of the Mad River terrane that are confined to a small area in the southeast portion (map unit MZgn). The Mesozoic Ingalls Tectonic Complex occupies the southern and western portions of the project area. Geologic units associated with this ophiolite mélange are mapped locally as ultramafic serpentinite and peridotite (MZPZu) and metamorphosed rocks of the Chiwaukum Schist, including biotite schist and amphibolite (MZhm). These rocks were intruded by igneous rocks of the Mesozoic Mount Stuart batholith, which forms the Mount Stuart Range in the central and western portions of the project area. Geologic units associated with the Mount Stuart batholith are mapped as granodiorite, tonalite, and granite (MZi), and diorite (Kid). Subsequent regional uplift resulting in erosion of older rocks produced Tertiary continental sedimentary rocks in fault-bounded low-lying grabens. These rocks occupy the eastern portion of the project area. The predominant geologic unit associated with the Tertiary sedimentary rocks is mapped as sandstone, siltstone, and shale of the Chumstick Formation (Tc). Quaternary unconsolidated sediments mapped throughout the project area consist of alluvium (Qa); glacial drift and glacial deposits (Qad) from alpine glaciers consisting of till, gravelly outwash, lacustrine and bedded silts, and terrace gravels; and mass-wastage deposits (Ols).

# 3.2.2 Geologic Structures

Major geologic structures in the Icicle project area and vicinity include the north-south striking, strike-slip Evergreen fault (Dragovich et al., 2002) located 6 miles to the west, and the northwest-southeast-striking, high-angle Leavenworth fault zone (Tabor et al., 1982 and 1987) located in the western portion of the subbasin, and the Entiat fault (Tabor et al., 1987) located east of the project area about 3 miles east of Cashmere, Washington.

Internal thrust faults are present within the Ingalls Tectonic Complex, and several subsidiary faults and folds are present associated with the Leavenworth and Entiat fault zones.

The Leavenworth and Entiat faults bound the Wenatchee River Valley, a structural valley located at the western margin of the northwest-trending Chiwaukum structural low (Cheney, 2007), a fault-bounded tectonically subsided region (formerly known as the Chiwaukum graben [Gresens, 1983]).

# 3.2.3 Soils

Soils are formed slowly over time by the interaction between geology of the parent material, slope, climate, and natural vegetation of the area. Parent material consists of bedrock, alluvium, colluvium, loess, and volcanic ash, and soil is often a mixture of these. Soils in the project area are mapped and classified by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) in its Soil Survey publications for mountainous regions, including Alpine Lakes and Icicle Creek sub-regions (NRCS, 2007) and the Wenatchee River Corridor sub-region (NRCS, 1975). Sub-region soil classifications are discussed below.

# 3.2.4 Regional Geological Hazards

Geological hazards, including seismic, mass wasting (landslides), and erosion, are present in the Icicle project area. The Chelan County Code, Chapter 11.86, Geologically Hazardous Overlay District (GHOD), uses published sources to identify areas having landslide and erosion hazards and also identifies hazards presented by snow avalanche. Where applicable, geological hazards present in the sub-regions are discussed in greater detail.

## 3.2.4.1 Seismic Hazards

The site is located within a region subject to earthquakes on shallow crustal faults and in the Cascadia subduction zone. Hazards associated with earthquakes include seismic shaking, surficial ground rupture, and liquefaction. Earthquakes can also trigger mass wasting events.

Large earthquakes in Washington and Oregon are associated with the CSZ, which lies approximately 150 miles to the west of the Icicle project area (Department of Natural Resources, 2008). Hazards associated with the CSZ include deep (Benioff zone) earthquakes and subduction zone earthquakes. Deep earthquakes generally originate during rupture of the sinking oceanic plate, have magnitude 7.5 or less, and occur approximately every 10 to 30 years. The subduction zone earthquakes occur because of rupture between the subducting oceanic plate and the overlying continental plate. These earthquakes have magnitude up to 9 and a recurrence interval on the order of 500 years.

A shallow earthquake within the Cascade Mountains occurred in 1872, east of the project area, near Entiat and had an estimated magnitude of 6.8 (Bakun, et al., 2002). Future earthquakes within the Cascades would likely be shallow and could exceed magnitude 7 (Noson and Qamar, 1988).

### 3.2.4.2 Mass Wasting

Mass wasting events include landslides, earthflows, mudflows, debris flows, slumps, creeps, and rock falls. Areas of existing or potential mass wasting are mapped in Chelan County's GHOD in all three sub-regions based on mapped slope failures and a combination of geologic, slope, and hydrologic conditions.

### 3.2.4.3 Erosion

Erosion hazards are identified in Chelan County's GHOD based on areas identified as "severe" erosion hazard according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Chelan County Soil Survey Manual (Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2017). The GHOD identifies the presence of erosion hazards in all three sub-regions of the project area. Erosion hazards increase in areas having steeper slopes.

# 3.2.5 Alpine Lakes

# 3.2.5.1 Geology and Physiography

The Alpine Lakes sub-region encompasses the mountainous region southwest of Leavenworth. The sub-region includes Square, Klonaqua, Eightmile, Colchuck, and Snow/Nada Lakes and the tributaries that connect these lakes with Icicle Creek.

Geology is characterized by steep bedrock mountains mapped as granites of the Mount Stuart batholith (MZi) and ultramafic/metamorphic of the Ingalls Tectonic Complex (MZPZu and MZhm). Alpine glaciation incised steep valleys, hanging valleys, and cirques that frequently encompass lake beds and stream channels. Several glaciers are still present. Glaciers and streams deposited thin layers of glacial drift and alluvium over bedrock in low-lying areas. Several large mass wastage deposits (Qls) are mapped.

The resistant granites of the intrusive Mt. Stuart batholith control topography. Elevations range from about 1,400 feet above sea level (asl) at the mouth of Snow Creek to 9,400 feet asl at Mount Stuart (WGS 84 datum). Slopes on glacially incised peaks and valley walls exceed 60 degrees, while the bottoms of valleys and cirques are generally less than 20 degrees.

## 3.2.5.2 Soils

Soils in the Alpine Lakes sub-region of the Icicle project area are broadly classified by NRCS as soils on mountains at middle elevations and soils in valleys and on mountains at high elevations.

On middle-elevation mountains up to about 3,600 feet asl, soils are shallow (up to 20 inches deep), well-drained, and formed from colluvium and residuum derived from metamorphic and igneous bedrock mixed with volcanic ash and loess. These are gravelly, stony, and boulder sandy loams occurring on slopes from about 5 to 45 degrees.

On mountains ranging from about 3,500 to 8,300 feet asl, soils are very deep (up to 60 inches), well-drained, and formed in volcanic ash and loess mixed with colluvium and residuum derived from metamorphic and igneous rock. On some mountainsides and in high elevation valley bottoms ranging from about 2,600 to 5,500 feet asl, soils are very deep, well-drained, and formed in volcanic ash and pumice over glacial till. High elevation soils are gravelly, stony, and boulder sandy loams occurring on slopes from about 5 to 45 degrees on mountainsides and 2 to 30 degrees in valley bottoms.

# 3.2.5.3 Geologic Hazards

Potential geological hazards consist of mass wastage including landslides and rock falls, debris flows, erodible soils on steep slopes, and seismic hazards associated with regional and local faults. A landslide is mapped at Eightmile Lake that formed the lake by blocking Eightmile Creek. Avalanches are common because of deep snow pack and steep slopes.

# 3.2.6 Icicle Creek Corridor

## 3.2.6.1 Geology and Physiography

The Icicle Creek sub-region consists of the mainstem Icicle Creek floodplain and valley walls from the mouth of Leland Creek near the Icicle Creek headwaters at RM 26 to the confluence with the Wenatchee River.

The geology of this sub-region is characterized by the same bedrock present in the Alpine Lakes sub-region. Alpine glaciation carved the existing Icicle Valley that extended from the headwaters of Icicle Creek to a terminal moraine in Leavenworth. Alluvium (Qa) is mapped in several places where the valley widens; the most significant alluvial deposits occur in the lower portion south of Leavenworth where the valley widens to over 1 mile. Glacial drift (Qad) is mapped on the east valley wall in the lower portion of the drainage. Mass wastage deposits (Qls) are mapped on the north valley wall near the mouth of Mountaineer Creek.

Topography is controlled by resistant bedrock that forms the walls of the Icicle Valley. Elevations range from 1,000 feet asl near the confluence of Icicle Creek with the Wenatchee River in Leavenworth to greater than 5,000 feet on the valley walls. Slopes on the valley wall exceed 60 degrees in places, and slopes on the valley floor are less than 20 degrees.

### 3.2.6.2 Soils

Soils in the Icicle Creek sub-region of the Icicle project area are the same as for the Alpine Lakes sub-region for the upper reaches of Icicle Creek (Subsection 3.2.5.2, Soils) and same as the Wenatchee River Corridor sub-region (Subsection 3.2.7.2, Soils) for the lower reach of Icicle Creek.

# 3.2.6.3 Geologic Hazards

Potential geological hazards consist of mass wastage including landslides and rock falls, debris flows at the mouths of tributaries and on steep slopes, flooding, erodible soils on steep slopes, and seismic hazards associated with regional fault zones and the Leavenworth and Entiat fault zones. Avalanches are common because of deep snow pack and steep slopes.

# 3.2.7 Wenatchee River Corridor

### 3.2.7.1 Geology and Physiography

The Wenatchee River Corridor sub-region lies within the Wenatchee River Valley between the cities of Leavenworth and Cashmere.

Geology is primarily characterized by bedrock uplands mapped as continental sedimentary rocks of the Chumstick Formation (Tc) that form the valley walls. Bedrock west of Leavenworth is associated with rocks of the Mount Stuart batholith. Bedrock is overlain by quaternary terrace and alluvial deposits in the Wenatchee River valley bottom that originated primarily from up-valley alpine glacial sources (Qad) but with some

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

lacustrine deposits of glacial outburst flood origin (Qf). At Leavenworth, the terminus of alpine glaciation, Qad consists of lacustrine sediments overlain by alluvium and coarse moraine deposits. The mapped width of the quaternary deposits on the valley floor from Leavenworth to Cashmere is about 0.5 to 1 mile. Throughout most of the valley, Quaternary deposits form small ridges and terraces above the Wenatchee River where the river has incised the sediments. Alluvium (Qa) is present in the Wenatchee River floodplain and near the mouths of tributaries. Mass wastage deposits (Qls) are mapped on the west side of the valley, south of the junction of Highways 2 and 97.

The Wenatchee River Corridor lies within the Chiwaukum structural low and is bounded to the northeast by the Entiat fault and to the west by the Leavenworth fault. Elevations range from 750 feet asl at the Wenatchee River at Cashmere to over 3,000 feet asl in the mountains surrounding the valley. Topography on the valley margins is controlled by bedrock with slopes less than 30 degrees except areas where streams have incised and have slopes greater than 40 degrees. Terraces on the valley floor generally have slopes less than 20 degrees.

## 3.2.7.2 Soils

Soils in the Wenatchee River Corridor and lower Icicle Creek are broadly classified by NRCS in valley bottoms as very deep (up to 60 inches), well-drained, and formed in alluvium. These are sandy loams occurring on slopes from about 5 to 15 degrees. Soils on mountainsides are deep (up to 40 inches), well-drained, and formed in volcanic ash and residuum derived from sandstone and metamorphic bedrock. These are silty loams occurring on slopes from about 15 to 25 degrees.

### 3.2.7.3 Geologic Hazards

Potential geological hazards include landslides, debris flows from intermittent and perennial drainages that empty to the valley, erodible soils, and seismic hazards associated with regional faults and the Leavenworth and Entiat faults.

# 3.3 Surface Water Resources

This section summarizes the surface water quantity in the project area. It also discusses the overall water budget for the project area. This review does not represent an extent and validity review and is not intended to determine the validity of quantities of water available surface water rights. Surface water resources are addressed for the following sub-regions, including:

- The Alpine Lakes (Square, Klonaqua, Colchuck, Eightmile, Upper and Lower Snow, and Nada Lakes);
- The Icicle Creek drainage from the Alpine Lakes to the confluence with the Wenatchee River; and
- The Wenatchee River Corridor from just upstream of Icicle Creek to the confluence with the Columbia River.

Information about water rights and water resources infrastructure is provided in Section 3.6, Water Use. Information about surface water quality is presented in Section 3.5.2, Surface Water Quality.

# 3.3.1 Alpine Lakes

The Alpine Lakes sub-region is at the top of the Icicle Creek Subbasin, and includes Square, Upper and Lower Klonaqua, Eightmile, Colchuck, Upper and Lower Snow, and Nada Lakes. There are also numerous other lakes within this sub-region; however; they do not have dams, are not managed for water supply, and are not anticipated to be impacted by the Icicle Strategy.

Square, Upper and Lower Klonaqua, Eightmile, Colchuck, Upper and Lower Snow, and Nada Lakes drain small catchments high in the watershed. Outflows from these lakes are managed by either IPID or the USFWS. Cumulatively, these catchments drain 10,596 acres and contribute an estimated minimum of 23,871 acre-feet of water to the Icicle Creek system. Table 3-1 provides a summary of the Annual Water Supply from these lakes.

Lake	Lake Water Surface Elev. (feet)	Drainage Area (acres)	10% Exceedance Annual Inflow (acre-feet)	50% Exceedance Annual Inflow (acre-feet)	90% Exceedance Annual Inflow (acre-feet)	Estimated Annual Inflow – Minimum (acre-feet)
Square	4,989	1,010	8,158	6,148	4,722	3,701
Lower Klonaqua	5,090	800	5,093	3,808	2,895	2,249
Eightmile	4,671	3,804	18,713	14,141	10,896	8,575
Colchuck	5,570	941	4,883	3,665	2,800	2,182
Upper and Lower Snow	5,420 & 5,415	3,060	12,610	9,478	7,254	5,663
Nada	4,989	981	3,310	2,497	1,920	1,507

 Table 3-1

 Alpine Lakes Annual Water Supply Statistics

Note: Elev. = elevation

Square, Upper and Lower Klonaqua, Eightmile, Colchuck, Upper and Lower Snow, and Nada Lakes all have man-made dams at their outlets and have been managed as reservoirs and used to augment the flow in Icicle Creek since the 1920s. The storage in these lakes is actively managed for irrigation and fish propagation use by IPID and USFWS under storage water rights, as described in Section 3.6.1, Alpine Lakes Storage Rights. Measurement of active storage volumes has been performed through collection of LiDAR and bathymetric survey data. Bathymetry was performed on both Eightmile Lake and Upper Klonaqua Lake (only). LiDAR was collected in October 2016, which included Square Lake, Lower Klonaqua Lake, Colchuck Lake, Eightmile Lake, and Upper and

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Lower Snow Lakes. Estimated useable storage volumes associated with the Alpine Lakes is provided in Table 3-2 below.

Lake	Maximum Normal Stage (feet)	Minimum Normal Stage (feet)	Operational Range (feet)	Active Storage Volume (acre-feet)
Square	4,985	4,954	31	2,130
Lower Klonaqua	5,094	5,066	28	1,690
Eightmile	4,667	4,644	23	1,370
Colchuck	5,563	5,546	17	1,480
Upper Snow	5,433	5,273	160	12,590
Lower Snow	5,429	5,427	2	140

Table 3-2Alpine Lakes Storage Volume Estimates

Source: Appraisal Study, Alpine Lakes Optimization and Automation (Aspect, 2014)

Each of these lakes has a small dam structure at the outlet that allows for capture and controlled release of water to increase water supply available for diversion from Icicle Creek by IPID or the USFWS. Generally, the lakes begin filling around the beginning of the water year (October) and fill through the late fall, early winter, and spring, even in dry years. Once each lake is full to the constructed spillway or overflow elevation on the dam at the lake outlet, water flows over the dam or constructed spillway to a natural stream channel or tributary to Icicle Creek. Controlled releases from the lakes commence typically in late July or early August in response to seasonal flow triggers in lower Icicle Creek to offset diversions by IPID and the USFWS. Water is released through a low-level outlet system, typically consisting of a gated or valved tunnel or pipeline that extends under or around the dam at the outlet. IPID or the USFWS opens a gate on the low-level outlet to release water and draw down the lake. The USFWS operates a valve each July or August at the outlet of a tunnel and pipeline to control releases from Upper and Lower Snow Lakes to Nada Lake. IPID typically opens gates at one or two of the lakes they operate (Square, Klonaqua, Eightmile, and Colchuck) in late July or early August. During dry years, they may open gates at all of the lakes.

# 3.3.2 Icicle Creek Corridor

# 3.3.2.1 Icicle Creek Tributaries

Major Icicle Creek tributaries downstream of the Alpine Lakes include Leland, French, Eightmile, and Snow Creeks.

Leland Creek conveys surface water runoff from the Square Lake drainage. Prospect Creek drains Square Lake and enters Leland Creek several miles downstream. There are several other tributaries to Leland Creek, which drains a tributary basin of approximately 15 square-miles and confluences with Icicle Creek at RM 28.0. Historical streamflows are not available for Leland Creek, but 2016 flow monitoring work found that Leland Creek had a discharge of approximately 19 cfs in late September. Table 3-3 provides all flow data obtained as part of the 2016 flow monitoring study conducted by WDFW for Leland Creek and its tributaries (Personal Communication with Robert Granger, WDFW, 2016).

#### CHAPTER 3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Date	Location	Discharge (cfs)	Water Temp (°C)
9/20/16	Leland Creek (upstream of confluence with Prospect Creek)	10.30	7.60
9/20/16	Prospect Creek (upstream of confluence with Leland Creek)	8.92	8.60
9/21/16	Leland Creek (upstream of confluence with Icicle Creek)	19.24	5.90
9/20/16 9/21/16	Prospect Creek (upstream of confluence with Leland Creek) Leland Creek (upstream of confluence with Icicle Creek)	8.92 19.24	

Table 3-3Leland Creek Drainage Flows

(Source: Personal Communication, Robert Granger, WDFW, 2016)

French Creek confluences with Icicle Creek approximately 6.0 miles downstream of Leland Creek at RM 22.0. Klonaqua Creek drains Klonaqua Lake and joins French Creek high in the system. French Creek drains a tributary basin area of approximately 25 square miles. Flows in French and Klonaqua Creeks are provided in Table 3-4.

Date	Location	Discharge (cfs)	Water Temp (°C)
9/19/16	French Creek (upstream of Icicle Creek Trail Foot Bridge)	12.56	8.70
9/19/16	French Creek (midway between Icicle Creek and Klonaqua Creek)	13.53	8.50
9/19/16	French Creek (upstream of confluence with Klonaqua Creek)	6.50	8.10
9/19/16	Klonaqua Creek (upstream of confluence with French Creek)	2.98	8.60

Table 3-4 French Creek Drainage Flows

(Source: Personal Communication, Robert Granger, WDFW, 2016)

OCR funded additional monitoring in French and Leland Creeks in 2018, and the results of that information are expected to be released by the end of 2018.

Eightmile Creek drains a tributary area of 30 square miles and conveys surface water runoff from both Eightmile Lake and Colchuck Lake via Colchuck and Mountaineer Creek. Eightmile confluences with Icicle Creek at approximately RM 9.0. Flow data are not available for Eightmile Creek, but Eightmile Creek is believed to provide a significant discharge to the Icicle Creek system.

Snow Creek conveys surface water flow from Upper Snow, Lower Snow, and Nada Lakes to Icicle Creek. Snow Creek confluences with Icicle Creek at RM 5.2, draining a tributary basin of approximately 10 square miles. Flow data is not available for Snow Creek.

### 3.3.2.2 Icicle Creek Mainstem

The Icicle Creek Subbasin is the largest subbasin in the Wenatchee River Watershed. Mainstream Icicle Creek is approximately 32 miles long, beginning high in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness at Josephine Lake and discharging into the Wenatchee River at the City of Leavenworth near RM 25.6. Figure 1-1 provides an overview of Icicle Creek's location, gaging stations, and major diversions, which includes IPID's, City of Leavenworth's, and LNFH/COIC's point of diversion.

The shape of the Icicle Creek hydrograph is typical for the area. Flows peak in June, with a steady decline throughout the rest of the summer. Low flows typically occur in

### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

September and remain low through early October. Stream flow then begins to increase in response to autumn precipitation and remains steady through winter. When snow begins melting in spring, streamflow increases until its summer peak.

Figure 3-2 shows 10 percent, 50 percent, and 90 percent exceedance flows in Icicle Creek at RM 5.8, just upstream of major diversions. Percent exceedance is a way to describe the percentage of time for which an observed stream flow is greater than or equal to a defined stream flow. Low flows have a high exceedance percentage because higher flows are expected most of the time. Conversely, high flows tend to have a lower exceedance percentage. The peak 50 percent exceedance flow at RM 5.8, which represents the peak annual flow during an average year, is approximately 2,000 cfs. The peak flow typically occurs in June. The 50 percent exceedance low flow, which represent the low flow during an average year, occurs in late September and is approximately 120 cfs.

The Icicle Creek mainstem has been divided into five distinct reaches based on characteristics and major infrastructure. These reaches were introduced in Section 1.2.1.1, Adequate Streamflow, and shown on Figure 1-3. A brief description of each reach is provided below.

### 3.3.2.3 Reach 1

Reach 1 of Icicle Creek is located above RM 5.7 and includes Icicle Creek's headwaters. Figures 1-1 and 1-3 provides River Miles and reaches. Reach 1 intercepts major tributaries, including Eightmile Creek, French Creek, and Leland Creek. The Icicle Creek U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) gaging station is also located within this reach at RM 5.8, which is upstream of all the major diversions. Reach 1 ends at the IPID Diversion at RM 5.7. Because Reach 1 benefits from many inputs (tributaries), but few outputs (diversion), this reach tends to have higher flows than those farther downstream.

### 3.3.2.4 Reach 2

Reach 2 of Icicle Creek begins at RM 5.7 and ends at RM 4.5. Snow Creek flows into Icicle Creek at RM 5.2. Diversions within this reach include IPID's and City of Leavenworth's diversion at RM 5.7. Additionally, diversions occur at the bottom of this reach to LNFH and COIC, who share diversion infrastructure at RM 4.5. The boulder field, which is a major fish passage barrier is also within Reach 2. Flows in Reach 2 are diminished by the IPID diversion during the irrigation season (April through September) and the City of Leavenworth Diversion year-round. IPID has a peak diversion rate of 117 cfs, and City of Leavenworth has the right to divert up to 6.2 cfs. Both of these diversions export water out of the Icicle Creek Subbasin, although IPID has some operational spills in the Icicle Creek Subbasin which return a portion of the diverted water to the system. Table 3-5 provides an estimate of flow in Reach 2 at the boulder field. This is upstream of the City of Leavenworth Diversion.

### Figure 3-2. Icicle Creek Stream Flows at RM 5.8



### ICICLE CREEK ABOVE SNOW CREEK NEAR LEAVENWORTH Flow Exceedance Probability Hydrograph

(Source: Wenatchee Watershed Plan, 2006)
#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Month	Flow at USGS Gauge (cfs)	IPID Diversion (cfs)	Estimated Flow at Boulder Field (cfs)
August	203	100	92
September*	130	95	20
October (1 – 8)**	97	0	97

Table 3-5Estimated 2016 Flow at the Boulder Field

\*IPID stopped diverting on September 30

\*\*Heavy precipitation increased flows beginning October 8th

## 3.3.2.5 Reach 3

Reach 3 spans the stretch of Icicle Creek from RM 4.5 to 3.9. This reach begins at the LNFH/COIC point of diversion and ends at LNFH's Structure 2. In addition to the above described IPID and City of Leavenworth diversions, flow in Reach 3 is diminished by COIC and LNFH's diversion. LNFH diverts up to 42 cfs year-round, while COIC has the right to divert 11.9 cfs during the irrigation season (late April through September). There are no major tributaries that contribute flow to Icicle Creek in this Reach.

## 3.3.2.6 Reach 4

Reach 4 of Icicle Creek begins at RM 3.9 and ends at RM 2.7. This reach is defined as the area between LNFH's Structure 2 and the Hatchery Channel spillway. This area is also known as the historical channel and is the location of target flows under the Guiding Principles. Flows in this section of Icicle Creek are diminished by the diversions described for Reaches 1 through 3. Additionally, the operation of Structure 2 decreases flows in this reach. Structure 2 spans the Historical Channel near the entrance to the Hatchery Channel and includes two radial gates that can be lowered to limit flow to the Historical Channel and divert flow to the Hatchery Channel. Based on the size and configuration of the openings in Structure 2, if the gates are fully open, water will still begin to back up into the Hatchery Channel when the flow upstream of Structure 2 reaches approximately 300 cfs. If the gates at Structure 2 are lowered, water can be diverted to the Hatchery Channel at lower flow rates. The Hatchery Channel has an inverse grade, meaning that the invert of the channel slopes up to its Spillway. Water fills the Hatchery Channel until the water surface reaches the spillway crest at the end of the channel. If the gates at Structure 2 are fully open, the water surface in the Hatchery Channel will reach the spillway crest when the flow in Icicle Creek upstream of Structure 2 reaches approximately 990 cfs.

Historically, the gates at Structure 2 were lowered for longer periods to keep the Hatchery Channel hydrated to maintain shallow groundwater supply to the hatchery. Due to restrictions imposed by regulators in an effort to improve fish passage through the Historical Channel, the use of Structure 2 to hydrate the Hatchery Channel has decreased in recent years. However, Structure 2 is still used, when allowed, to fill the Hatchery Channel for shallow aquifer recharge and to maintain turbulent conditions at the plunge pool downstream of the spillway during tribal fishing to attract fish to the pool. In addition, Structure 2 limits the flow that can be passed on the Historical Channel to

approximately 2,600 cfs. Flows in excess of 2,600 cfs could potentially damage habitat in the Historical Channel. There are no major inputs to the system in Reach 4.

## 3.3.2.7 Reach 5

Reach 5 of Icicle Creek is from RM 2.7 to RM 0.0, which spans from the Historical Channel spillway to its confluence with the Wenatchee River. Flows in Reach 5 are impacted by the diversions described for Reaches 1 through 4. Additionally, local private irrigators have individual surface water diversions along this reach; however, these diversions are orders of magnitude smaller than the diversions described in Reaches 1 through 4. There are no tributaries in this reach, but the LNFH outfall puts a significant amount of water, approximately the amount of water LNFH diverts, back into the system at the top of this reach.

# 3.3.3 Wenatchee River Corridor

The Wenatchee River flows from the western edge of Chelan County, past Leavenworth, where it is joined by Icicle Creek, to its confluence with the Columbia River in Wenatchee. The Wenatchee River drains the 1,370-square-mile Wenatchee River Watershed, which contains 230 miles of major streams and rivers. Major tributaries to the Wenatchee River include Nason Creek, the Chiwawa River, Chiwaukum Creek, Icicle Creek, Chumstick Creek, Peshastin Creek, and Mission Creek. Icicle Creek contributes 20 percent to the Wenatchee River's flow (Watershed Planning Unit, 2006).

Figure 3-3 provides flows on the Wenatchee River at USGS gaging station 12459000, located near Dryden, just downstream of the confluence with Peshastin Creek at RM 21.5. This point is downstream of where the Wenatchee River intercepts Icicle Creek. Figure 3-3 shows 10 percent, 50 percent, and 90 percent exceedance flows on the Wenatchee River. In the Wenatchee River, flows peak in June and decline throughout summer. The lowest flows occur in September and October, after which streamflow begins to rise in response to autumn precipitation. Streamflow remains stable through much of the winter, with a steady increase beginning in March and April in response to snowmelt, until stream flow peaks again in June. The 50 percent peak exceedance flow that occurs in June is nearly 10,000 cfs. The 50 percent low flow exceedance, which occurs at the end of September and beginning of October, is approximately 600 cfs.

## 3.3.3.1 Overall Water Budget

The overall water budget of Icicle Creek surface water resources involves various basin inputs and basin outputs. Basin inputs include direct precipitation that falls as either rain or snow, whereas outputs include surface water diversions (less return flow), surface and subsurface water outflow, evaporation, evapotranspiration, and groundwater recharge.

#### **ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN**

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 3-3. Wenatchee Stream Flow near Peshastin Creek



<sup>(</sup>Source: Wenatchee Watershed Plan, 2006)

### **Basin Input**

Basin inputs primarily consist of precipitation (both as rain and snow). Typically, snow begins accumulating in the highest elevations of the basin in early fall (September/October) and continues through early spring (March/April). The other type of basin input typically considered in water balance calculations include inter-basin transfers of water (e.g., transfer of water in from an external basin); however, this condition does not exist in the Icicle Creek Subbasin.

The Icicle Creek hydrograph in Figure 3-2 shows the basin inputs as they directly relate to stream flow. The mean annual streamflow at the USGS gage at RM 5.8 is 669 cfs (Wenatchee Assessment, 2003). The mean annual volume is 483,484 acre-feet (Wenatchee Assessment, 2003).

The Wenatchee hydrograph in Figure 3-3 shows the basin inputs as they directly relate to stream flow. The mean annual stream flow at the Wenatchee River gage near Peshastin is 3,099 cfs (Wenatchee Assessment, 2003). The mean annual volume is 2,239,941 acrefeet (Wenatchee Assessment, 2003).

### **Basin Outputs**

Basin outputs consist of evaporation (i.e., from surface water features such as lakes/reservoirs, rivers, and canals), evapotranspiration (e.g., vegetative cover whether naturally occurring or otherwise), surface and shallow subsurface outflow (e.g., Icicle Creek flow), deep recharge (aquifer recharge), out-of-basin transfers (e.g., IPID and COIC diversion), and other consumptive uses such as domestic and municipal supplies from groundwater in continuity with surface water. Basin outputs include:

- IPID Diversion (less return flow) 117 cfs; 30,000 acre-feet
- COIC Diversion (less return flow) up to 11.9 cfs; 3,500 acre-feet
- City of Leavenworth Diversion 6.2 cfs; up to 4,480 acre-feet
- LNFH Diversion (less return flow) 42 cfs; 30,353 acre-feet
- Evapotranspiration Unknown
- Rural domestic wells 1 cfs; 724 acre-feet (Aspect, 2013)
- Other permitted water uses 9.35 cfs; 1,150 acre-feet

Figure 3-4 provides a summary of the Icicle Water Budget, as prepared by the Watershed Planning Unit in 2006. In Figure 3-4, for Municipal and Domestic demand, the purple bar represents municipal demand and the black bar represents non-municipal domestic demand. For stream flows, the purple bar represents high flows (10 percent exceedance), the black bar represents average flow (50 percent exceedance), and the yellow bar represents low flows (90 percent exceedance). Figure 3-4 indicates that the quantity of water allocated for Icicle Creek exceeds the total water available at 10 percent exceedance flow (high streamflow years). Most of this use is attributed to irrigation water rights. However, this analysis is of all water rights in Ecology's water rights database, which may include water rights that have not been beneficially used in the past and are



#### Figure 3-4. Icicle Water Budget

(Source: Wenatchee Watershed Plan, 2006)

Notes: Mun. = municipal; Dom. = domestic; IR. = irrigation; Certs = certificates; Qi = instantaneous quantity; Apps = applications; Comm/Ind = commercial and industrial; W.R. = water right; Prop = propagation

subject to relinquishment. Water rights in Washington State are based on beneficial use, and water rights that are not used are not considered valid and are known as "paper" water rights. Because this analysis did not examine the validity of water rights, actual use in the watershed may be lower.

Figure 3-5 provides a summary of the Wenatchee River Watershed Water Budget, as prepared by the Watershed Planning Unit in 2006. In Figure 3-5, for Municipal and Domestic demand, the purple bar represents municipal demand and the black bar represents non-municipal domestic demand. For flows, the purple bar represents high flows (10 percent exceedance), the black bar represents average flow (50 percent exceedance), and the yellow bar represents low flows (90 percent exceedance). Figure 3-5 indicates that the quantity of water allocated for the Wenatchee River Watershed is within the high range of available flows but exceeds the 50 percent and 90 percent exceedance flows. As is the case in Icicle Creek, most of this use is attributed to irrigation water rights and claims. However, as discussed above, this analysis did on examine the validity of water rights, and actual use may be lower.



Figure 3-5. Wenatchee River Watershed Water Budget

(Source: Wenatchee Watershed Plan, 2006)

# 3.4 Groundwater Resources

This section describes the occurrence and movement of groundwater in the Icicle project area. Groundwater quality is discussed in Section 3.5.3, Groundwater Quality. Groundwater resources organized by sub-region:

- The Alpine Lakes (Square, Upper and Lower Klonaqua, Eightmile, Upper and Lower Snow, and Nada Lakes);
- The Icicle Creek drainage from the Alpine Lakes to the confluence with the Wenatchee River; and
- The Wenatchee River Corridor from just upstream of Icicle Creek to the confluence with the Columbia River.

These areas were defined based both on similarity of hydrogeologic conditions within each area, and on where the effect of specific actions (e.g., lake storage restoration, improved irrigation efficiencies, etc.) would be expected to occur. Information and previous studies used to develop this section include:

• Advance Project Plan, Well Rehabilitation, Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery (Robinson & Noble, 1989)

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- Initial Watershed Assessment Water Resources Inventory Area (WRIA) 45 Wenatchee River Watershed (Ecology, 1995)
- WRIA 45 Summary of Groundwater/Surface Water Interaction and Groundwater Resource References (Golder, 2005)
- Groundwater Data Summary for the Wenatchee River Watershed Total Maximum Daily Load Study (Ecology, 2007)
- Groundwater Conditions at the Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, Leavenworth, Washington (USBR, 2010)
- Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Groundwater Model Update Technical Memorandum (USBR, 2014)
- Leavenworth national Fish Hatchery Water Source Assessment (Aspect, 2014).
- Alternatives Evaluation Study Public release Version Cascade Orchards Irrigation Company (Anchor QEA, 2015)
- Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Geophysical Survey Results and Recommendations (Aspect 2015)
- Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Groundwater Supply Investigation (Aspect 2015)
- Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Infiltration Gallery Conceptual Alignment (Aspect 2015)

The remainder of this Section provides an overview of hydrogeologic conditions in the project area, groundwater occurrence and flow within the locations described above, and groundwater uses.

# 3.4.1 Hydrogeologic Setting

This description of the hydrogeologic setting in the Icicle project area builds on the geologic conditions described in Section 3.2, Earth. As discussed previously, bedrock geology in the project area is dominated by crystalline metamorphic and igneous intrusive rock, with the surficial occurrence of sedimentary sandstone, siltstone, and shale rocks in the project area limited to the slopes east and southeast of the City of Leavenworth. Unconsolidated glacial and alluvial deposits overlie the bedrock adjacent to the Alpine Lakes, along the Icicle Creek drainage and its tributaries, and along the Wenatchee River to the Columbia River. These unconsolidated deposits are laterally discontinuous along the Alpine Lakes and in the Icicle Creek drainage above LNFH, where the bedrock-bound valleys are narrow. Adjacent to and below LNFH the Icicle Creek drainage broadens as it approaches the Wenatchee River. Through this area and downstream to the Columbia River the unconsolidated deposits increase in thickness and become laterally continuous.

Groundwater is ultimately derived from precipitation and snowmelt infiltrating through surficial soils and rock, recharging the groundwater system. Groundwater flow is expected to generally follow topography, flowing from higher elevations to lower elevations, sub-parallel to the flows of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. There is expected to be a high degree of hydraulic continuity between the unconsolidated deposits and surface waters where the two are in contact, with groundwater discharging to or being recharged by surface water depending on location and time of year.

Movement and occurrence of groundwater is controlled primarily by the physical characteristics of the geologic units. In general, wells completed in the bedrock have low reported production capacity, with yields on the order of 1 gallon per minute (gpm), although some wells completed in weathered bedrock reportedly produce yields on the order of 15 gpm (Ecology, 1995). The coarse-grained unconsolidated deposits (e.g., sands and gravels), especially at and below LNFH, are the main source of groundwater in the area. Wells completed in coarse-grained deposits reportedly yield from 5 gpm to more than 100 gpm. Finer-grained unconsolidated deposits (silt, clay, and glacial till) generally do not yield significant quantities of water and may act as barriers to flow, where present.

# 3.4.2 Groundwater Occurrence and Movement

The following subsections provide a more detailed description of the occurrence and movement of groundwater in the four different areas, with the Icicle Creek sub-region being divided at LNFH.

## 3.4.2.1 Alpine Lakes

Surficial geology within the Alpine Lakes sub-region of the project area is dominated by igneous intrusive and metamorphic bedrock, with limited unconsolidated deposits mapped only around the shoreline of Eightmile Lake. Detailed water budget data for the lakes are not available but given the prevalence of low-permeability bedrock and the steep terrain, lake hydrology is expected to be dominated by precipitation and snowmelt runoff, with groundwater recharge and discharge a relatively minor component of the water budget.

The limited amount of precipitation and runoff that recharges the bedrock and alluvial groundwater systems is expected to flow toward and discharge to the lakes or migrate down-valley before discharging to the Icicle Creek drainage. This flow pattern is affected by lake stage. When the lakes are at high stage (e.g., during spring runoff or as the result of storage operations) these flows may reverse, with surface water recharging groundwater. Although a minor part of the overall water budget, groundwater likely supports late season water levels in the lakes and downstream flows by discharging to surface water when the lakes at lower stages (e.g., during the summer or fall or as the result of releases from storage operations).

## 3.4.2.2 Icicle Creek Corridor

## Tributaries and Icicle Creek Reach 1 and 2

Surficial geology along the Icicle Creek drainage from the Alpine Lakes to LNFH is dominated by igneous intrusive and metamorphic bedrock, with discontinuous unconsolidated alluvial and glacial deposits mapped along the creek and its tributaries. The creek valley in this section is relatively narrow with steep walls. Similar to the Alpine Lakes, given the prevalence of low-permeability bedrock and the steep terrain,

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

hydrology in the Icicle Creek drainage is expected to be dominated by precipitation and snowmelt runoff, with only limited groundwater recharge or discharge.

Groundwater occurring in the bedrock and discontinuous alluvial systems is expected to discharge to Icicle Creek and its tributaries. This relationship may be temporarily reversed during periods of high surface water stage and flow, with surface water recharging groundwater. Although groundwater is a minor part of the annual water budget for Icicle Creek and its tributaries above LNFH, groundwater discharge to surface water likely helps support late season flows in the creek.

## Icicle Creek Reach 3, 4, and 5

Icicle Creek transitions from a narrow, bedrock-dominated valley to a broader valley with more extensive unconsolidated glacial and alluvial deposits immediately upstream of LNFH at approximately RM 4. This change in geologic conditions has a significant effect on the occurrence and movement of groundwater, with groundwater contained in unconsolidated deposits playing a significant role in the overall water budget.

The upstream edge of this area also coincides with the location of a surface water diversion on Icicle Creek shared by LNFH and COIC. LNFH conveys surface water in a pipeline from the diversion to the hatchery facilities. COIC conveys water in an unlined canal located along the west edge of the alluvial valley, serving lands between the canal and Icicle Creek downstream to the Wenatchee River. Another diversion, operated by IPID, is located further upstream. The IPID canal is largely lined and extends along the east side of the valley and down the Wenatchee River valley, serving lands near the mouth of Icicle Creek and along the Wenatchee River. LNFH also operates the Hatchery Channel, a human-made channel constructed between the LNFH facility and Icicle Creek. The Hatchery Channel is periodically hydrated with water diverted from Icicle Creek to improve recharge to the unconsolidated deposits and support water levels and yields from LNFH's nearby water supply wells.

Surficial geology along the valley floor is mapped as alluvial deposits. Intrusive and metamorphic bedrock is mapped along the steep slopes of the west edge of the valley, and glacial deposits mantle the slopes on the east side of the valley. Depth to bedrock underlying the valley floor is on the order of 150 to 250 feet, depending on location. The alluvial deposits include coarse-grained sand, gravel, and cobbles that readily transmit water, and finer-grained silts and clays that restrict groundwater flow. The coarser-grained deposits form a shallow, unconfined aquifer and a deeper, semi-confined aquifer separated by a discontinuous layer of finer-grained deposits. LNFH operates water supply wells completed in both the shallow and deeper unconsolidated aquifers, with recent combined well yields on the order of 4,000 gpm (USBR, 2010).

Sources of groundwater in this area include direct infiltration of precipitation and snowmelt, recharge from surface water of Icicle Creek and the Hatchery Channel when hydrated, and seasonal leakage from the COIC and IPID irrigation canals. Previous studies (USBR, 2010; USBR, 2014) indicate a high degree of hydraulic continuity between the unconsolidated aquifers and surface waters of Icicle Creek and the Hatchery Channel. Active management of Icicle Creek, Hatchery Channel, and pumping of LNFH's groundwater supply wells all affect groundwater flow and occurrence in this area. Absent these factors, groundwater flow is expected to be generally down valley, with a component of flow toward Icicle Creek. During periods of high stage in Icicle Creek (e.g., spring runoff) or when the Hatchery Channel is hydrated, groundwater is expected to be recharged from surface water. During periods of lower stage, or when LNFH is operating their supply wells, Icicle Creek generally loses water, recharging the aquifers.

Some seasonal groundwater recharge also likely occurs as a result of leakage from the irrigation canals. A seepage loss study of the unlined COIC canal identified relatively minor losses from the canal of about 5 percent of total flows, or about 0.3 cfs during the period evaluated. Although a seepage loss study has not recently been completed for the IPID canal, the IPID canal is mostly lined through this area, so losses are expected to be less than those for the unlined COIC canal.

## 3.4.2.3 Wenatchee River Corridor

Surficial geology in the project area downstream from Icicle Creek is predominantly unconsolidated alluvium along the Wenatchee River Valley floor, with sedimentary bedrock forming the valley walls. Depth to bedrock underlying the valley floor is on the order of 100 to 200 feet, depending on location. The alluvial deposits include coarse-grained sand, gravel, and cobbles that readily transmit water, and finer-grained silts and clays that restrict groundwater flow.

Groundwater occurs primarily in the unconsolidated alluvial deposits, with bedrock representing a minor component of the water budget. Wells completed in the bedrock have low reported production capacities, with yields on the order of 1 gpm, although some wells completed in weathered bedrock reportedly produce yields on the order of 15 gpm (Ecology, 1995). Wells completed in the alluvium report yields ranging from about 5 gpm to more than 100 gpm, depending in part on the characteristics of the unconsolidated materials (e.g., grain size, saturated thickness).

Sources of groundwater in this area include direct infiltration of precipitation and snowmelt, recharge from surface water of the Wenatchee River, and infiltration of irrigation and domestic (septic) return flows. Based on the generally coarse-grained nature and relatively thick sequence of unconsolidated deposits adjacent to the Wenatchee River, a high degree of hydraulic continuity is expected between the river and groundwater. This assumption is supported by an Ecology-led study of groundwatersurface water interaction and nutrient loading in the Wenatchee River Watershed (Ecology, 2007) that identified gaining and losing reaches along the entire length of the river, with some areas showing a seasonal transition from gaining to losing conditions.

# 3.4.3 Groundwater Uses

Groundwater uses in the project area include municipal supply for the Cities of Leavenworth and Cashmere, municipal and multiple domestic supply to smaller water systems, supply to the LNFH for fish propagation, and water right permit-exempt domestic uses. No groundwater uses were identified in the Alpine Lakes area. Groundwater uses within the Icicle Creek drainage above LNFH are limited to about 50

### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

to 60 apparent permit-exempt wells located mostly along Icicle Creek Road, identified based on review of Ecology's well log database. Most of these wells appear to be completed in bedrock rather than unconsolidated deposits.

Groundwater uses in the area from the LNFH to the Wenatchee River include LNFH's permitted withdrawals and apparent permit-exempt domestic uses. LNFH holds water rights that authorize groundwater withdrawals of 6,700 gpm on an instantaneous basis, up to 7,677 acre-feet/year. The number of permit-exempt uses in this area is uncertain, but approximately 300 water well logs from this area were identified in Ecology's well log database.

Groundwater uses downstream from Icicle Creek to the Columbia River include municipal supply for the Cities of Leavenworth and Cashmere, municipal and multiple domestic supply to smaller water systems, and water right permit-exempt domestic uses. Based on information in their Water System Plan, the City of Leavenworth holds two groundwater rights that authorize withdrawal of 3,000 gpm (6.68 cfs), up to 2,000 acrefeet/year. The Water System Plan states annual quantities authorized for withdrawal under these groundwater rights are non-additive to the City of Leavenworth's surface water rights to Icicle Creek; further, 2,000 gpm (4.46 cfs) of the instantaneous withdrawals authorized under these rights is interruptible and subject to curtailment when flows in Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River fall below minimum rates. As discussed in Section 1.8 of this document, the City of Leavenworth's water rights are currently under appeal and attributes may change based on the outcome of this litigation.

A water right summary provided by the City of Cashmere indicates they hold four groundwater rights that authorize withdrawal of 1,400 gpm (3.12 cfs), up to 1,227 acrefeet/year. Like the City of Leavenworth, these rights include a combination of additive and non-additive quantities to other water rights. These groundwater rights are not subject to interruption based on instream flows, but several of the City of Cashmere's surface water rights are subject to instream flows. Note that this summary of groundwater rights held by the Cities of Leavenworth and Cashmere was based on review of information provided by the two cities and gathered from Ecology water right files; this review does not represent an extent and validity review and is not intended to determine the validity of quantities of water available under these groundwater rights.

# 3.5 Water Quality

This section describes water quality of surface and groundwater in the Icicle project area that could be affected by the Program Alternatives. Section 3.3, Surface Water Resources, and Section 3.4, Groundwater Resources, describe these resources in greater detail. The project area includes the Alpine Lakes area within the Icicle Creek Basin, Icicle Creek down to its confluence with the Wenatchee River, the mainstem Wenatchee River from just upstream of Icicle Creek down to its confluence with the Columbia River, and underlying shallow and deep aquifers.

# 3.5.1 Regulatory Setting

The federal CWA, passed in 1972, aims to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters. As part of this goal, the CWA sets forth the basic structure for regulating pollutant discharges to surface waterways (e.g., lakes, rivers, ponds, streams, and wetlands) and groundwater (e.g., shallow and deeper aquifers) from both point and non-point sources. The CWA includes provisions for the development of water quality standards, institutes a water quality assessment process to identify impaired waters that do not meet the water quality standards, and establishes the NPDES permitting program to regulate point sources that discharge pollutants to waters of the United States.

The CWA is administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in coordination with state governments. Water quality standards are developed by individual states with oversight from the EPA. Water quality standards identify the potential designated or beneficial uses of surface water bodies within the state (e.g., aquatic life, recreation, and water supply), set water quality criteria (numeric pollutant concentrations and narrative requirements) to provide protection of those designated uses, and include antidegradation policies to protect high quality waters and specify how water quality criteria are to be implemented. The water quality standards for aquatic life and public use of Washington's surface waters are developed and administered by Ecology (Chapter 173-201A WAC; Ecology, 2012a). Where appropriate, these standards are supplemented by the EPA's *Quality Criteria for Water 1986* (EPA, 1986) and its associated amendments. Human health-based water quality criteria used by Ecology are contained in the National Toxics Rule (40 CFR Part 131).

Sections 303(d) and 305(b) of the CWA require states to identify surface waters that do not meet water quality standards and to report the water quality condition of these waters to EPA biennially in the form of a Water Quality Assessment and Integrated Report. This report is used to identify impaired waters that may require the preparation of a water cleanup plan, such as a TMDL allocation or other water quality improvement project. A TMDL describes the type, amount, and sources of water pollution in a particular waterbody, provides an analysis of how much the pollution needs to be reduced or eliminated to meet water quality standards, and establishes targets and strategies to control the pollution in that waterbody (Ecology, 2016a).

Ecology's current Water Quality Assessment and Integrated 305(b) report and 303(d) list were approved by EPA on July 22, 2016. The Water Quality Assessment classifies assessed surface waters into the following water quality categories:

- Category 1 Meets tested standards for clean waters
- Category 2 Waters of concern
- Category 3 Insufficient data
- Category 4 Polluted waters that do not require a TMDL and have pollution problems that are being solved in one of the three following ways:
  - Category 4a Has an approved TMDL in place

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- Category 4b Has a pollution control program in place
- Category 4c Is impaired by a non-pollutant, such as low water flow or dams
- Category 5 Polluted waters that require a TMDL or other water quality improvement project

Category 5 waters are placed on the Section 303(d) list of waters whose beneficial uses have been impaired by pollution. Once a water is placed on the Section 303(d) list, Ecology must then work to develop a TMDL or other water quality improvement project to address the identified impairments.

If there is also a discharge that impacts groundwater, then the requirements of a state waste discharge permit must also be incorporated into the NPDES permit per Chapter 173-200 WAC. Where appropriate, these standards are supplemented by the EPA's *Groundwater Rule* (EPA, 2006)<sup>1</sup>, which provides for the protection of public groundwater systems.

## 3.5.2 Surface Water Quality

As described in Section 3.3, Surface Water Resources, surface waters within the Icicle project area include select Alpine Lakes and their receiving streams that flow to Icicle Creek, Icicle Creek from its headwaters to its confluence with the Wenatchee River, and the Wenatchee River from just upstream of Icicle Creek to the Columbia River. The Wenatchee River and Icicle Creek have been listed on multiple versions of Washington's CWA 303(d) list for temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, and fecal coliform bacteria (Table 3-6). Other water quality issues include surface water contamination with polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT) and its breakdown products (e.g., dichloro-diphenyl-dichloroethane [4,4'-DDD] and dichloro-diphenyl-ethane [4,4'-DDE]), and various other organic pesticides.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Ground Water Rule (GWR) 71 FR 65574, November 8, 2006, Vol. 71, No. 216 Correction 71 FR 67427, November 21, 2006, Vol. 71, No. 224

	Water Quality Parameters										
Waterbody	1996	1998	2004	2008	2012	Current <sup>2</sup>					
Icicle Creek	Temperature, Dissolved Oxygen, pH, Instream Flow	Temperature, Dissolved Oxygen, pH, Instream Flow	Temperature, Dissolved Oxygen, pH	Dissolved Oxygen, pH	None	4,4'-DDE, PCB					
Wenatchee River	Temperature, Dissolved Oxygen, pH, Instream Flow	Temperature, Dissolved Oxygen, pH, Instream Flow	Temperature, Dissolved Oxygen, pH, 4,4'-DDT, 4,4'-DDD, 4,4'-DDE, Alpha BHC, PCB	Dissolved Oxygen, pH, 4,4'-DDE, PCB	4,4'- DDE, PCB	4,4'-DDE, PCB, Endosulfan					

 
 Table 3-6

 Clean Water Act Section 303(d) (Category 5) Listings for Project Waterbodies in the Primary and Secondary Project Development Areas

Source: Ecology 2016b

Impaired water quality can adversely affect the designated or beneficial uses of a waterbody, including decreased aesthetic or recreational opportunities, lowered habitat function, and adverse impacts on wildlife and humans. Most of these water quality impairments in the Wenatchee River Watershed occur in the lower portions of the watershed and are largely a result of the much higher degree of urban and agricultural development in the Wenatchee River Corridor.

Within the Wenatchee River Watershed, temperature impairment of water quality has been historically recorded in the lower portion of the watershed within both Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River (Table 3-6). Water quality degradation related to temperature is caused by a variety of both natural and human-induced processes that contribute to increases in water temperature in streams and other waterbodies. Because warmer water holds less dissolved oxygen than cooler water, increased water temperatures can affect the types of organisms able to live in a waterbody, as well as impairing other designated uses such as recreation and water supply. Increased stream temperatures can result from increases in suspended sediments, removal of riparian vegetation, and decreased instream flows from surface water diversions and groundwater withdrawals.

In addition to increased water temperature, high levels of nutrients, primarily nitrogen and phosphorus, can also result in lowered dissolved oxygen levels. If large amounts of nutrients are available, aquatic plant growth can become excessive and the eventual decomposition of these plants can deplete the water of dissolved oxygen. In the Wenatchee River Watershed, phosphorus is the primary nutrient of concern and enters the river system from a variety of both point and non-point sources. Point sources include wastewater treatment plants and fish hatcheries, and non-point sources include septic

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The Washington Department of Ecology's current Water Quality Assessment was submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in September 2015; it was approved by EPA on July 22, 2016.

## ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

systems, agricultural runoff, and abandoned or closed landfills (Ecology, 2009). Such sources are most commonly found in the downstream portion of the project area.

Excessive plant growth from heavy nutrient loading can also cause large, relatively sudden, swings in the pH of the water (Ecology, 2009), which can affect the availability of nutrients and metals and adversely affect aquatic species. High pH (i.e., alkaline) levels are typically encountered in parts of the lower Wenatchee River Watershed and affect aquatic organisms, including all life stages of anadromous fish, by impairing their salt and water balancing process and increasing the toxicity of some contaminants (Ecology, 2009).

Fecal coliform refers to potential disease-causing pathogens (e.g., bacteria and viruses) associated with human and animal waste, which can enter the water body through multiple sources. Water quality degradation from fecal coliform primarily affects water use designations, such as water supply, stock watering, aquatic life support, wildlife habitat, and recreation.

PCBs are organic chlorine compounds that were manufactured in the United States between 1929 and 1979 (Hobbs and Friese, 2016). Common sources of PCB contamination include older electrical equipment (e.g., transformers and capacitors), paints, inks, and sealants. Historically, PCBs have been released into the environment mainly through volatilization into the atmosphere and spills into waterways and onto land. PCBs are known to be carcinogenic and to have adverse effects on the immune, endocrine, nervous, and reproductive systems of humans. In the Wenatchee River Watershed, PCB levels have exceeded water quality standards in portions of the Wenatchee River since 2004 and more recently in the lower-most portion of Icicle Creek in 2015 (Table 3-6).

DDT is a water-resistant chlorinated insecticide that was heavily used to control orchard pests in the Wenatchee River Watershed between the mid-1940s and 1972, when its use was banned by the EPA (Ecology, 2007b). Within the Wenatchee River Watershed, the concentration of DDT and its derivatives have exceeded water quality standards in the lower portion of Icicle Creek and portions of the Wenatchee River more recently (Table 3-6).

To date, Ecology has developed several water quality improvement projects to address impairments that affect project surface waters (Table 3-7). These include TMDLs for temperature (Ecology, 2007b), and dissolved oxygen and pH (Ecology, 2009).

Water Quality Improvement Project Name	Pollutant(s)	Applicable Surface Waters	Status
Wenatchee River Watershed Temperature Total Maximum Daily Load	Temperature	<ul> <li>Chiwaukum Creek</li> <li>Icicle Creek</li> <li>Little Wenatchee River</li> <li>Mission Creek</li> <li>Nason Creek</li> <li>Peshastin Creek</li> <li>Brender Creek</li> <li>Chumstick Creek</li> <li>Wenatchee River</li> </ul>	EPA approved August 2007
Wenatchee River Watershed	Dissolved	Wenatchee River	EPA approved
Dissolved Oxygen and pH Total Maximum Daily Load	Oxygen, pH	vvatersned	August 2009

 
 Table 3-7

 Water Quality Improvement Projects Affecting Project Surface Waters and Associated Tributaries

Source: Ecology 2016c.

Current water quality is discussed for each of the major project waters in the following sections.

## 3.5.2.1 Alpine Lakes

As noted in Section 3.3, Surface Water Resources, surface waters within the Icicle Creek Basin originate from high lakes located in the Central Cascades of Washington. This portion of the Icicle project area includes eight lakes: Square Lake, Upper Klonaqua Lake, Lower Klonaqua Lake, Eightmile Lake, Colchuck Lake, Nada Lake, Upper Snow Lake, and Lower Snow Lake, and their receiving streams. These lakes support a variety of designated uses as listed in WAC 173-201A-600, including aquatic life uses, the highest quality recreational use type, and all water supply and miscellaneous uses defined under WAC 173-201A-200 (Table 3-8).

Information on the historic and current water quality of the project lakes is limited, and no water quality studies are listed on the interactive Washington State Lakes Environmental Data website (Ecology, 2016d). Historic lake reconnaissance studies conducted for the USGS in the mid- to late-1970s (Dion et al., 1976; Denthier et al., 1979) provide some basic water quality information for a limited number of lakes. A 1976 study conducted by Dion and others included six of the eight lakes being considered in this EIS (Upper Klonaqua Lake, Lower Klonaqua Lake, Eightmile Lake, Colchuck Lake, Upper Snow Lake, and Lower Snow Lake). That study found the water quality of those lakes to be quite high, with all six lakes having high levels of dissolved oxygen throughout the entire water column and very low nutrient (nitrogen and phosphorus) and bacteria (fecal coliform) levels. Denthier et al. (1979) classified the water quality of these lakes as being excellent, as indicated by high water clarity and low concentrations of dissolved solids. All of the lakes in the Icicle project area were being managed for water storage at the time these studies were conducted.

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Table 3-8
Designated Use Listings for Project Waters in the Primary and Secondary Project Development Areas

		Aq	uatic	Life U	ses		Recre	ation l	Jses	Wat	ter Sup	oply U	ses	N	liscell	aneou	ıs Use	s
Waterbody	Char Spawning/Rearing	Core Summer Habitat	Spawning/Rearing	Rearing/Migration Only	Redband Trout	Warm Water Species	Extraordinary Primary Contact	Primary Contact	Secondary Contact	Domestic Water	Industrial Water	Agricultural Water	Stock Water	Wildlife Habitat	Harvesting	Commerce/Navigation	Boating	Aesthetics
Alpine Lakes and Receiving Streams (Square Lake, Klonaqua Lake, Eightmile Lake, Colchuck Lake, Nada Lake, Upper Snow Lake, and Lower Snow Lake)		x	x	x			х			x	х	х	x	х	х	x	х	х
Icicle Creek (including tributaries) from mouth to National Forest boundary		х						х		х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х
Icicle Creek (including tributaries) from National Forest boundary to confluence with Jack Creek		х					x			x	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х
Icicle Creek above and including Jack Creek (including all tributaries)	х						х			х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х
Wenatchee River mainstem between mouth and Peshastin Creek			х	Х				х		х	Х	Х	x	х	Х	х	Х	х
Wenatchee River mainstem between Peshastin Creek and the Wenatchee National Forest boundary		х						х		х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х	х

The high water quality of the lakes has been primarily attributed to two factors: 1) limited use by humans due their remoteness, relative inaccessibility, and regulatory protections; and 2) the abundant annual precipitation that allows large volumes of water to flow through them every year, diluting and flushing out any accumulated pollutants (Gilliom et al., 1980). In their 1980 study for USGS, Gilliom et al. analyzed the susceptibility of 60 lakes (including all eight of the project lakes) to water quality degradation by recreational use and determined that all of the project lakes had a low susceptibility to long-term, whole-lake degradation from recreation activities. Although the effect of water management activities on water quality was not specifically addressed in that study, such activities were occurring at the time of the study and would have influenced the water quality observations that were made.

Potential sources of water quality degradation that could affect the lakes are largely limited to recreational uses (e.g., camping and hiking) and ongoing water retention and storage activities by the IPID and USFWS. The major types of pollutants that could enter these lakes from recreational activities include nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), pathogens (bacterial, protozoa, and viruses), and sediment. For water retention and storage activities, potential pollutants would primarily be limited to sediment.

None of the lakes or their immediate receiving waters are listed as impaired under Section 303(d) of the CWA. Snow Creek, which receives flow from Nada Lake and Lower Snow Lake, is listed as a water of concern (Category 2) for temperature, pH, and dissolved oxygen in Ecology's current Water Quality Assessment (Ecology, 2016b). Waters listed under Category 2 may have pollution levels that are not quite high enough to violate the water quality standards or there may not have been enough violations to categorize it as impaired according to Ecology's listing policy (Ecology, 2016e). The location of these listings occurs in the vicinity of Snow Creek's confluence with Icicle Creek, which is located downstream of the diversion shared by IPID and the City of Leavenworth and upstream of the diversion shared by the LNFH and COIC. There are no permitted NPDES outfalls on any of the lakes or their immediate receiving waters.

## 3.5.2.2 Icicle Creek Corridor

Designated uses for Icicle Creek are specified in WAC 173-201A-602 and summarized in Table 3-8. Designated uses include aquatic life support, medium to high quality recreational uses, and all water supply and miscellaneous uses defined under WAC 173-201A-200. Potential sources of water quality degradation that affect Icicle Creek include flow diversion, stormwater runoff from adjacent roads and developed areas, point-source discharges from water treatment plants and other facilities, non-point pollutants from septic systems, and recreational uses. Water quality parameters affected by pollutants from these sources include temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, turbidity, nutrients, fecal coliform bacteria, and concentrations of various pollutants including heavy metals and organic compounds.

The Leavenworth Water Treatment Plan is an NPDES-permitted facility on Icicle Creek (Ecology, 2016f). That facility is permitted to discharge both process wastewater and non-routine and unanticipated wastewater to Icicle Creek through an outfall located approximately 0.4 mile downstream from the Snow Creek confluence under an NPDES

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

General Permit for Water Treatment Plants (Ecology NPDES Permit No. WAG645001). The LNFH also has an NPDES permit to discharge wastewater from the hatchery into Icicle Creek (NPDES Permit No. WA0001902). The hatcheries outfall is located at RM 2.7.

Annual temperature monitoring in Icicle Creek has been conducted by the USFWS since 2005 in locations upstream, adjacent to, and downstream of the LNFH (Hall and Kelly-Ringel, 2011; Hall and Henry, 2012; Hall, 2013a, 2013b; Fraser, 2015a, 2015b). Throughout this period, monitoring has indicated that the cumulative effect of two LNFH operations—supplementation with Snow Creek water and the mixing of hatchery return water with well water—reduces in-water temperatures in Icicle Creek during the summer months.

Ecology's current Water Quality Assessment (Ecology, 2016b) records three Category 5 water quality impairment listings for Icicle Creek under Section 303(d) of the CWA (Table 3-6). Two of these are for PCBs and occur in sections of stream channel both upstream and downstream of the East Leavenworth Road Bridge. The other Category 5 listing is for 4,4'-DDE and occurs in a section of the stream upstream from the East Leavenworth Road Bridge. All of these detections were found in the tissue of fish collected from these stream reaches.

During a recent Ecology source assessment study for PCBs and DDT in the Wenatchee River Watershed (Hobbs and Friese, 2016), researchers found that the greater bioaccumulation of PCBs in the Wenatchee River Watershed food web is occurring downstream from Cashmere, approximately 10 RM downstream from the Icicle Creek listing locations. These data appear to suggest that the fish collected from the Icicle Creek reaches were migrating fish that had been feeding in downstream areas. As such, the researchers suggest that the Icicle Creek 303(d) listings for PCBs may be inappropriate.

In addition to its Category 5 listings, Icicle Creek also has several Category 4a listings (approved TMDL in place) for temperature, dissolved oxygen, and pH on Ecology's current Water Quality Assessment (Ecology, 2016b). One Category 4c listing (impairment by a non-pollutant) is also included for instream flow.

The Category 4a temperature listings in Icicle Creek occur between Boggy Creek and Jack Creek, between Doctor Creek and Ida Creek, downstream of Fourth of July Creek, upstream of Bridge Creek, downstream of Eightmile Creek, both upstream and downstream of Snow Creek, downstream of the East Leavenworth Road Bridge, and upstream of the Icicle Creek confluence with the Wenatchee River. The lower portion of Jack Creek is also listed as a Category 4a water for temperature. These listings are being addressed by the Wenatchee River Watershed Temperature TMDL, which was approved by the EPA in August 2007 (Ecology, 2007b).

Category 4a listings for dissolved oxygen and pH occur downstream of the East Leavenworth Road Bridge and upstream of Icicle Creek's confluence with the Wenatchee River (Ecology, 2016b). The Icicle Creek LNFH diversion channel is also listed as a Category 4A water for dissolved oxygen. These impairments are addressed under the Wenatchee River Watershed Dissolved Oxygen and pH TMDL, which was approved by the EPA in August 2009 (Ecology, 2009) and its associated addendum (Ecology, 2012b).

A portion of Icicle Creek is also Category 4c listed for instream flow impairment. Multiple flow studies performed during the 1990s determined that measured flows in this section of the channel did not meet the instream flows set by the Instream Resources Protection Program – Wenatchee River Watershed, WRIA 45 (Chapter 173-545 WAC) nearly 45 percent of the time or for 66 days on average from August to October (Ecology, 2016g). These conditions are attributed to upstream consumptive uses of water, including streamflow diversions for irrigation, municipal water supply for the City of Leavenworth, and process water supply for the LNFH.

Ecology's current Water Quality Assessment also lists multiple Category 2 (waters of concern) listings for Icicle Creek. Two Category 2 listing for temperature occur in locations both immediately upstream of and within the LNFH diversion channel. Seven Category 2 listings for dissolved oxygen occur in locations between Boggy Creek and Jack Creek, between Bob Creek and Doctor Creek, upstream from its confluence with Bridge Creek, both upstream and within the LNFH diversion channel, and upstream of the East Leavenworth Road Bridge. Jack Creek is also listed as a Category 2 water for temperature. As with the Category 4a listings, areas of low dissolved oxygen are being addressed under the August 2009 Wenatchee River Watershed Dissolved Oxygen and pH TMDL (Ecology, 2009) and its associated addendum (Ecology, 2012b).

## 3.5.2.3 Wenatchee River Corridor

Designated uses for the Wenatchee River are specified in WAC 173-201A-600 and WAC 173-201A-602 and summarized in Table 3-8. Designated uses include aquatic life support, medium to high quality recreational uses, and all water supply and miscellaneous uses defined under WAC 173-201A-200. Lands within the Wenatchee River Corridor are much more heavily developed than lands located in the higher elevations of the Icicle project area and include several urban areas (Cities of Leavenworth, Peshastin, Dryden, Cashmere, Monitor, Sunnyslope, and Wenatchee) and considerable agricultural lands. As such, potential sources of water quality degradation are more numerous and include flow diversion; point-source discharges from publicly owned treatment works (POTW), municipal stormwater systems, industrial facilities, fish hatchery effluent discharges, and irrigation returns; and non-point pollutants from septic systems, urban runoff, and agricultural runoff. Water quality parameters that are affected by pollutants from these sources include temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, turbidity, nutrients, fecal coliform bacteria, and concentrations of various pollutants including heavy metals and organic compounds.

Multiple NPDES-permitted facilities discharge to the Wenatchee River. Permitted outfalls include those for the Leavenworth, Peshastin, Dryden, and Cashmere POTWs; multiple fruit packing plants; a Chelan County Public Utility District fish acclimation facility in Dryden; multiple industrial and construction stormwater outfalls; a sand and gravel operation; and multiple irrigation districts for irrigation system weed control.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Ecology's current Water Quality Assessment (Ecology, 2016b) records multiple Category 5 water quality impairment listings for the Wenatchee River, including five for PCBs, five for 4,4'-DDE, and one for endosulfan, an organochlorine pesticide (Table 3-6).

Category 5 listings for PCBs and 4,4'-DDE occur downstream from the Icicle Creek confluence, upstream and downstream of the U.S. Route 2 Bridge in the City of Leavenworth, between the City of Leavenworth and the City of Peshastin, and downstream of the City of Cashmere (Ecology, 2016b). All listings are based on the presence of these pollutants in fish tissue at concentrations that exceed water quality criteria. During a recent source assessment study for PCBs and DDT in the Wenatchee River Watershed (Hobbs and Friese, 2016), Ecology identified multiple potential sources of these pollutants and investigated these potential sources by studying the concentrations in water, biofilms (algae and microbial biomass), and invertebrates in the mainstem of the Wenatchee River. The initial survey showed that the sources of both contaminants are confined to the lower portion of the river (below the City of Leavenworth). The study further identified two distinct PCB source locations—one near the City of Cashmere and the second near the City of Wenatchee. Ecology concluded that both of these sources are likely unknown contaminated sites. For DDT, the study determined that the greatest inputs of DDT into the Wenatchee River are occurring during high-flow and predominantly from the Chumstick Creek and Mission Creek Basins. Irrigation returns were not found to be a large source of DDT to the Wenatchee River. The study also identified an unknown source of DDT between the USGS Peshastin gaging station and Old Monitor Road Bridge just downstream of the City of Cashmere.

The Category 5 listing for endosulfan occurs in Brender Creek, a tributary that enters the Wenatchee River at City of Cashmere, which is also listed as a Category 5 water for chlorpyrifos, a crystalline organophosphate pesticide (Ecology, 2016b). Another Category 5 listing for endosulfan occurs downstream of the City of Cashmere.

In addition to the Category 5 listings, the Wenatchee River and some of its tributaries also have several Category 4a listings for temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, and bacteria on Ecology's current Water Quality Assessment (Ecology, 2016b). These listings occur at multiple locations throughout the length of the river. These water quality issues are being addressed through the Wenatchee River Watershed TMDLs for temperature (Ecology, 2007b), dissolved oxygen and pH (Ecology, 2009), and fecal coliform bacteria (Ecology, 2007a).

Two Category 4c listings are included for the Wenatchee River in Ecology's current Water Quality Assessment (Ecology, 2016b). River sections identified in these listings occur in the upper portion of the river (between Lake Wenatchee and the City of Leavenworth) and one between the Cities of Leavenworth and Peshastin. These flow deficiencies are attributed to consumptive water uses, particularly irrigation withdrawals.

The current Water Quality Assessment includes multiple Category 2 listings for the Wenatchee River for pH, temperature, dissolved oxygen, and 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzopara-dioxin (TCDD) (Ecology, 2016b). Most of the Category 2 listings for pH, temperature, and dissolved oxygen occur upstream from the City of Leavenworth. The Category 2 TCDD listings occur in the segment of the river adjacent to the City of Leavenworth, between the Cities of Leavenworth and Peshastin, and downstream of the City of Cashmere.

# 3.5.3 Groundwater Quality

Groundwater resources in the Icicle project area consist of bedrock and discontinuous alluvial systems and are ultimately derived from rain or snowmelt (Ecology, 1995)<sup>3</sup>. There are two major aquifers in the Wenatchee River watershed: a lower bedrock aquifer and an overlying unconsolidated alluvial and outwash aquifer. The shallower alluvial and outwash aquifer is the main source of groundwater in the area, and in many places has a direct connection with surface waters. Although a minor part of the overall water budget in the Alpine Lakes and upper Icicle Creek portion of the Icicle project area, groundwater likely supports late season water levels in the lakes and downstream tributaries, including Icicle Creek, by discharging to surface waters when levels are lower (e.g., during the summer or fall, or as a result of lake releases from storage operations).

The quality and quantity of the alluvial and outwash aquifer is highly variable depending upon the local geology, the quality of the surface water, and the anthropogenic impacts, such as agriculture. Groundwater quality within the Upper Wenatchee River Watershed is considered to be excellent but deteriorates slightly in the Icicle Creek and Leavenworth areas, and more so moving further downstream (Ecology, 2007)<sup>4</sup>. Elevated nutrient content in the Peshastin and Cashmere areas may be contributing to low dissolved oxygen values in the Wenatchee River.

# 3.6 Water Use

Water use within the Icicle project area includes a variety of uses, including municipal, rural domestic, fish propagation, instream flows, and irrigation. This section discusses water use and is based primarily on existing state records and operational records of water users, as well as previous reports and studies on water management in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. This review does not represent an extent and validity review and is not intended to determine the validity of quantities of water available under these water rights.

## 3.6.1 Water Rights

## 3.6.1.1 Regulatory Framework

Water right issuance and management is governed by Chapter 90.03 RCW for surface water rights and Chapter 90.44 RCW for groundwater rights. Water rights provide for the use of waters of the state within specific limitations and provisions. These two statutes

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/95160.pdf

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/0503018.pdf

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

specify the process and considerations that must be made to issue a water right or to transfer an existing water right. There are several key concepts established in Chapter 90.03 RCW that relate to a water user's ability to exercise an existing water right. These include impairment, abandonment, relinquishment, and beneficial use.

## New Water Rights and Water Right Transfers

Chapter 90.03 RCW describes the process of obtaining a new water right. Generally, a water right application must be submitted, which sets the priority date of the water right; and public notice is made. Ecology, which has jurisdiction over water rights, applies a four-part test to determine if the water right can be permitted. If the four-part test is approved, a permit is issued. Then the permittee must put their water to beneficial use and Ecology certifies that water use based on a recommendation of a Certified Water Right Examiner. At that time, a water right certificate is issued and must be continuously used at least once every 5 years (or qualify for limited exceptions) in order to remain valid. The four-part test includes determining whether a proposed use would be beneficial, would not injure other water users, is available for the proposed use, and would not be detrimental to the public welfare. While Ecology has jurisdiction over water right permitting, ultimately the Courts have the final adjudicative authority in Washington State.

RCW 90.03.380 and 90.44.100 allow changes to existing water rights. The types of changes that are permissible are governed by water right type and stage. The permitting process for a water right change generally parallels that of a new water right, except Ecology must investigate the history of the right to determine if any relinquishment or abandonment has occurred due to nonuse without sufficient cause. Generally, impairment considerations and public-interest considerations (groundwater and trust water) are the primary requirements of a change to a water right.

## **Existing Water Rights**

There are items that impact a water right holder's ability to use a water right. These include impairment, abandonment, relinquishment, and waste.

- Impairment. A water user is not allowed to use their water right unless all rights on the same source with earlier priority dates are fully satisfied. This is the prior appropriation doctrine (i.e., "first in time, first in right"). The assumption under this water management doctrine is that there may not always be enough water to satisfy all uses. The establishment of priority dates and curtailing junior users prevents injury to existing water uses, which is part of the four-part test.
- Abandonment. A water right is forfeited when there is intentional. The intent to abandon may be shown by explicit declarations, inferred by removal of diversion works, or inferred by prolonged non-use without an attempt to reconstruct water works. If a water right is abandoned, the water reverts back to the state. Abandonment is a fact-specific determination.
- Relinquishment. Relinquishment is another way a water right can be forfeited. This is also known as the 'use-it or lose-it' rule. Under the relinquishment rules,

water reverts back to the state if not put to beneficial use for 5 or more consecutive years without sufficient cause. Sufficient causes are described in RCW 90.14.140. Generally, tentative extent and validity determinations are conducted by Ecology to determine relinquishment when evaluating an application to change a water right. The procedures of determining extent and validity and when such reviews occur are described in Water Resources Policy 1120.

• Waste. Waste relates to the requirement for beneficial use (i.e., if water is being wasted, it is not being beneficially used). Waste of water is prohibited in RCW 90.03.005 and state water case law. The Washington State Supreme Court has found that waste is the amount of water used in excess of the amount necessary for reasonable use. Reasonable use includes recognition of local custom, sound principles of water management, and funding availability.

## 3.6.1.2 Alpine Lakes Water Rights

This section provides a summary of storage water rights for the Alpine Lakes held by IPID and USFWS. This summary is based on information gathered from Ecology's water rights and Dam Safety Office files; WDNR; the USFS and the United States Bureau of Land Management; water right adjudication files from Chelan County Superior Court; and the Chelan County Auditor. Information about land ownership and easements authorizing water impoundment is available in Section 3.17, Wilderness Area.

Attributes of the storage water rights in the project area are provided in Table 3-9. These attributes include storage rights for Colchuck, Eightmile, Klonaqua, Square, Nada, Upper Snow, and Lower Snow Lakes. The rights on Colchuck, Eightmile, and Upper and Lower Klonaqua Lake were subject to the 1927 Icicle Creek water rights adjudication filed in Chelan County Superior Court. The storage rights for Square Lake, Nada Lake, and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes were established after the adjudication began and were not subject to the adjudication. In total, 10,500 acre-feet of storage rights were certificated by IPID, with an additional 16,000 acre-feet of storage certificated by USBR, which are now utilized by the USFWS.

### Klonaqua, Eightmile, and Colchuck Lakes Storage Rights

In 1926, IID filed applications with the State of Washington Office of Supervisor of Hydraulics (an Ecology predecessor agency) requesting to divert water from Klonaqua, Eightmile, and Colchuck Lakes for seasonal irrigation. Petitions were also filed with the Washington State Department of Public Lands (a DNR predecessor) to procure the shore and overflow rights to the three lakes. The Office of Supervisor of Hydraulics issued permits to develop the lake sources and the Department of Public Lands issued an order granting "the right to overflow and perpetually inundate said lands."

In 1927, water rights to Icicle Creek and its tributaries were adjudicated in Chelan County Superior Court. The 1929 Final Court Decree affirmed IID's water right permits for the lakes in the amounts of 25 cfs, 2,500 acre-feet per year at Eightmile Lake and Klonaqua Lake, and 50 cfs, 2,500 acre-feet per year at Colchuck Lake. The decree noted that the water rights represented by the permits are "inchoate but may be perfected by

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Rights Summary Water Source	Certificate Number	Owner Listed on Certificate	Priority Date	Certifi- cated Qi (cfs)	Certifi- cated Qa (afy)	Adjudi- cated Qi (cfs)	Adjudi- cated Qa (afy)
Upper and Lower Klonaqua Lake	1227	IID	1926 (Class 5)	25		25	2,500
Eightmile Lake	1228	IID	1926 (Class 5)	25		25	2,500
Colchuck Lake	1229	IID	1926 (Class 5)	50		50	2,500
Square Lake	5527	IID	1926	10	2,000	NA	NA
Snow Lake	1591	IID	1929	25		NA	NA
Snow Lake	1592	IID	1929		1,000	NA	NA
Snow Lake	1825	USBR	1942		16,000	NA	NA

 Table 3-9

 Attributes of Alpine Lake Storage Rights

<sup>1</sup> Right confirmed for 83.33 cfs through adjudication. The right was subsequently split and a change to place of use was completed for 1.7525 cfs.

<sup>2</sup> Documented total storage constructed at Snow Lake is 12,000 acre-feet, shared by USFWS and IPID. Under a separate agreement, IPID is entitled to 750 acre-feet of the Snow Lake storage.

**Notes:** Qi = instantaneous quantity; Qa = annual quantity; cfs = cubic feet per second; afy = acre-feet per year; IID = Icicle Irrigation District; PID = Peshastin Irrigation District; USBR = United States Bureau of Reclamation; --- = not listed; NA = not applicable, these rights were not subject to the adjudication. Qi for the storage rights are a limit on the rate of diversion for storage purposes. Release rates are limited by RCW 90.03.030, which states, "Any person may convey any water which he or she may have a right to use along any of the natural streams or lakes of this state, but not so as to raise the water thereof above ordinary high water mark, without making just compensation to persons injured thereby". IID and PID have entered into a joint operating agreement that specifies PID has 40-percent interested in IID storage rights and Icicle Creek/Snow Creek diversionary rights.

compliance with provisions under which the permits were issued; that these rights for storage of water under said permits do not affect the water rights of any other claimant herein reported."

These rights were subsequently certificated by the Office of Supervisor of Hydraulics for 25 cfs (50 cfs at Colchuck Lake) for the purpose of irrigation of 7,000 acres; no annual quantities were specified on the certificates. The Proof of Appropriation (PA) filed to support certificating the storage right to Colchuck Lake indicates that, because of conditions at the site, the reservoir was not raised to the full height planned, that 1,200 acre-feet per year of water was used, and that "utilization of full storage rights necessitate a pumping unit during extreme low flow on Icicle water sheds."

### Square Lake Storage Right

An application requesting to divert water from Square Lake for the purpose of irrigation was filed with the State of Washington Office of Supervisor of Hydraulics in 1926. A second application, under the same application number, was filed in 1939 to construct a reservoir and store water at Square Lake. A PA was filed in 1953, asserting completion of construction of the reservoir and distribution system in 1952 and use of up to 40 cfs for "supplementing water supply for total area embraced in Icicle and Peshastin Irrigation Districts... as adjudicated in the Icicle Water right adjudication proceedings." A single certificate was issued for 10 cfs, 2,000 acre-feet per year for irrigation of lands lying within the IPID.

## Snow and Nada Lakes Storage Rights

In 1929, IID filed separate applications to appropriate water from Snow Creek and to store water in Snow Lakes. Construction of the storage project was completed in 1940 when USBR drove a tunnel between Nada Lake and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes to provide water for what is now the LNFH. In 1941, IID received two certificates authorizing 25 cfs, 1,000 acre-feet per year for irrigation of 7,000 acres lying within the lands of the IPID. In 1942, Reclamation received a water right certificate for Upper and Lower Snow Lakes in the amount of 16,000 acre-feet per year to supplement the water supply for the hatchery and holding ponds.

Information filed in support of IID's water right included a private agreement between IPID and USBR. This agreement established that USBR would build the control works and provide storage at Upper and Lower Snow Lakes and in return IPID would reduce its rights to Upper and Lower Snow Lakes from 1,000 to 750 acre-feet per year and would not call on storage from Upper and Lower Snow Lakes until water stored in IPID's other reservoirs have begun to be used. File information also indicates that only approximately 12,000 rather than 16,000 acre-feet of storage was constructed by USBR. Based on this, it appears that the current combined storage rights for Upper and Lower Snow and Nada Lakes are approximately 12,000 acre-feet, of which IPID is entitled to 750 acre-feet per year.

In addition to the storage rights discussed above, there may be reserved rights held by the USFS for waters in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area that have not been quantified but could be implied under the federal reserved water right doctrine. However, these water rights would have a priority date of July 12, 1976 (the date the Alpine Area Management Act was passed) or later for lands incorporated into the wilderness area after the management act. Also, the purpose of use of these water rights would be limited to the purpose of wilderness establishment, as described in the Alpine Lakes Area Management Act.

## 3.6.1.3 Icicle Creek Diversion Rights

Department of Ecology records indicate there are 19 diversionary water rights on Icicle Creek and its tributaries. Cumulatively, these water rights authorize the diversion of 187.36 cfs (Table 3-10.).

Of the 19 water rights listed in Table 3-10, four are major diversions on Icicle Creek that account for 95 percent of the water diverted. These major diverters are IPID, LNFH, COIC, and City of Leavenworth, and these entities are involved in many of the projects proposed under the Icicle Strategy. The following subsections provide more detail on the diversionary water rights held by these four entities.

## **IPID Diversionary Water Rights**

IPID holds diversionary rights to Snow and Icicle Creeks totaling 117.71 cfs (two issued to IID one issued to PID). These water rights were subject to the 1927 Icicle Creek water rights adjudication and have 1910 and 1919 priority dates. The IPID diversion is located at RM 5.7 on Icicle Creek and consists of gravity flow headworks. The water is then conveyed through canals out of basin and into the Wenatchee Valley where it is applied to commercial and residential lands. IPID manages the storage rights discussed above to

### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

#### PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

ensure adequate flow at their point of diversion to satisfy their diversionary rights. An annual quantity is listed on only one of IPID's three water rights. The one water right with an annual quantity authorizes the use of 25,000 acre-feet per year. IPID irrigates 7,000 acres with these water rights. Based on flow measurements at their diversion point, IPID generally diverts the entire quantity authorized under their Icicle Creek water rights. IPID's CWCP provides a summary of water rights and use (Anchor QEA, 2018).

Water Right No.	Person or Organization	Priority Date	Purpose of Use	Qi (cfs)	Qa (afy)	Source Name
S4-*35007JWRIS	Simons, R E	01/01/1901	IR	0.17	50.00	Icicle Creek
S4-*35008JWRIS	Brisky, O	01/01/1901	IR	1.00	300.00	Icicle Creek
S4-*35009JWRIS	Fromm, S J	01/01/1901	IR	0.08	25.00	Icicle Creek
S4-*35010JWRIS	Fromm, S J	01/01/1901	IR	1.00	300.00	Icicle Creek
S4-*35001JWRIS	Cascade Orchards Inc	01/01/1905	IR	11.90	2,065.00	Icicle Creek
S4-CV1P170	Cascade Orchards Inc	01/01/1905	IR	0.20	34.71**	Icicle Creek
S4-35002ABBJWRIS	Icicle Irrigation District	04/01/1910	IR	81.58	25,000.00	Icicle Creek
S4-CV1P224	Icicle Irrigation District	04/01/1910	IR	1.75	536.28**	Icicle Creek
S4-35003ABBJWRIS	Snow Creek Water Users Inc	10/14/1910	IR	4.00	450.00	Snow Creek
S4-*35004JWRIS	City of Leavenworth	01/01/1912	MU	1.52	1,100**	Icicle Creek
S4-*00329CWRIS	Peshastin Irrigation District	10/27/1919	IR	34.38	10,535**	Icicle Creek
S4-CV1P18	Snow Creek Water Company	01/03/1922	IR			Snow Creek
S4-*05300CWRIS	USFS Wenatchee	11/06/1940	DM	0.05	35.00**	Chatter Creek
CS4-01824C@2	USFWS Leavenworth Fisheries Complex	03/26/1942	FS	42.00	27,482.00	Icicle Creek
S4-*16124CWRIS	City of Leavenworth	06/20/1960	MU	1.50	1,085**	Icicle Creek
S4-24376CWRIS	Falzon, D	08/03/1976	IR	0.05	10.00	Icicle Creek
S4-26394	Schmidt, W E	09/27/1979	DS, PW	3.00	1.00	Bridge Creek
S4-28122	City of Leavenworth	01/28/1983	MU	3.18	636.00	Icicle Creek

Table 3-10 Icicle Creek Surface Water Rights

Source: Ecology, Water Resources Explorer, https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/waterresources/map/WaterResourcesExplorer.aspx **Notes:** Qi = Instantaneous Quantity; cfs = cubic feet per second; Qa = Annual Quantity; afy = acre-feet per year; FS = Fish Propagation; IR = Irrigation; MU = Municipal; DS = Single Domestic; PW = Power Generation; DM = Multiple Domestic; \*\*= estimated made based on authorized Qi or WPS.

### **USFWS Diversionary Water Rights**

USFWS holds diversionary rights to Icicle Creek that authorize the diversion of 42.00 cfs at RM 4.5. The water right authorizes the use of 27,482 acre-feet per year for fish propagation at LNFH. LNFH has an intermediate force-release performance goal of 1.2 million fish under U.S. v. Oregon, with that goal ultimately increasing to 1.625 million fish. This water right was changed in 2011 via a Chelan County Water Conservancy Board Decision to add a point of diversion at RM 2.8 in the hatchery spillway pool. This additional point of diversion is to be used on a contingency basis should the original point of diversion at RM 4.5 fail to provide sufficient water. The water use is considered non-consumptive and returns to Icicle Creek just below LNFH at approximately RM 2.6. This water right was not subject to the Icicle Creek adjudication, having a 1942 priority date. While diversionary records are not currently available, the change Report of Examination (ROE) and operations indicate the water right is likely in good standing.

### **COIC Diversionary Water Rights**

COIC shares a point of diversion on Icicle Creek with LNFH at RM 4.5. Their water rights provide for the diversion of 11.9 cfs for irrigation of 600 acres. COIC has a 1905 priority date, as confirmed in the Icicle Creek water rights adjudication, and serves lands just south of the City of Leavenworth. In 1940, COIC applied to change a portion of their water right to provide water to LNFH, which was granted by Ecology in the form of Certificate of Change S4-CV1P170. According to the COIC Alternatives Analysis published in 2015, COIC uses approximately 2,000 acre-feet per year, with a peak diversion rate of about 8.0 cfs. LFNH uses the remaining 3.9 cfs authorized under the COIC water right in exchange for maintenance of the diversion infrastructure (WWT, 2015). The Alternatives Analysis provides a summary of COIC water rights and use (WWT, 2015).

### City of Leavenworth Diversionary Water Rights

City of Leavenworth has rights to divert 6.2 cfs from Icicle Creek. Their point of diversion is located at RM 5.7, across Icicle Creek from IPID's diversion. The priority dates of City of Leavenworth's water rights ranges from 1912 to 1983, with one of their water rights being adjudicated. The purpose of use for the water rights is municipal, which encompasses uses such as domestic, commercial, and irrigation. The City's water system plan summarizes the water rights and water use (Valera & Associates, 2018).

The City of Leavenworth also has one pending water right application and several rejected water right applications for water from Icicle Creek for municipal use. As discussed in Section 1.7, Litigation Related to Water Management in the Icicle Creek Watershed, City of Leavenworth appealed Ecology permitting decisions regarding the quantity of their water rights. That litigation is currently on hold pending the outcome of comprehensive water resource planning.

In addition to the Icicle Creek diversion, the City of Leavenworth has groundwater rights, with points of diversion near RM 27.2 of the Wenatchee River. This location is approximately 0.6 mile upstream of the confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. These wells are drilled to approximately 94 and 106 feet deep and have state water rights authorizing the withdrawal of 1,190 acre-feet per year. The City maintains both sources for redundancy purposes, with the Icicle diversion being operational without

## ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

power. Based on conversations with the City Manager, the City of Leavenworth would preferentially exercise new water made available through the Icicle Strategy from the City's Wenatchee River well field rather than their Icicle Creek diversion, except for in emergency or critical water supply situations, in order to reduce impacts on Icicle Creek.

Much of the water diverted from Icicle Creek under the above described water rights is used for water service. The three water purveyors, City of Leavenworth, IPID, and COIC, provide water to approximately 3,250 parcels, although some parcels might be counted twice because of dual service (i.e., indoor water provided by City of Leavenworth and outdoor water provided by an irrigation district). Table 3-11 illustrates how many parcels are served by IPID, COIC, and City of Leavenworth. Additionally, this table shows parcels served by size class. As would be expected, the bulk of parcels served by the City of Leavenworth are smaller, less than half an acre in size, while the irrigation districts tend to serve larger parcels that are at least half an acre in size or more. It should be noted that some of the larger parcels served by the City may also have IPID or COIC service for outdoor irrigation. Additionally, parcel service is dynamic and subject to change within the irrigation districts. Some PEIS commenters expressed a concern about lawn size in some areas of the Icicle Creek Subbasin. While the majority of lawn parcels are small in size, the presence of low-cost gravity diversions in some areas of COIC and IPID do not create an incentive to reduce lawn size. The Preferred Alternative includes a lawn incentive program to convert these lawn uses and is discussed in more detail in Chapter 2.

Dereel Size	Parcels Served per Entity								
Parcel Size	City	COIC	IPID						
0.00-0.10	108	0	0						
0.11-0.25	552	0	128						
0.26-0.50	270	12	234						
0.51-1.00	150	65	361						
1.01-2.00	122	118	353						
2.01-3.50	36	19	135						
>3.50	41	41	508						
Total	1,279	255	1,719						

 Table 3-11

 Number of Parcels Served by Entity per Parcel Size Class

## *3.6.1.4 Wenatchee River Watershed Instream Resources Protection Program*

Ecology is required by state law to retain adequate amounts of water in streams to protect and preserve instream resources and uses, such as fish, wildlife, recreation, aesthetics, water quality, and navigation. Ecology does this through the implementation of instream flow rules. Per Chapter 90.22 RCW, Ecology can establish minimum flows or levels on streams and lakes by regulation. This statute sets forth the process for adopting instream flow rules. Instream flow rules are water rights, and consequently, have a priority date consistent with the date they are enacted. Instream flow rules for The Wenatchee River Watershed are set forth under Chapter 173-545 WAC. The rule was originally adopted in 1983. All water rights in the Wenatchee River Watershed with a later priority date are junior to the instream flow rule and are subject to interruption when instream flows are below the targets prescribed in the rule. The rule was amended December 11, 2007, based on local watershed planning. The control point in Icicle Creek for measuring minimum instream flows is the Ecology gage 45B070 located downstream of LNFH. Figure 3-6 provides a graph of Icicle Creek minimum instream flows as set in WAC 137-545-060(1) compared to the 2015-year flows measured for Icicle Creek at Ecology gage 45070, and Figure 3-6 compares 2016 flows with the flows prescribed in WAC 137-545-060(1). Note, 2015 was a statedeclared drought year, while 2016 was not. Minimum instream flows were not met either of these years and are generally not met in throughout the year in "average" years.

The Wenatchee Instream Flow Rule also established a reserve to the Icicle Creek Subbasin (WAC 173-545-090). This reservation was created with an OCPI determination and was affirmed through 2016 legislation after the Swinomish v. Ecology Washington Supreme Court Decision, which limited the use of OCPI determinations for creating reserves to instream flow rules. The reserve allows for the use of 0.1 cfs of water, with an additional 0.4 cfs to be considered after completion of flow restoration efforts targeting habitat on Icicle Creek between RM 5.7 and RM 2.7. Water uses established under the Icicle Creek reserve are not subject to the instream flows established in WAC 173-545-060.

The Wenatchee Instream Flow Rule also prescribes flows in the Wenatchee River at several control points. However, these flows are often not met in drought years, and are regularly not met in average water years. Figure 3-7 shows the Wenatchee Instream Flow Rule at the monitor gaging station with dry, average, and wet year flows.

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 3-6. Instream Flow Rule for Icicle Creek and 2015 Flows







## 3.6.1.5 Wenatchee Valley Water Rights

The Wenatchee Valley supports a myriad of water uses from municipal to agricultural. Based on Ecology's records, there are approximately 130 active water right records with the Wenatchee River listed as the primary source. Of these, there are 47 interruptible water rights in the Wenatchee Valley, with 34 being irrigation rights. These interruptible water rights account for 5.6 cfs and 1,150 acre-feet per year. The remaining Wenatchee Valley Water Rights account for 10,345 cfs, 32 percent of which is for fish propagation purposes, which is non-consumptive in nature.

The 2016 Columbia River Basin Long-Term Water Supply and Demand Forecast looked at historical and projected future water use demands in the Wenatchee River Watershed by use category. Figure 3-8 illustrates how much water per month has been used historically and is forecasted to be used through 2035. This does not account for instream flow water rights, which the report concluded is the highest demand use in the Wenatchee River Watershed. Figure 3-9 shows the total demand, including instream flow, compared with various flow scenarios.



#### Figure 3-8. Historical and Projected Demand in the Wenatchee River Watershed

Source: Ecology, 2016, 2016 Columbia River Basin Long-Term Water Supply and Demand Forecast Note: H-Corp H- Clim = Historical Crops, Historical Climate; H- Crop F- Clim = Historical Crops, Future Climate; F- Crop H- Clim = Future Crop, Historical Climate; F-Crop F- Clim = Future Crops, Future Climate, where H-Crop represents historical crop mix (1981 to 2011); F-Crop as future crop mix (2035) under medium economic scenario; h-Clim as historical climate (1981 to 2011) and F-Slim values represent demand forecast under IPCC 4.5 centering 2035.



Figure 3-9. Comparison of Surface Water Supply and Demand (1981 to 2011)

Source: Ecology, 2016, 2016 Columbia River Basin Long-Term Water Supply and Demand Forecast

# 3.6.2 Water Resource Infrastructure

Water Resources Infrastructure includes constructed impoundments (e.g., reservoirs), diversion infrastructure (e.g., diversion boxes and groundwater wells), and conveyance infrastructure (e.g., pipes and canals). A summary of the key water resource infrastructure and water uses are described in the following sections.

## 3.6.2.1 Storage Reservoirs

There are seven man-made reservoirs in the Icicle project area that coincide with the existence of former natural lakes. Those reservoirs are known as Square, Klonaqua, Eightmile, Colchuck, Upper Snow, Lower Snow, and Nada Lakes.

### Square Lake

### INFRASTRUCTURE DESCRIPTION

Square Lake is the most hydrologically distant reservoir in the system. Man-made improvements were constructed at Square Lake between the 1920s and 1950s with the goal of impounding approximately 2,400 acre-feet with an operational range of 31 feet. The purpose of storage is to make water seasonally available for irrigation within the IPID service area. Infrastructure at the lake consists of a rock-masonry dam structure that has artificially raised the maximum water surface elevation of the lake from 4,954 feet to approximately 4,985 feet. Mechanical outlet controlling works were also installed and consist of a 30-inch diameter cast iron slide gate with an above-grade mechanized handwheel actuator. The gate itself is installed near the exit of the outlet tunnel, which was blasted through bedrock (approximately 300 linear feet of 5-foot wide by 7-foot tall tunnel). Together, the improvements allow for an active storage volume of approximately 2,130 acre-feet and a release quantity of up to 35 cfs<sup>5</sup>. Other man-made improvements include approximately 230 feet of constructed channel that confluences with the natural channel approximately 260 feet downstream of the lake (spillway). A man-made weir structure was historically used for flow measurement; however, it is in disrepair and is no longer used.

Improvements to Square Lake were reviewed and approved by Washington State Department of Hydraulics in 1939.

### OPERATION

Square Lake is one of four storage sites in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness actively managed by IPID. During typical years, only one or two of the lakes is actively managed to increase late summer releases to the Icicle Creek. During drought years, water is withdrawn from most of the lakes. Because Square Lake is more remote and difficult to access, it is operated less frequently than other lakes such as Colchuck and Eightmile Lakes.

During the years when Square Lake is actively managed, IPID personnel hike approximately 13 miles (one way) to the lake to open the gate to start releasing water in July. IPID personnel return in Late September or October to close the gate after the lake

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Flows have been measured as high as 35-cfs as recently as 2016; however, significantly higher flows are likely achievable during lake-full conditions.

## ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

has been drawn down and the irrigation season is over. Water flows from the tunnel and discharge channel to Prospect Creek, which flows to Leland Creek, which is a tributary to Icicle Creek. The lake refills during the spring when the gate is closed. When the lake is full, water flows over the dam spillway to Prospect Creek. Water continues to flow through the lake and over the dam spillway uncontrolled until the gate is opened again. Although Square Lake is only utilized on a rotational basis, the lake has the potential to refill annually (Aspect and Anchor QEA, 2015).

### **Upper and Lower Klonaqua Lake**

### INFRASTRUCTURE DESCRIPTION

Upper and Lower Klonaqua Lake are the second most hydrologically distant lakes and include both an upper and lower lake (two lakes total); however, only one lake (Lower Klonaqua) has been improved to allow for active storage / release of water without pumping. Permanent man-made improvements were constructed at Lower Klonaqua in the 1920s and 1930s with the goal of impounding approximately 2,500 acre-feet of water by IID. The purpose of stored water is for seasonal release into French Creek / Icicle Creek (conveyance purposes) and recapture similar to release from Square Lake. Infrastructure at the lake consists of an earthen and rock-masonry dam structure and spillway that has artificially raised the maximum water surface elevation of the lake to approximately 5,094 feet with an operational range of 28 feet. The dam itself is approximately 10 to 12 feet wide at the dam crest. Mechanical outlet controlling works were also installed as part of the original construction and consist of a 30-inch diameter cast iron slide gate with above-grade mechanized handwheel actuator positioned in a vertical gate shaft accessible from the surface. As-built drawings indicate the outlet works tunnel was constructed as a combination of blasting and cut / cover piping.

Based on LiDAR survey and field observations, the improvements allow for an active storage volume of approximately 1,690 acre-feet. Other man-made improvements include approximately 60 feet of constructed channel that confluences with the natural channel approximately 200 feet downstream of the lake (spillway). The existing outlet tunnel has partially collapsed and is due for maintenance; however, storage release flows of up to 25 cfs<sup>6</sup> have been measured as recently as July 2016 despite apparent flow obstructions.

#### OPERATION

Klonaqua Lake is one of the four storage sites in the Alpine Lakes Area managed by IPID. During an average water year, only one or two of the IPID-managed lakes is actively managed to increase late summer releases to Icicle Creek. Because Klonaqua Lake (Lower) is more remote and difficult to access, it is operated less frequently than Colchuck and Eightmile Lakes.

During the years when Klonaqua Lake is actively managed, IPID personnel hike more than 10 miles (one way) to the Lower Klonaqua Lake to open the gate in July. IPID personnel return to close the gate in late September or October when the lake is drawn down and the irrigation season is over.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Flows have been measured as high as 25 cfs; however, significantly higher flows are likely achievable during lake-full conditions.

When the gate is open, water discharges through the tunnel and discharge channel to an unnamed creek, which flows to French Creek, which is a tributary to Icicle Creek. Based on recent experience and observations from IPID personnel, Lower Klonaqua Lake typically refills by the summer following the irrigation season when the lake is drawn down. When the lake is full, water flows over the dam spillway. Water continues to flow through the lake and over the dam spillway uncontrolled until the gate is opened again.

## **Eightmile Lake**

### INFRASTRUCTURE DESCRIPTION

Eightmile Lake is a tributary reservoir of Eightmile Creek, which has a confluence with Icicle Creek at approximately RM 9.0. Man-made improvements were constructed at Eightmile Lake in the 1920s, resulting in an approximate reservoir elevation of 4,671 feet and a 27-foot operational range originally. This lake functions similar to the other IPID-managed lakes in that water is seasonally released and conveyed through natural channels to the IPID diversion at RM 5.7 of Icicle Creek.

Infrastructure at Eightmile Lake is a combination of earthen embankment and rockmasonry dam and spillway structure with a slide gate controlling the outlet works in the lake during lake-full conditions. The controlling works at Eightmile Lake included a rockmasonry tower positioned above the outlet pipe that supported a handwheel actuator for the outlet gate that controls flow from the lake to low-level outlet pipeline. The rock-masonry tower was destroyed, and the gate actuator was damaged by ice or debris flows (leaving only the gate and partial stem intact). The gate at Eightmile Lake is functional; however, IPID attaches a log to the gate stem to use as a come-along to open and close the gate. In addition, rocks and debris that settle against the gate make it difficult to open and close.

A portion of the existing earthen embankment portion of the dam at Eightmile Lake was eroded during flooding, which has reduced the maximum water surface elevation by at least 4 feet and has limited the storage available for release without the use of pumps or a siphon. The condition of the existing facilities at Eightmile Lake has limited the active storage volume to 1,370 acre-feet with an operational range of 23 feet.

In addition, portions of the low-level outlet pipeline have collapsed. IPID has noticed a significant, recent reduction in the capacity of the low-level outlet as a result of the constriction in the pipe caused by these collapses. IPID has noted that if the low-level outlet capacity is not restored by the time another drought occurs, they will be very limited in their ability to sustain irrigation supplies diverted from Icicle Creek because of diminished flows.

The Jack Creek fire burned much of the upland watershed, including up to the shore of Eightmile Lake, in the summer of 2017. The fire burned trees and brush over a large catchment of Eightmile Lake. The hydrologic characteristics of runoff from the watershed are likely to change due to the burn, resulting in much higher peak runoff rates in the short term during large storm events. These changes increase the risk of potential overtopping and erosion of the embankment, or even complete failure of the existing dam at Eightmile Lake. To address this risk, IPID declared an emergency on March 13, 2018
#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

and is working with Chelan County, Ecology's Dam Safety Office, USFS, National Weather Service, and others to develop and implement emergency action procedures.

#### OPERATION

Eightmile Lake is one of the four storage sites in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area that are managed by IPID. During a typical year, only one of the IPID-managed lakes is actively managed to increase late summer releases to the Icicle Creek. Because of its proximity to Icicle Creek and relative ease of access, the controls at Eightmile Lake are operated more frequently than the controls at the more remote lakes.

The gate on the low-level outlet pipe of Eightmile Lake controls releases from the lake. To actively manage the storage in Eightmile Lake, IPID personnel hike approximately 4 miles (one-way) to the lake to open the gate on the discharge pipeline in July. IPID personnel return to close the gate in late September or October when the lake is drawn down and the irrigation season is over. Release flows as high as 22 cfs<sup>7</sup> were measured from Eightmile Lake during summer 2016.

When the gate is open, water discharges through the low-level outlet to Eightmile Creek, which is a tributary to Icicle Creek. Based on recent experience and observations from IPID personnel, the lake typically refills by the summer following the irrigation season when the lake is drawn down. The active storage capacity available for release and the equivalent volume that has to be refilled is limited by the condition of the dam at the outlet. When the lake is full, water flows over a deteriorated dam spillway outlet to Eightmile Creek. Water continues to flow through the lake uncontrolled until the gate is opened again.

#### **Colchuck Lake**

#### INFRASTRUCTURE DESCRIPTION

Like Eightmile, Colchuck Lake is a tributary reservoir of Eightmile Creek, which has a confluence with Icicle Creek at approximately RM 9.0. Man-made improvements were constructed at Colchuck Lake in the 1920s and 1930s, raising the elevation level to 5,563 feet with an operational range of 17 feet. This lake functions similar to the other IPID-managed lakes in that water is seasonally released and conveyed through natural channels to the IPID diversion at RM 5.7 of Icicle Creek.

Infrastructure at this lake includes a concrete / rock-masonry dam and spillway with a slide gate controlling the outlet works in the lake during lake-full conditions. The controlling works at Colchuck Lake include a rock-masonry tower positioned above the outlet pipe that supports a handwheel actuator for the outlet gate. The control tower is accessible by footbridge. IPID has made recent improvements to the lake, including installation of a buried liner near the dam to limit unwanted seepage. A controlled outlet from the lake generally follows natural channel alignment.

The existing facilities at Colchuck Lake allow for an active storage volume of 1,480 acrefeet with an operational range of 17 feet.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Flows have been measured as high as 22 cfs; however, higher flows may be achievable during lake-full conditions.

#### OPERATION

Colchuck Lake is one of the four storage sites in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area that are managed by IPID. During an average water year, only one of the IPID-managed lakes is actively managed to increase late summer releases to the Icicle Creek. Because of its proximity to Icicle Creek and relative ease of access, the controls at Colchuck Lake are operated more frequently than the controls at the more remote lakes.

The configuration of the dam and infrastructure at Colchuck Lake is similar to Eightmile Lake. The gate, which is located at the inlet to a corrugated metal low-level outlet pipe, controls releases from the lake. To actively manage the storage in Colchuck Lake, IPID personnel hike approximately 4 miles (one way) to the lake to open the gate on the discharge pipeline in July. IPID personnel return to close the gate in late September or October when the lake is drawn down and the irrigation season is over. Release flows as high as 25 cfs<sup>8</sup> were measured from Colchuck Lake during summer 2016.

In the fall of 2012, IPID lowered the lake level at Colchuck Lake sufficiently to perform maintenance on the dam and the control gate. Concrete was added to repair the dam and plug holes in the foundation, which had been leaking. Debris and logs that had built-up on the upstream side of the dam were removed. Maintenance was performed on the control gate and a plank was installed to improve access to the gate. Additional maintenance was performed in fall of 2016 to reduce seepage losses through the dam infrastructure.

Water discharge from Colchuck Lake flows through the low-level outlet pipe to an unnamed creek, which flows to Mountaineer Creek and subsequently Eightmile Creek, which is a tributary to Icicle Creek. Based on recent experience and observations from IPID personnel, the lake typically refills by the summer following the irrigation season when the lake is drawn down. When the lake is full, water flows over the dam spillway outlet to the unnamed creek. Water continues to flow through the lake uncontrolled until the gate is opened again.

#### Upper and Lower Snow Lakes and Nada Lake

#### INFRASTRUCTURE DESCRIPTION

Upper Snow Lake, Lower Snow Lake, and Nada Lake drain to Snow Creek, which is another tributary to Icicle Creek. Reservoir improvements at the lakes consist of three man-made dams and one constructed tunnel. The dams operate to provide maximum normal water surface elevations of 5,433 feet at Upper Snow Lake and 5,429 feet at Lower Snow Lake, and control outflow on Nada Lake. The Lower Snow Lake Dam is a rock-masonry structure constructed across the natural outlet to Snow Creek. There is not currently any control of the flow of water through Lower Snow Lake Dam. Water flows freely over the dam to Snow Creek when the lake is full.

The Upper Snow Lake Dam is also a rock-masonry structure that controls flow from Upper Snow Lake to Lower Snow Lake. When Upper Snow Lake is full, water flows over the dam to Lower Snow Lake and on to Snow Creek. When the Upper Snow Lake is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Flows have been measured as high as 25 cfs; however, significantly higher flows may be achievable during lake-full conditions.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

drawn down sufficiently, water flows from Lower Snow Lake back to Upper Snow Lake through an opening at the base of the Upper Snow Lake dam controlled by a flap gate. The flap gate is designed to allow for one-way flow from Lower Snow Lake back to Upper Snow Lake, but the USFWS has indicated that the gate leaks. Upper Snow Lake has an operational range of approximately 160 feet that is controlled through an outlet works tunnel between Upper Snow and Nada Lakes. The tunnel was constructed in the 1930s and involves three controlling valves that are operated in sequence to control releases. Once the system is operating, only one valve is required to modulate flow from Upper Snow Lake to Nada Lake.

A dam reconstruction project was completed at Nada Dam, downstream of Upper and Lower Snow Lakes, in 2009. The new dam at the outlet from Nada lake is not currently being used to control the water level in the lake. The dam is a concrete structure with two bays for stop-logs or future slide gates. A Parshall flume was installed below the dam for flow measurement and monitoring. Flow depth is recorded by battery powered monitoring equipment in a stilling well adjacent to the flume. A solar panel is used for recharging the batteries of the monitoring equipment (Aspect/Anchor, 2015).

Based on a 2016 LiDAR survey, the active storage of the Snow Lakes is estimated at 12,590 and 140 acre-feet, respectively.

#### OPERATION

Upper and Lower Snow Lakes and Nada Lake are operated by the USFWS as part of their management of the LNFH. The operation of these facilities was reviewed in the following recent studies:

- Management Recommendations for Reservoir Releases from Upper Snow Lake: Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery (Wurster, 2006)
- Water Storage Report, Wenatchee River Basin (Anchor QEA, 2011)

The lakes are operated jointly to increase late summer flows in Snow Creek, which is a tributary to Icicle Creek. The increased flows to Icicle Creek help supply the LNFH's operational requirements (approximately 40 cfs between June and October) and supplement flow in Icicle Creek.

#### **Upper Snow Lake**

Upper Snow Lake is actively managed by the USFWS. Water is released from Upper Snow Lake to Nada Lake through the outlet works tunnel and penstock. LNFH personnel hike to a valve shed above Nada Lake (more than 6 miles one way) to open the valve on the penstock in July each year. The valve remains open during the late summer months, typically between mid-July and mid-October. LNFH personnel may return to the lake to adjust the valve during that time to increase the rate of release. Historically, the valve was open an average of 77 days each year between 1998 and 2005, with an average annual release of 3,700 acre-feet (Wurster, 2006).

The USFWS currently operates Upper Snow Lake in accordance with the *Management Recommendations for Reservoir Releases from Upper Snow Lake: Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery* (Wurster, 2006). The USFWS currently releases approximately 7,000 acre-feet from Upper Snow Lake to Nada Lake from July to October. Releases start around 30 cfs in late July and may increase to 60 cfs as natural flows in Icicle Creek drop. After the valve on the outlet is closed in the fall, Upper Snow Lake refills. For 6 of the 7 years (1998 to 2005, excluding 2000) that were evaluated in the *Management Recommendations for Reservoir Releases from Upper Snow Lake: Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery*, Upper Snow Lake was full by the time the valve was opened the following summer. The only year when Upper Snow Lake did not fully refill was 2001, which was a drought year.

At the end of the summer when Upper Snow Lake has been drawn down, the water level in Upper Snow Lake is typically lower than the water level in Lower Snow Lake. Water flows from Lower Snow Lake to Upper Snow Lake through a small (approximately 9square-foot) hole and flap gate at the base of Upper Snow Lake Dam. In 2005, it was estimated that approximately 200 acre-feet of water passed through the opening.

More information regarding the current condition and operations of the infrastructure is available in the Draft Environmental Assessment issued in 2017 (USBORUSBR, 2017). This assessment was completed to analyze the impacts of installing a new valve at the Upper Snow Lake outlet.

#### Lower Snow Lake

Lower Snow Lake is not actively managed by USFWS. When Lower Snow Lake is full, water spills over the dam or discharges to Snow Creek through a breach that was identified on the east side of the dam during the 2008 *Safety Evaluation of Existing Dams (SEED) Inspection* (WW Wheeler and Associates, 2009a). Water was observed in the channel downstream of the dam during a site visit on September 25, 2009. During that site visit, the water level behind the dam was 2 to 3 feet lower than the crest of the dam, which indicates that water still flows from the lake through a breach or through leaks in the dam, even when the water level is below the crest of the dam.

#### **Hydrologic Monitoring**

The USFWS monitors flows at four sites within the Snow Creek Subbasin. Flows are monitored on Snow Creek at the inflow to Upper Snow Lake, at the penstock that discharges from Upper Snow Lake to Nada Lake, at the flume at the outlet of Nada Lake, and at the confluence with Icicle Creek. The USFWS has actively monitored these sites since 2004 using data loggers to collect data over extended periods of time. This data helps the USFWS manage releases from the lakes.

### 3.6.2.2 Diversion Infrastructure

Use associated with surface water diversion infrastructure is described in Section 3.19 (Utilities); however, additional description is provided below. There are three significant diversion facilities along Icicle Creek, including surface water diversion for IPID, COIC, City of Leavenworth, - LNFH, and USBR. There are also many individual irrigation diversions that are not specifically identified herein. Furthermore, LNFH also utilizes groundwater well sources for supply.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **IPID Diversion**

The IPID diversion includes both an in-channel reinforced concrete dam / spillway and a controllable concrete intake structure on the right bank of Icicle Creek at RM 5.7 (controllable with flashboards). The intake structure was recently rehabilitated by IPID in 2015 to improve efficiency. Water is diverted to a reinforced concrete channel. Headgates and an overflow in the diversion channel downstream of the intake structure provide additional control of flow in IPID diversion channel. A rotating drum fish screen at the downstream end of the diversion channel delivers flow to the IPID Division 1 Canal. A bypass delivers excess flow and fish back to Icicle Creek at the fish screen. Flow is measured in a rated section of the channel downstream of the headgates. Diverted quantities at this location are approximately 117 cfs.

#### **City of Leavenworth**

The City of Leavenworth utilizes a surface water diversion from Icicle Creek at RM 5.7, on the left bank of Icicle Creek across the creek from IPID's diversion facilities. Both facilities draw from the pool created by the IPID Diversion Dam. City of Leavenworth facilities include a vertical flat panel fish screen in a reinforced concrete enclosure that protects the screen and diversion facilities from ice and debris. A gate on the upstream side of the enclosure is opened to provide sweeping velocity across the screen. Diverted quantities by the City of Leavenworth are approximately 6.2 cfs at this location.

#### **COIC / LNFH Diversion**

COIC and LNFH share a diversion at RM 4.5. The diversion includes an in-channel reinforced concrete dam / spillway with a fish ladder, a fish screen, and a gate house that controls flow from the creek to buried pipeline. Water flows through approximately 1,400 feet of buried pipeline to a bifurcation facility that splits flow to the COIC and LNFH systems. The bifurcation includes a large valve on the pipeline that can be opened to release flow from the pipeline to a reinforced concrete box operated by COIC. The concrete box includes a rotating drum fish screen, an overflow bypass, and a weir that measures flow delivered to COIC. Flows not delivered to COIC at the bifurcation are conveyed to LNFH. Diverted quantities at this location are approximately 8 cfs delivered to COIC, with the remaining 3.9 cfs authorized under their right going to LNFH, and up to 46 cfs, delivered to LNFH.

## 3.7 Fish

This section describes the fish species and life stages present, their distributions, species status, and habitat conditions within the project area. Aquatic invertebrate community structure and influence of habitat conditions are also described. Information on special-status species is provided in Section 3.10, Threatened and Endangered Species. Information on tribal fishing harvest is provided in Section 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Tribal Fish Harvest.

## 3.7.1 Alpine Lakes

The Alpine Lakes are included in a group of mountain lakes managed in Washington as "high lakes," which in Eastern Washington are generally considered to be those occurring at an elevation greater than 3,500 feet. Historically, most of the high lakes of Washington lack suitable spawning habitat or productive conditions for rearing juveniles, and probably contained no fish prior to introductions of sport fish by humans (Wydoski and Whitney, 2003). Currently, Washington's high lakes are managed to "protect, restore, and enhance fish populations and their habitats in high lakes while maximizing recreational opportunities consistent with natural resource protection guidelines" (Uehara, 2009). The high lakes fishery is now managed by WDFW to support recreation goals in balance with environmental considerations (Pfeifer, Swayne, and Curtis, 2001). Fish abundance and stocking are tracked by WDFW with the help of volunteer high lakes fishing organizations.

Human introduction of trout and char into the high lakes began as early as the late nineteenth century by settlers, loggers, and miners, and perhaps even earlier by Native American tribes. Some lakes were still periodically stocked by WDFW and volunteers into the 2000s to support a high lakes recreational fishery; however, the majority remain fishless (WDFW, 2016a). Although some lakes have self-sustaining populations, the stocked lakes are managed to sustain low densities and more recently are stocked with fish that would not reproduce successfully, limiting the likelihood of unmanaged population growth in the lakes (Pfeifer, Swayne, and Curtis, 2001).

All of the lakes included in the Icicle Strategy were stocked in the past, but stocking has been discontinued because of lack of funding or sufficient natural reproduction (Maitland, 2016). All lakes were stocked with westslope cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki lewisi*) at one time, some with rainbow trout (*O. mykiss*), and some with non-native eastern brook trout and lake trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis* and *Salvelinus namaycush*) (Table 3-12).

Lake	Trout Species	Last Year Stocked
Colchuck Lake	Cutthroat	2000
Eightmile Lake	Cutthroat, Rainbow, Lake	2005
Lower Klonaqua Lake	Cutthroat, Rainbow	1970
Upper Klonaqua Lake	Cutthroat	1970
Nada Lake*	Eastern Brook	Unknown
Lower Snow Lake*	Cutthroat, Eastern Brook	Unknown
Upper Snow Lake*	Cutthroat, Eastern Brook	Unknown
Square Lake*	Cutthroat, Rainbow	1979

 Table 3-12

 Summary of Alpine Lakes Trout Stocking Status

\*Sufficient natural reproduction

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

### 3.7.1.1 Habitat Conditions

The Alpine Lakes are relatively pristine compared to downstream habitats, having changed little from conditions prior to European settlement. The Alpine Lakes are characterized by naturally low productivity and provide relatively limited habitat potential for fish primarily because of cold water supplied by melting snow or glaciers, a short growing season, location at the head of the watershed, and lack of inputs of organic material. The primary changes to Alpine Lakes habitat include structures constructed to manage surface water and the introduction of sport fish, including non-native trout.

## 3.7.2 Icicle Creek Corridor

The Alpine Lakes discharge water to a series of small creeks that are tributaries to Icicle Creek, which is a major tributary to the Wenatchee River. Within the watershed, Icicle Creek provides important high quality and relatively undisturbed headwater habitat for a variety of anadromous<sup>9</sup> and resident<sup>10</sup> fish. Icicle Creek provides approximately 29 river miles of spawning and rearing habitat to native salmon and trout species, including ESA-listed Upper Columbia spring-run Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*), Upper Columbia summer steelhead (*O. mykiss irideus*), and bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) depending on flows and passage through several natural and artificial barriers (Dominguez et al., 2013). However, as noted in Table 3-13, fish habitat in Lower Icicle Creek is reduced in late summer and early fall because of low instream flows during this time of year.

Current Habitat Limitations on Lower ICICIE Creek							
		Affected	Average Year	Low Flow Year			
Reach	River Miles	Species/Life Stage	Months When Target WUA Not Achieved	Months When Target WUA Not Achieved			
	0.2 to	Steelhead rearing	Late July to late October	Mid-June through October			
5	2.4	Bull trout spawning	None	September through October			
4 (Historical Channel)	2.7 to 3.9	Steelhead rearing	Early August to late October	Mid-June through October			
		Bull trout rearing	Early August to late October	Mid-June through October			
3.9 to		Steelhead rearing	Early August to late October	Early to mid-April and mid- June through October			
3	4.5	Bull trout rearing	Early August to late October	Early to mid-April and mid- June through October			
1, 2	6.0 to	Steelhead rearing	September	ND			
	9.1	Cutthroat trout rearing	September	ND			

Table 3-13
Current Habitat Limitations on Lower Icicle Creek

Note: conclusions from Granger, 2017

ND = No Data. Analyses have not been performed.

WUA = weighted usable area

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Life history pattern of spawning and rearing in tributary streams and migrating to the ocean.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Life history pattern of residing in tributary streams for the fish's entire life without migrating.

Fish passage above LNFH is generally considered to be limited, particularly above the Boulder Field at RM 5.6, which serves as a natural barrier under typical flow conditions. Low numbers of anadromous steelhead and Chinook salmon can pass through the Boulder Field; biologists recently observed two redds<sup>11</sup>, and one juvenile anadromous Chinook salmon was observed upstream of the Boulder Field (WDFW, 2016). It is unlikely that coho salmon (*O. kisutch*) can ascend the Boulder Field.

Currently, operation of Structure 5 just downstream of the Boulder Field also limits fish passage during spring and early summer when broodstock collection for LNFH is occurring (mid-May through June). Structure 5 is closed in order to capture and prevent passage of hatchery fish to areas farther upstream. This also prohibits non-hatchery fish from moving upstream of LNFH during this time. Operation of Structure 2 can also limit passage by decreasing flows in this reach when the gates are closed to divert water into the Hatchery Channel. As the operators of LNFH, USFWS coordinates with WDFW, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries, the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation on the timing of the adjustments for broodstock collection and closing of the gates at Structure 2 to minimize potential impacts on anadromous fish and tribal fishing that occurs at the plunge pool in front of the LNFH.

### 3.7.2.1 Anadromous Fish

Anadromous fish returning to Icicle Creek are dominated by spring-run Chinook salmon produced at LNFH that pass through Lower Icicle Creek to return to the LNFH facility in spring and early summer. Natural spawning of native anadromous fish is reduced from historical conditions as a result of habitat degradation, including flow diversions, and overfishing. Historical barriers to upstream passage at LNFH also have limited natural anadromous fish spawning to the lower 2 RM of Icicle Creek until improvements to fish passage in recent years.

Icicle Creek also provides spawning habitat for native anadromous fish, including the Upper Columbia spring-run Chinook salmon and Upper Columbia summer steelhead. Both species are listed as endangered under the ESA and are discussed in greater detail in Section 3.10, Threatened and Endangered Species.

#### LNFH Spring-run Chinook Salmon

Spring-run Chinook salmon are raised at the LNFH as mitigation for the Grand Coulee Dam (USFWS, 2016a). Between 2000 and 2015, the number of adult LNFH spring-run Chinook salmon returning to Icicle Creek each year ranged from 2,403 (in 2013) to 15,082 (in 2001) (O'Brien, 2016). Creel surveys indicate that between 3 percent and 21 percent were caught in the sport fishery in Icicle Creek each year during the same period. A small number were observed in snorkel surveys upstream of LNFH (USFWS, 2016b).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Spawning nests located in stream gravel or lakeshores.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

### 3.7.2.2 Resident Fish

Icicle Creek also supports several key species of resident fish, including bull trout, protected under the ESA: rainbow trout, westslope cutthroat trout, and other species of minnows, sculpins, and suckers.

#### **Bull Trout**

Bull trout are distributed throughout the Wenatchee River Watershed, including in Icicle Creek. The Columbia River bull trout distinct population segment (DPS) are listed as threatened under the ESA (USFWS, 1998). A distinct native bull trout population exists in Icicle Creek (USFWS, 2015).

Icicle Creek and other headwater areas of the basin offer some of the best habitat in the Mid-Columbia region. Bull trout spawn in cold, clear headwaters near the crest of the Cascade Mountains that are too cold for other anadromous species. Populations are isolated to headwater areas by downstream conditions that are too warm for incubation and early rearing.

Multiple life-history types of bull trout exist in the Wenatchee River Watershed (USFWS, 2015; Cappellini, 2001). Most bull trout in Icicle Creek are of a fluvial lifehistory type, meaning they migrate downstream to rear in tributary rivers, the mainstem Wenatchee River, or the Columbia River. Some resident forms that remain close to spawning areas throughout their life cycle are likely to exist given suitable headwater conditions. A small percentage of the population (15 to 20 percent) may migrate long distances to other subbasins of the Columbia River for foraging or overwintering and may return to spawning areas annually every few years. It is unlikely that many bull trout from the Wenatchee River Watershed are fully anadromous. Bull trout may return to spawning areas weeks to months prior to spawning. Most populations in the Wenatchee River Watershed spawn from mid-September to mid-October (USFWS, 2015).

Juveniles eat invertebrates, and subadults and adults eat mainly fish. Bull trout are a highly effective predator on smaller fishes and can limit juvenile salmon populations in some locations (Wydoski and Whitney, 2003). Bull trout are extremely sensitive to habitat degradation by humans because they require cold, clear water for spawning. Bull trout are also threatened by hybridization with eastern brook trout and overharvest by anglers.

Prior to improvements to fish passage management at LNFH in 2001, low numbers of widely dispersed bull trout were observed in the Icicle Creek drainage, mainly in upper Icicle Creek and lower Jack Creek, and with the majority observed below passage barriers at LNFH (Ringel, 1997; Cappellini, 2001). Since 2003, bull trout snorkel surveys have been conducted in Icicle Creek from the Boulder Field area near the confluence with Snow Creek to the confluence with the Wenatchee River. Fish counts have ranged from 10 fish in 2011 to 157 fish in 2009 (USFWS, 2009, 2016b).

#### **Rainbow Trout**

Rainbow trout are the most commonly observed fish species in Icicle Creek and tributaries draining the Alpine Lakes (Ringel, 1997; USFWS, 2016b). Genetically identical to steelhead trout, rainbow trout exhibit a non-migratory resident life history. In

some cases, steelhead progeny may take on resident life-histories in subsequent generations and vice-versa. As juveniles, rainbow trout cannot be distinguished from steelhead. Hybridization between rainbow trout and westslope cutthroat trout is common, and hybrids may occur in the Icicle Creek drainage (Ringel, 1997).

Rainbow trout prefer cool, well oxygenated water but can tolerate broader temperature ranges than other salmon and trout. Growth and age at maturity varies greatly and occurs between age 1 and 5 years, depending on water conditions. Rainbow trout spawn in the spring between February and June, and unlike salmon, may spawn many times over a lifetime. Rainbow trout feed mainly on drifting aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates, and only occasionally on other fish.

#### Westslope Cutthroat Trout

Westslope cutthroat trout are widespread throughout Icicle Creek (Wydoski and Whitney, 2003). The historical distribution was limited to two adjacent river basins, the Lake Chelan and Methow Basins, in the mid-Columbia river and in the Pend Oreille River in northeastern Washington; however, widespread stocking of hatchery-reared fish and subsequent establishment of self-reproducing populations has expanded the distribution of the subspecies to nearly all tributary rivers and streams of the mid- and upper-Columbia River. Extensive stream surveys during the 1990s documented naturally reproducing populations of westslope cutthroat trout in nearly every tributary above 3,000 feet elevation across the Cascade Mountains.

Westslope cutthroat trout in Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River may have a resident or fluvial life-history (Wydoski and Whitney, 2003). Fluvial forms may return to small tributaries for refuge during high flows. Adult westslope cutthroat trout spawn from March to July in in relatively low densities compared to other salmon in small, cold headwater streams with gravel and cobble substrates and well-oxygenated water. Fry emerge in late spring or summer. Both forms remain mostly stationary as juveniles, establishing feeding stations in low-velocity, moving water. Juveniles tend to move into pools in the fall, seeking suitable winter habitat, and fluvial forms will overwinter in deeper pools and beaver ponds. Westslope cutthroat trout feed on drifting insects, zooplankton, and other larval aquatic invertebrates, and their growth is determined by the length of the growing season, productivity, and water temperatures in headwater areas. Fluvial forms that move into more productive and warmer rivers tend to grow faster and larger, up to 10 to 12 inches over 10 years.

Westslope cutthroat trout populations are likely impacted in Icicle Creek by hybridization with rainbow trout introduced for sport fisheries and by displacement by rainbow trout and non-native eastern brook trout. Introduced eastern brook trout have displaced westslope cutthroat trout in many low gradient reaches of tributary streams, including Eightmile Creek, a tributary to Icicle Creek (Griffith and Leary, 1988). Because of their small size and slow growth, westslope cutthroat trout are vulnerable to predation by native bull trout. All cutthroat trout are vulnerable to overfishing by recreational anglers.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Other Resident Fishes**

The community of native resident species in Icicle Creek also includes mountain whitefish (*Prosopium williamson*), longnose sucker (*Catostomus catostomus*), bridgelip sucker (*Catostomus columbianus*), longnose dace (*Rhinichthys cataractae*), redside shiner (*Richardsonius balteatus*), northern pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus oregonensis*), and sculpin (NPCC, 2004; USFWS, 2009, 2016b). Fewer species have been observed upstream of the LNFH diversion, suggesting that this known fish passage barrier may have reduced species diversity above the barrier over time (Ringel, 1997).

Many of these resident fishes eat plant matter or invertebrates, with the exception of sculpins, which eat large numbers of salmon and trout fry in headwater streams (Hillman, 1989), and northern pikeminnow, which can be effective predators on other fishes in larger rivers (LCFRB, 2004).

Non-native eastern brook trout also occur in Icicle Creek and its tributaries (Ringel, 1997; USFWS, 2009, 2016b).

### 3.7.2.3 Habitat Conditions

Habitat conditions in the lower portions of Icicle Creek are relatively less favorable for fish as one moves farther downstream towards the City of Leavenworth. In the more developed portions of the Icicle project area, habitat has been adversely affected by bank stabilization and flood control projects, loss of riparian vegetation, increased urbanization and related alterations in sediment transport and flows. In Icicle Creek, the primary limiting factors to fish include reduced habitat diversity, low stream flows, elevated stream temperatures, blocked fish passage, and increased competition among fish species compared to historical conditions (NPCC, 2004).

Recent human uses that have contributed to habitat degradation include water withdrawal for irrigation and domestic uses, agriculture and grazing in riparian zones, timber harvest, road building, fire suppression, urban development, and recreation. Potential impacts on water quality as a result of these activities are described in Section 3.5.2, Surface Water Quality. In Icicle Creek and its tributaries, non-native eastern brook trout may limit native salmon and trout from thriving because of competition and displacement. Hybridization between eastern brook trout and bull trout limits bull trout productivity by producing sterile offspring. In some streams, including Icicle Creek, eastern brook trout have greatly reduced numbers of bull trout (USFWS, 2015).

### 3.7.2.4 Fish Passage Barriers

Potential salmon and trout spawning habitat occurs up to RM 29 in Icicle Creek; however, there are several natural and artificial barriers that can limit migration through the watershed. These include the following.

• The LNFH diversion (RM 4.5) was constructed in 1930 to 1940 to supply surface water to the hatchery. LNFH shares diversion facilities with COIC and operates the facilities under an agreement with COIC. Since 2001, LNFH has been adaptively managing the intake structure to improve passage (Hall, 2012); however, passage continues to be impaired at very low and very high flows (Anglin et al., 2013).

Between 2012 and 2015, it is estimated that between 287 and 1,003 spring-run Chinook salmon were able to pass above the LNFH diversion annually (Hall, 2012; USFWS, 2016c).

- A natural boulder field (RM 5.6) near the confluence with Snow Creek currently blocks fish passage under most flow conditions. However, it is estimated that passage can occur under high-flow (10-year flood) conditions (Ringel, 1997), or as a series of pools form during a window of flows between 100 to 200 cfs (Dominguez et al., 2013). Large bull trout have been observed above the Boulder Field, indicating that opportunistic adult salmon and trout species may find passage during some flows (Dominguez et al., 2013); however, the Boulder Field presented an obstruction to Chinook salmon and steelhead in at least one study (Cappellini, 2001).
- The IPID diversion (RM 5.7) also hinders upstream passage at moderately low flows less than 150 cfs (reviewed in NPCC, 2004; Dominguez et al., 2013).

Other factors limiting fish passage include the potential for fish to become entrained at surface water diversion facilities on Icicle Creek. Fish screens at the LNFH/COIC diversion (RM 4.5), IPID diversion (RM 5.7), and the City of Leavenworth diversion (RM 5.7) do not currently meet National Marine Fisheries Service criteria and require updating (NPCC, 2004).

## 3.7.2.5 Tribal Fishing

Within the project area there are Usual & Accustomed Fishing Areas where the YN and CTCR tribes have historically fished. These areas are discussed in greater detail in Section 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest. Both the Yakama Nation (YN) and Confederal Tribes of the Colville Reservation (CTCR) maintain fishing rights in Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. These tribes target non-listed spring-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) returning to the LNFH (YN, 2009; CTCR, 2011). Known fishing areas include the plunge pool immediately downstream of the LNFH Hatchery Channel spillway and in the mainstem Wenatchee River. The YN maintains fishing rights within a mile of Dryden Dam (not within 25 feet of any fishway), in mid-summer targeting summer-run Chinook salmon and summer-run steelhead (*O. mykiss*) (YN, 2009). The CTCR maintains a summer Chinook fishery in Tumwater Canyon and mainstem Wenatchee River (CTCR, 2011).

Since the reintroduction of coho salmon (*O. kisutch*) to the upper Wenatchee River and Icicle Creek drainages, tribal subsistence fisheries for coho salmon have been opened when runs are large and surplus fish are available (CRITFC, 2011). Upriver sockeye salmon (*O. nerka*) and upriver summer-run Chinook salmon (including the Wenatchee stocks) are harvested by treaty tribes (including the YN) in the mainstem Columbia River prior to ascending their natal rivers.

It is the policy of the YN and CTCR fishery codes to sustainably manage fishery resources and enhance fish and habitat off the Yakama and Colville Reservations to support tribal harvest for subsistence, recreational, and economic needs of tribal members (YN, 2009; CTCR, 2011). Refer to Section 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Tribal Fish Harvest, for more

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

information about fishing limits. From 1999 to 2003, the YN harvest in Icicle Creek averaged 2,905 spring-run Chinook per year and an average of over 3,000 surplus adults returning to LNFH were provided directly to Columbia River tribes (YN, CTCR, Spokane Tribe, and the Kalispell Tribe) and food banks. In 2015, CTCR anglers caught 113 hatchery-origin spring-run Chinook salmon from mid-May to early June (Rayton, 2016).

The harvest of whitefish, sucker, pikeminnow, and other native resident fish and non-native species are open year-round to tribal members unless restricted by specific regulation (YN, 2009). Efforts are also underway to restore harvestable lamprey populations in the Wenatchee River Watershed (YN, 2016).

## 3.7.3 Wenatchee River Corridor

As noted in Section 3.3, Surface Water Resources, Icicle Creek is a major tributary to the Wenatchee River, which links Icicle Creek to the Columbia River. The Wenatchee River is a major migratory pathway for several fish species, including ESA-listed species. Wenatchee River salmon and steelhead stocks are reduced from historical levels largely as a result of habitat degradation, including flow diversion, lowered water quality, and overfishing. In comparison to other rivers of similar size in Washington, the Wenatchee River continues to provide good quality and diverse habitat for a variety of anadromous and resident fish downstream of Icicle Creek.

### 3.7.3.1 Anadromous Fish

The Wenatchee River provides habitat to several native populations of anadromous fish, including Upper Columbia spring-run Chinook salmon, Upper Columbia summer-run steelhead, and bull trout that are all protected under the ESA.

#### Upper Columbia Spring-run Chinook Salmon

Spring-run Chinook salmon within the Icicle project area include the Wenatchee stock<sup>12</sup> of the Upper Columbia Spring Chinook Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU), which is listed as endangered under the ESA (NOAA Fisheries, 2016; 64 FR 14308; 70 FR 37160). Wenatchee stock includes fish that spawn in the Wenatchee River and its tributaries, but not those spring-run Chinook that return to LNFH.

Prior to spawning, adults hold in deeper pools and under cover in the mainstem Wenatchee River or natal tributaries. Juveniles (parr) may redistribute downstream from tributaries to the middle and lower Wenatchee River during their first spring or fall, then typically overwinter in fresh water before migrating to sea the following spring (Peven, 2003; Hillman and Chapman 1989 in Chapman, 1989).

The number of adults estimated to return to the Wenatchee River can vary considerably from year to year; however, average abundance declined steadily from greater than 3,000 fish in the 1960s to less than 500 fish in the mid-1990s (10-year average) (WDFW, 2016b). Numbers have increased in recent years to a 10-year average exceeding 1,500 fish since 2010. Hatchery-reared fish have supplemented the number of spawning adults since

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> This population is considered a distinct stock based on its spawning distribution, early run timing beginning in May, early spawn timing in very late July through September, and genetic composition.

the early 1990s; however, natural production has not recovered to a level that would sustain a recreational fishery (WDFW, 2010).

From 1989 to 2015, an estimated average of 148 Wenatchee River adult spring-run Chinook salmon per year migrated into Icicle Creek to spawn. Evidence of spring-run Chinook spawning has been observed from the mouth of Icicle Creek to the confluence with Snow Creek; however, the majority of redds are observed from the LNFH to Sleeping Lady (RM 2.8 to 3.3) (Hillman et al., 2016). The spring-run Chinook salmon spawners in Icicle Creek are strays that originate from the Chiwawa Hatchery supplementation program and White River in the upper Wenatchee River Watershed.

#### Summer-run Chinook Salmon

Wenatchee summer-run Chinook salmon<sup>13</sup> are also found in the Wenatchee River. Prior to spawning, adults hold in deeper pools and under cover in the mainstem, and spawning occurs throughout the mainstem with redds observed specifically within 8 miles of the City of Leavenworth near the confluence with Icicle Creek (WDFW, 2016b). Small numbers of summer-run Chinook salmon enter Icicle Creek to spawn. Since the late 1980s, the spawning population has been supplemented by hatchery-reared spawners.

Over the past several decades, the number of Wenatchee summer-run Chinook salmon returning to their native spawning areas has been relatively stable between 6,000 and 8,300 fish (10-year average). The abundance of adults returning to the spawning grounds has exceeded WDFW's goals for achieving sustainability of the population of 7,500 fish in 17 out of 29 years (WDFW, 2016b).

From 2006 to 2015, 2 to 75 summer-run Chinook salmon redds have been observed in Icicle Creek downstream of LNFH (Hillman et al., 2016). Summer-run Chinook salmon spawning in Icicle Creek are a mixture of hatchery-origin strays and wild-origin fish.

#### Summer-run Steelhead

Summer-run steelhead in the Icicle project area include the Wenatchee stock<sup>14</sup> of the Upper Columbia Summer Steelhead ESU, which is listed as threatened under the ESA (NOAA Fisheries, 2016; 64 FR 14308; 70 FR 37160).

Most spawning takes place in the Wenatchee River and tributaries upstream of the confluence with Icicle Creek, including the Little Wenatchee, Chiwawa, and White Rivers, and Nason Creek. Spawning also takes place in Icicle Creek and other tributaries downstream of Icicle Creek, including Mission and Peshastin Creeks (NPCC, 2004; WDFW, 2016b).

Adult steelhead enter the Wenatchee River from August through the following April and spawn in very late March through May. Steelhead parr may redistribute downstream away from natal streams during their first year to rear in mainstem reaches of the Wenatchee

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> This population is considered a distinct stock based on its spawning distribution, river entry time in June, spawn timing in late September through mid-November, and genetic composition.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> This population is identified as a distinct stock based on their spawning distribution and run timing.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

River. Steelhead tend to remain in fresh water until migrating to sea as yearlings the following spring (reviewed in NPCC, 2004).

During the 54 years from 1962 to 2015, the annual goal of 3,000 spawning adults was estimated to have been met in only 9 years, and a minimum abundance of 1,000 spawning adults required for population recovery has been met in 35 years.

From 1962 to 2015, the estimated number of adult spawners has varied considerably. A major decline in the late 1970s and early 1980s occurred when the number of spawners dropped to near or below 100 fish in 6 consecutive years. Since 1987, the Wenatchee summer-run steelhead population has been supplemented by fish raised in hatcheries. Numbers have increased since the early 1990s with an average number of spawners between 1,000 and 2,500 fish (10-year average) (WDFW, 2016b).

In 2014 and 2015, it is estimated that 121 and 135, respectively, Wenatchee summer-run steelhead spawners reached Icicle Creek, representing a mixture of hatchery-origin strays and wild-origin fish (Hillman et al., 2016). The number of summer-run steelhead redds observed in the lower reaches of Icicle Creek has ranged from a low of 6 to a high of 180 from 2001 to 2013.

#### Coho Salmon

Coho salmon (*O. kisutch*) were once extinct in the Wenatchee River Watershed but were reintroduced in 1999 through an effort led by the CTCR and YN. Currently, coho salmon spawn and rear in the mainstem Wenatchee River between the City of Cashmere to Lake Wenatchee and in Icicle Creek (NPCC, 2004).

Coho salmon enter the Wenatchee River in early September through late November, spawning between mid-October to late December. Coho fry emerge in April or May, then distribute themselves downstream to tributaries or off-channel habitat where they overwinter and rear for 1 year until migrating to sea the following March through May (NPCC, 2004).

Over the past several decades, the number of coho within the Icicle project area has been increasing. Between 1999 and 2011, the number of fish returning to the Wenatchee River ranged from 350 adults to 23,000 adults with the population reaching sufficient numbers in 2009, 2011, 2014, and 2015 for tribal and sport fisheries to be opened (Galbreath et al., 2013; Kraig and Scalici, 2016).

#### Sockeye Salmon

Sockeye salmon (*O. nerka*) that migrate through the Wenatchee River include the Wenatchee stock of the Upper Columbia River sockeye salmon stocks, which are considered healthy and are not ESA-listed. However, monitoring has been recommended because of the potential for the species to become threatened (64 FR 14528). Wenatchee sockeye salmon originate in tributary sub-watersheds to Lake Wenatchee, upstream of the confluence with Icicle Creek.

Yearling juvenile sockeye salmon migrate to sea in the spring. Adults return to the Wenatchee River Watershed in June and July after 2 to 3 years at sea, with the peak of the run entering the Wenatchee River in mid-July.

Recreational fishing of Wenatchee sockeye salmon occurs in Lake Wenatchee when the numbers of returning fish meet state goals of 23,000 fish (WDFW, 2016c). No sockeye salmon fishery is allowed in the mainstem Wenatchee River.

#### **Pacific Lamprey**

Pacific lamprey (*Entosphenus tridentatus*) occur throughout the Wenatchee River downstream of Icicle Creek but have not been observed in Icicle Creek (Beals and Lampman, 2016a). Pacific lamprey are a federal species of concern and state priority species (USFWS, 2010; WDFW, 2008).

Larval lamprey are filter feeders that inhabit silt and mud substrate in slow-moving water for 4 to 7 years in temperatures up to 77 °C (Wydoski and Whitney, 2003). In the Columbia River, juveniles metamorphose in October or November and immediately migrate downstream to sea in the fall or the following spring where they feed parasitically by attaching to larger fish and sucking body fluids using their sucker-like mouths, sharp teeth, and rasping tongues. Adult Pacific lamprey migrate back to fresh water in spring and summer, overwinter in deep pools, then spawn the following spring from April through July. Adults cease feeding after entering fresh water and subsist on energy stores through spawning, after which most will die; however, some may survive and return to sea. Adults spawn by excavating nests in fine gravel and sandy substrate in relatively cool (45 to 50 °C), oxygen-rich water at the tails of pools and riffles.

Pacific lamprey abundance in the Wenatchee River Watershed is estimated to be greatly reduced from historical conditions. Adult lamprey counts at mainstem Columbia River dams since 2000 indicate that the number of lamprey observed in the mid-Columbia River near the confluence with the Wenatchee River has ranged from approximately 31 to 3,036 fish annually (DART, 2016); however, it is unknown how many of this subset of adults enter the Wenatchee River each year to spawn (Johnsen and Nelson, 2012).

#### 3.7.3.2 Resident Fish

Bull trout, rainbow trout, westslope cutthroat trout, and other resident species (listed below) are prevalent throughout the Wenatchee River and tributaries.

#### **Bull Trout**

Bull trout reside in headwater areas to tributaries of the Wenatchee River, and fluvial lifehistory types may use the Wenatchee River as foraging habitat or as a migratory corridor. The Wenatchee River Watershed has high diversity among bull trout populations<sup>15</sup>.

Fluvial bull trout that originate in headwaters of the Chiwawa River have been monitored by WDFW since 1989; the total number of redds<sup>16</sup> observed has averaged 233 redds, ranging from 71 redds in 1990 to 377 redds in 1999 (WDFW, 2016a).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Seven distinct spawning populations of bull trout are identified in the Wenatchee River Watershed based on their geographic distribution and isolation from other spawning populations and unique genetics.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Typically, each redd is fertilized by one male bull trout.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Rainbow and Westslope Cutthroat Trout**

Rainbow trout and westslope cutthroat trout are common throughout rivers and lakes of Washington, including the Wenatchee River and tributaries (Wydoski and Whitney, 2003). See Section 3.7.2.2, [Icicle Creek] Resident Fish for life-history information.

#### **Other Resident Fishes**

Other native resident fish that inhabit the Wenatchee River include mountain whitefish; three-spined stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*); minnows, including chiselmouth (*Acrocheilus alutaceus*), peamouth (*Mylocheilus caurinus*), longnose dace, speckled dace (*Rhinichthys osculus*), redside shiner, northern pikeminnow, and possibly leopard dace (*Rhinichthys falcatus*) and Umatilla dace (*Rhinichthys umatilla*), which have spotty distributions in the region; suckers, including longnose sucker, bridgelip sucker, largescale sucker (*Catostomus macrocheilus*), and mountain sucker (*Catostomus platyrhynchus*); and sculpins, including mottled sculpin (*Cottus bairdii*), shorthead sculpin (*Cottus confuses*), torrent sculpin (*Cottus rhotheus*), and possibly Paiute sculpin (*Cottus beldingii*) based on one historical account (Chapman, 1989; Wydoski and Whitney, 2003; NPCC, 2004).

As in Icicle Creek, many of these resident fishes eat plant matter or invertebrates, with the exception of sculpins (Hillman, 1989) and northern pikeminnow that become effective predators on other fishes when they grow to larger sizes in larger rivers (e.g., greater than 300 millimeters [mm]) (LCFRB, 2004).

Non-native crappie also occur in the Wenatchee River (NPCC, 2004).

### 3.7.3.3 Habitat Conditions

In general, fish habitat in the Wenatchee River has been degraded over time through a variety of causes, including agriculture, road and railroad development, and increased urbanization and development. Habitat impacts have resulted from floodplain development for agriculture and urban uses, irrigation diversions, bank armoring, and reduced habitat-forming woody debris, and riparian vegetation removal.

### 3.7.3.4 Barriers to Passage

Passage through the Wenatchee River up to Icicle Creek is relatively unobstructed compared to rivers of similar size in the Pacific Northwest.

In the Lower Wenatchee River, Dryden Dam, an 8-foot-high irrigation diversion dam, has a fish ladder to facilitate passage, but may cause migration delay for some salmon (Reviewed in NPCC, 2004) and may limit lamprey passage (Johnsen and Nelson, 2012).

Irrigation diversions are typically designed to exclude juvenile salmon and other fish but may impair downstream redistribution and passage of larval and juvenile lamprey in the lower Wenatchee River Watershed (reviewed in Johnsen and Nelson, 2012). Larval lamprey are small enough to easily pass through bypass traps and screens and become entrained in irrigation canals during water diversion in summer and become stranded when canals are dewatered in the fall. Recent salvage efforts at the Dryden Diversion, located just downstream of Peshastin Creek at RM 28.3, have rescued and released approximately 6,500 juveniles in 1 year (Mosey, 2009), and it was estimated that tens of thousands of larval and juvenile lamprey may be entrained in just the Dryden Diversion each year (Beals and Lampman, 2016b).

## 3.7.4 Aquatic Invertebrates

Invertebrates are a major source of food for fish, and changes in invertebrate communities may result in changes in the condition of fish communities (Waters, 1982; Wilzbach et al., 1986). Salmon and trout commonly feed on larval or recently emerged invertebrates such as mayflies, stoneflies, and caddisflies that are fully aquatic at the larval stage, and zooplankton such as water fleas and tiny crustaceans.

In the Alpine Lakes, trout feed primarily on zooplankton and benthic invertebrates. In outlet streams from the Alpine Lakes, Icicle Creek, and the Wenatchee River, the aquatic invertebrate community appears to increase in diversity with increasing stream order (Adams, 2012), owing to changes in food sources from courser to more fine organic particulate matter (Vannote et al., 1980).

Aquatic invertebrates, like other aquatic organisms, respond to changes in water quality, food abundance, and other habitat parameters. Macroinvertebrate community composition can reflect historical water quality or habitat degradation (Rosenberg and Resh, 1993). In Washington State, benthic macroinvertebrate (invertebrates large enough to be seen without magnification) communities are analyzed to monitor the health of streams (Plotnikoff and Ehinger, 1997). Key conditions that influence the aquatic invertebrate communities in Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River include elevated water temperature and associated low dissolved oxygen, phosphorus enrichment, and associated elevation of pH (Adams, 2012). A biological assessment of the macroinvertebrate community of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River reflects a signal of poor water quality in the lower Wenatchee River downstream of the Town of Monitor, fair water quality between Dryden and Monitor, and good water quality near the Town of Peshastin and in Icicle Creek, with the exception of points immediately downstream of the City of Leavenworth (Adams, 2012). The macroinvertebrate community appeared to be most disturbed in two locations on the Wenatchee River, near and downstream of City of Leavenworth, and downstream of the City of Cashmere to the mouth of the Wenatchee River, with sites of concern in the upper Icicle Creek near two recreational camping areas. Pollution tolerant species were present; however, a clear pattern was not discernable and may reflect localized factors in the stream.

## 3.8 Vegetation

Vegetation within the Icicle project area supports a variety of different landscapes, ranging from forested areas, riparian corridors, wetlands, and more urbanized development. Within the project area, these vegetation types provide wildlife habitat, ecosystem services, and recreational and aesthetic value.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This section is based primarily on existing information and aerial photograph analysis. Although existing mapping, WDFW Priority Habitat and Species data (WDFW, 2016), and USFWS National Wetlands Inventory data provide an indication of the potential presence or absence of sensitive areas, such as wetlands, this information would be field verified as appropriate during project-level review. Field visits were completed for some parts of the project area as indicated below.

## 3.8.1 Alpine Lakes

The Alpine Lakes are located on the eastern side of the Cascade Mountain range in an area that includes alpine and subalpine biotic zones. The Alpine Lakes within the Icicle project area include Colchuck, Eightmile, Upper and Lower Klonaqua, Square, Nada, and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes.

These lakes are located east of the Cascade crest. The Icicle project area in and adjacent to these lakes exhibits a range of vegetation communities from west to east as a result of differences in elevation and precipitation. The crest of the Cascades annually receives about 180 inches of precipitation, mostly in the form of snow, while lower elevations in the eastern portion of project area, near the City of Leavenworth, average 25 inches of precipitation a year.

The Alpine Lakes are dominated by forested habitat with species such as silver fir (*Abies amabilis*), subalpine fir (*Abies lasiocarpa*), Engelmann spruce (*Picea engelmannii*), and mountain hemlock (*Tsuga mertensiana*) in the upper elevation areas. Avalanche chutes are brushy with deciduous species such as Sitka alder (*Alnus sinuata*), vine maple (*Acer circinatum*), and Rocky Mountain maple (*Acer glabrum*). Lower elevations include Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), western white pine (*Pinus monticola*), ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*), shore pine (*Pinus contorta*), western hemlock (*Tsuga heterophylla*), and western redcedar (*Thuja plicata*) (USFS, 2016; Franklin and Dyrness, 1973).

All of these species were observed during a reconnaissance site visit to Colchuck, Eightmile, Upper and Lower Klonaqua, and Square Lakes in July 2016. Similar forest and shrub vegetation communities are likely present at Nada and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes, based on aerial photograph analysis and the similar elevation and location of these lakes. No species listed on the Chelan County Weed List were observed during the field reconnaissance site visit.

Dominant shrub and understory species observed during the July 2016 site visits include Scouler willow (*Salix scouleriana*), Cascade azalea (*Rhododendron albiflorum*), twinberry (*Lonicera involucrata*), white spirea (*Spiraea betulifolia*), red huckleberry (*Vaccinium parvifolium*), kinnikinnick (*Arctosaphylos uva-ursi*), and western thimbleberry (*Rubus parviflorus*). Common and scientific names of plant species observed during the July 2016 site visits are provided in Table 3-14.

Existing mapping does not identify any wetland habitats within the vicinity of Colchuck, Eightmile, Upper and Lower Klonaqua, Square, and Upper Snow Lakes; however, palustrine scrub-shrub (PSS) and palustrine forest (PFO) wetland systems have been mapped in a few locations along the shoreline of Lower Snow and Nada Lakes (WDFW, 2016; USFWS, 2016). Reconnaissance surveys confirmed wetland conditions are present at several of the lakes and along the trail to Eightmile Lake. Wetland conditions were also observed along the Eightmile Lake trail in several locations. These wetlands included palustrine emergent (PEM), PSS, and PFO wetland systems associated with creeks and streams along the trail (See Figure 3-10).

Scientific Name	Common Name	Indicator Status	
Abies grandis	Grand fir	FACU-	
Abies amabilis	Silver fir	FACU	
Abies lasiocarpa	Subalpine fir	FACU	
Acer circinatum	Vine maple	FAC-	
Acer glabrum	Rocky mountain maple	FACU	
Achillea millefolium	Yarrow	FACU	
Alnus sinuata	Sitka alder	FACW	
Arctostaphylos uva-ursi	Kinnikinnick	FACU	
Holodiscus discolor	Oceanspray	UPL	
Lonicera involucrata	Twinberry	FAC+	
Lupine polyphyllus	Large-leaved lupine	FAC+	
Mahonia aquifolium	Tall Oregon grape	UPL	
Picea engelmannii	Engelmann spruce	FAC	
Pinus monticola	Western white pine	FACU	
Pinus ponderosa	Ponderosa pine	FACU-	
Plantago major	Common plantain	FACU+	
Populus tremuloides	Quaking aspen	FAC+	
Populus trichocarpa	Black cottonwood	FAC	
Pseudotsuga menziesii	Douglas fir	FACU	
Pteridium aquilinum	Bracken fern	FACU	
Rhododendron albiflorum	Cascade azalea	FACU	
Rosa nutkana	Nootka rose	FAC	
Rubus parviflorus	Western thimbleberry	FAC-	
Salix lasiandra	Pacific willow	FACW	
Salix scouleriana	Scouler willow	FAC	
Sambucus cerulea	Blue elderberry	FACU	
Smilacina racemosa	False-Soloman's-seal	FAC-	
Spiraea betulifolia	White spirea	FACU	
Thuja plicata	Western redcedar	FAC	
Tsuga mertensiana	Mountain hemlock	FACU	
Vaccinium ovatum	Evergreen huckleberry	UPL	
Vaccinium parvifolium	Red huckleberry	UPL	

Table 3-14
Plant Species Observed at the Alpine Lakes during the July 2016 Site Visit

Notes: FAC = Facultative, FACU = Facultative Upland, FACW = Facultative Wetland, UPL = Obligate Upland

#### **ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN**

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 3-10. Wetland Near Eightmile Lake



At Eightmile Lake, wetland conditions were not observed at the outlet location, but several potential PEM, PSS, and PFO wetland features were observed along the lake shoreline. PEM and PSS wetland conditions were present near the outlet location at Square Lake and in several areas along the shoreline of Square Lake. Overall, potential wetland habitat was more common at Square Lake than any of the other three lakes investigated during the site visits. At Klonaqua Lake, PEM and PSS wetland conditions were present in the vicinity of the outlet location and appeared to be present in some locations along the lake shoreline, but the majority of the lake shoreline was composed of upland habitat. Wetland features were not present at the outlet location at Colchuck Lake and the majority of the lake shoreline resembled upland conditions.

## 3.8.2 Icicle Creek

## 3.8.2.1 Vegetation

Vegetation along the Icicle Creek corridor is dominated by forested communities similar to the species identified in Section 3.8.1, Alpine Lakes. The species composition changes with elevation and corresponding changes in precipitation. At the higher elevations near the upper end of Icicle Creek, vegetation is similar to that found at the Alpine Lakes. At the lower elevations in the valley near the City of Leavenworth, the Icicle Creek riparian corridor includes more roads, agricultural, and rural residential development. Vegetative communities include those associated with more developed areas such as roads, agricultural fields, residential properties, golf courses, and other urban developments. The majority of the riparian corridor along Icicle Creek includes upland habitat; however, existing mapping identifies PEM, PSS, and PFO wetland features along the shoreline of Icicle Creek in several locations (WDFW, 2016; USFWS, 2016).

The following subsections address in greater detail the vegetative communities present in areas with the greatest potential to be affected by the Program Alternatives.

## 3.8.2.2 Icicle Creek Boulder Field

The Icicle Creek Boulder field is an approximately 2,600-foot-long high-gradient reach of Icicle Creek located upstream of RM 5.6. This is one of the locations where fish passage could be addressed as part of the Strategy Alternatives (Dominguez et al., 2013). Riparian habitat south of this reach along Icicle Creek includes steep sloped upland forest and shrub vegetation communities with rock features as a dominant substrate. To the north, trees and shrubs occur in isolated and sparse patches with rock substrate as the dominant ground cover. A gravel parking lot and a gravel access road are located north of the creek, ranging from 50 to 200 feet from the creek shoreline. Icicle Road is just north of the access road and vegetation is similar to the steep sloped hillside to the south. No wetland habitat is mapped along this reach of Icicle Creek (USFWS, 2016b).

### 3.8.2.3 Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery

LNFH is located adjacent to Icicle Creek at RM 3.0, about 2 miles south of the City of Leavenworth. LNFH diverts surface water from Icicle Creek at RM 4.5 for fish production at the hatchery. LNFH discharges effluent back to Icicle Creek at RM 2.8.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Proposed activities associated with the alternatives at the LNFH include water quality and fish passage improvements between RM 2.8 and 4.5.

The LNFH property is developed with buildings, raceways, ponds, other structures, and paved and unpaved impervious surfaces. Riparian habitat adjacent to the Hatchery Channel includes upland tree, shrub, grass, and herbaceous habitat typical for the region. Paved and unpaved roads are located near the channel. Rural residential development and pasture are located west and north of LNFH. The Icicle Creek historical channel is located east of the hatchery channel. Upland forest and shrub vegetation communities are located in higher elevations east and south of the Icicle Creek historical channel. No wetland habitat is mapped within the LNFH; however, the Icicle Creek historical channel east of the hatchery channel has been mapped as palustrine scrub-shrub wetland habitat (USFWS, 2016b).

## 3.8.2.4 Confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River

The confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River is located at the south end of the Leavenworth city limits. Riparian habitat in this portion of the Icicle project area includes upland tree, shrub, grass, and herbaceous vegetation communities typical for the region. Land use also includes residential development and pasture with associated paved and unpaved roads. The Leavenworth Golf Club and residential development is located on the left bank of the Wenatchee River, across from the Icicle Creek and Wenatchee River confluence. Palustrine emergent wetland habitat is mapped adjacent to Icicle Creek (USFWS, 2016b).

## 3.8.3 Wenatchee River Corridor

The Icicle project area extends along the Wenatchee River from near Icicle Creek downstream to the confluence with the Columbia River at the City of Wenatchee and includes riparian and upland areas. The majority of land use in this part of the project area consists of agricultural activities, and the main vegetative communities consist largely of orchards. The IPID irrigation canals extend down the valley on the hillsides on both sides of the Wenatchee River and provide water for irrigation of agricultural properties from the City of Leavenworth down to the Town of Monitor. Agricultural lands are intermixed with scattered residential development, intensifying near City of Wenatchee and the confluence with the Columbia River. Riparian trees in this area are limited to narrow bands of deciduous trees such as black cottonwood (*Populus trichocarpa*), along the banks of the Wenatchee River and its tributaries. Along the banks of the Wenatchee River there is scattered riparian habitat, similar to that described in Section 3.8.2, Icicle Creek.

While the majority of the Wenatchee River Corridor is upland, existing mapping identifies palustrine emergent (PEM), palustrine shrub (PSS), and palustrine forested (PFO) wetland features in the Wenatchee River Corridor in numerous locations (WDFW, 2016; USFWS 2016).<sup>17</sup> This includes the area currently being considered for the IPID Pump Station on the right bank of the Wenatchee River near the Highway 2 Bridge,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> The palustrine system includes all nontidal wetlands dominated by trees, shrubs, persistent emergent, emergent mosses or lichens, and all such wetlands that occur in tidal areas where salinity is below 0.5 ppt

adjacent to the Town of Dryden (Figure 2-43). Land use in this area is dominated by orchards and rural residential development with associated paved and unpaved roads. No wetland habitat is mapped in this area of the Wenatchee River (USFWS, 2016b).

## 3.9 Wildlife

Wildlife diversity is generally related to the structure and composition of plant species within vegetative communities. Wetlands and forested areas with well-developed shrub layers are likely to support the greatest number of species and populations of wildlife (Brown, 1985). Coniferous and deciduous forest and wetland environments provide habitat for a variety of wildlife species because of the vegetative diversity and availability of forage and nest sites.

This section is based on existing information and aerial photograph analysis. Field visits were completed for some parts of the Icicle project area as indicated below.

Overall, wildlife habitat in the Alpine Lakes and Icicle Creek portions of the Icicle project area are relatively high quality and provide diverse habitat to support a variety of wildlife species. Habitat within the Wenatchee River Corridor is more impacted by urban development and provides lower quality wildlife habitat for wildlife species to occupy. More developed portions of the project area tend to support wildlife species adapted to human activities and disturbance.

## 3.9.1 Alpine Lakes

## 3.9.1.1 Amphibians and Reptiles

Wetlands and riparian areas associated with the Alpine Lakes and receiving streams in this portion of the Icicle project area provide habitat for a variety of amphibians, such as Pacific tree frog (*Pseudacris regilla*), western toad (*Anaxyrus boreas*), tailed frog (*Ascaphus truei*), Cascades frog (*Rana cascadae*), Columbia spotted frog (*Rana luteiventris*), and long-toed salamander (*Ambystoma macrodactylum*). Several frogs, were observed during a reconnaissance field visit to five of the Alpine Lakes (Colchuck, Eightmile, Upper and Lower Klonaqua, and Square Lakes) in July 2016. Frogs observed during the site visit were observed within the lakes, not on land. The frog species were assumed to be the Cascades frog, based on the limited visibility of observing the frogs within the lake water.

The USFS performed large-scale amphibian presence/absence surveys in the Icicle Creek Basin in July and August 2016. Within the Icicle Creek Basin, the surveys included Nada and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes and the five lakes observed during the July site visits, including Colchuck, Eightmile, Upper and Lower Klonaqua, and Square Lakes. Amphibian species observed at these eight lakes during the USFS surveys included Cascades frog (Square Lake), Columbia spotted frog (Upper and Lower Snow Lakes),

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Pacific tree frog (Upper and Lower Klonaqua, and Square Lakes), and long-toed salamander (Upper and Lower Snow Lakes) (Claeson, 2016).

Reptiles, such as the western garter snake (*Thamnophis elegans*), are likely to occur in the upland habitats surrounding the lakes. Upland habitats with rocks and wood debris support species such as northern alligator lizard (*Elgaria coerulea*) and western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*). Common garter snakes (*Thamnophis sirtalis*) and northern alligator lizards were observed during the July 2016 site visits.

## 3.9.1.2 Mammals

Mammal species associated with forested habitats at the Alpine Lakes include mountain beaver (*Aplodontia rufa*), bobcat (*Lynx rufus*), hoary marmot (*Marmota caligata*), fisher (*Martes pennanti*), Douglas squirrel (*Tamiasciurus douglasii*), voles (*Microtus spp.*), pika (*Ochotona princeps*), and striped skunk (*Mephitis mephitis*). Larger mammals, such as elk (*Cervus elaphus*), black-tailed deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), black bear (*Ursus americanus*), cougar (*Felis concolor*), and coyote (*Canis latrans*), are also found in the forested habitat. Mountain goats (*Oreamnos americanus*) are found in the high-altitude areas (USFWS, 2016a). Deer tracks and scat were frequently observed during the July 2016 site visit.

Wetlands and riparian areas associated with streams originating from the lakes provide habitat for bats (*Myotis spp.*), shrews (*Sorex spp.*), common opossum (*Didelphis marsupialis*), and raccoon (*Procyon lotor*). These and similar species depend on water for foraging and breeding habitat.

## 3.9.1.3 Birds

Forested habitats in this portion of the Icicle project area provide foraging and nesting habitat for a wide variety of bird species with more than 150 species of birds recorded (USFWS, 2016a). Songbird species that occupy habitats found within the Alpine Lakes area of the Icicle project area include song sparrow (*Melospiza melodia*), bushtit (*Psaltriparus minimus*), Bewick's wren (*Thryomanes bewickii*), Stellar's jay (*Cyanocitta stelleri*), spotted towhee (*Pipilo erythrophthalmus*), Swainson's thrush (*Catharus ustulatus*), winter wren (*Troglodytes troglodytes*), varied thrush (*Ixoreus naevius*), black-capped chickadee (*Parus atricapillus*), chestnut-backed chickadee (*Parus rufescens*), dark-eyed junco (*Junco hyemalis*), golden-crowned kinglet (*Regulus satrapa*), and red-breasted nuthatch (*Sitta canadensis*).

Migratory bird species, such as black swift (*Cypseloides niger*), Cassin's finch (*Carpodacus cassinii*), fox sparrow (*Passerella iliaca*), loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), olive-sided flycatcher (*Contopus borealis*), rufous hummingbird (*Selasphorus rufus*), and willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii*), likely use forested habitats for foraging during spring and fall migrations (USFWS, 2016a).

Predatory birds, such as bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), and osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*), commonly hunt in these habitat types and occur in forested areas near bodies of water. Snags and downed trees along the lake edges also provide perch sites for these and other raptor species. Snags in forested habitats also provide potential nest sites for cavity-nesting birds, such as great horned owl (*Bubo* 

*virginianus*) and species of woodpeckers, including Lewis's woodpecker (*Melanerpes lewis*), downy woodpecker (*Picoides pubescens*), northern flicker (*Colaptes auratus*), and pileated woodpecker (*Dryocopus pileatus*).

Lake and wetland habitats containing riverine, emergent, scrub/shrub, and forested wetland types provide wildlife habitat for a variety of bird species. Lakes can be expected to provide habitat for belted kingfisher (*Ceryle alcyon*) and wintering and migratory waterfowl, including gadwall (*Anas strepera*), American widgeon (*Mareca americana*), mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*), common loon (*Gavia immer*), and western grebe (*Aechmophorus occidentalis*). Emergent and scrub/shrub wetland areas provide habitat for red-winged blackbird (*Agelaius phoeniceus*), song sparrow (*Melospiza melodia*), and marsh wren (*Cistothorus palustris*), among others. Great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*) may forage in lake and wetland habitats where they could prey on amphibians and other species.

## 3.9.2 Icicle Creek

The Icicle Creek corridor provides similar forested, riparian, and wetland habitat conditions that would support the same types of wildlife species as the Alpine Lakes area with more variation in plant species and vegetation communities likely to the result of the lower elevation and precipitation in the Lower Icicle Creek area. Species more vulnerable to human activities and development, such as larger mammal species like black bear and cougar, would be less likely to be found near roads and parcels with residential development in the lower elevation areas of Icicle Creek. This part of the Icicle project area includes more native and non-native wildlife species adapted to human activity because of the presence of roads, agricultural fields, residential properties, golf courses, and other developments. Roads also function as a potential barrier to migration of larger mammal species such as deer and elk.

## 3.9.2.1 Icicle Creek Boulder Field

The Icicle Creek Boulder Field, as described in Section 3.8.2.2, is an approximately 2,600foot-long high-gradient reach of Icicle Creek located near RM 5.6. Wildlife species likely to occur within this area include birds, mammals, reptiles, and amphibian species similar to those described for the Alpine Lakes in Section 3.9.1. Species adapted to human activity and disturbances would occur associated with roads and residential development in the vicinity.

## 3.9.2.2 Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery

LNFH, as described in section 3.8.2.3, is located adjacent to Icicle Creek at RM 3.0, about 2 miles south of the City of Leavenworth. Upland wildlife species within this area would also include those better adapted to human activity and disturbance, such as crows, squirrels, etc. Fish and aquatic invertebrates are described in Section 3.7, Fish.

## 3.9.2.3 Confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River

The area near the confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River, as described in Section 3.8.2.4, is located at the south end of the Leavenworth city limits. Just upstream, the COIC shares a point of diversion with LNFH located on Icicle Creek at RM 4.5. Riparian habitat in this part of the Icicle project area includes upland tree, shrub,

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

grass, and herbaceous habitats typical for the region as described in Section 3.8, Vegetation. Land use also includes residential development and pasture with associated paved and unpaved roads. The Leavenworth Golf Club and residential development is located on the left bank of the Wenatchee River, across from the Icicle Creek and Wenatchee River confluence. Palustrine emergent wetland habitat is mapped adjacent to Icicle Creek (USFWS, 2016b). Upland wildlife species within this area would also include those better adapted to human activity and disturbance, such as crows, squirrels, etc.

## 3.9.3 Wenatchee River Corridor

The Icicle project area extends along the Wenatchee River from Icicle Creek downstream to the confluence with the Columbia River at the City of Wenatchee and includes riparian and upland habitat areas and associated wildlife.

The majority of the potential wildlife habitat in the Wenatchee River Corridor area of the Icicle project area is relatively lower quality because of the dominant presence of residential and commercial development, roads, and agricultural land use. Developed areas provide habitat for disturbance-tolerant species such as American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*), American robin (*Turdus migratorius*), European starling (*Sturnus vulgaris*), and house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*).

Developed areas reduce available wildlife habitat for mammals and limit habitat value for larger mammals that require greater areas of unbroken habitat to forage and reproduce. These areas are populated by common, urban-adapted mammal species, including raccoon, opossum, and eastern gray squirrel, and a variety of small mammals, including deer mice and old world rodents (such as the Norway rat).

The IPID irrigation canals extend down the valley on the hillsides on both sides of the Wenatchee River and provide water for irrigation of agricultural properties from City of Leavenworth down to the Town of Monitor. Species in these areas include native and non-native wildlife species adapted to human activity because of the presence of roads, agricultural fields, residential properties, and commercial and other developments.

## **3.10Threatened and Endangered Species**

This section describes plant, wildlife, and fish species that are listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA that have the potential to occur within the project area. This section also provides information on state priority habitats and species established by WDFW.

Section 9 of the ESA prevents the take of endangered species and, for threatened species, authorizes the agencies (NOAA Fisheries and USFWS) to adopt regulations necessary and advisable for species conservation, which may include prohibiting take (16 U.S. Code § 1538). The ESA defines "take" to mean harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, trap, capture, or collect, or attempt to engage in any such conduct.

The ESA requires NOAA Fisheries and USFWS to designate critical habitat for listed species, defined as follows: 1) specific areas within the geographical area occupied by the species at the time of listing, if they contain physical or biological features essential to conservation, and those features may require special management considerations or protection; and 2) specific areas outside the geographical area occupied by the species at the time of listing if the agency determines that the area itself is essential for conservation.

The Washington State Hydraulic Code serves to protect fish and their habitats. Implementing elements of the Program Alternatives that use, divert, obstruct, or change the natural flow or bed of fresh state waters would require a Hydraulic Project Approval from WDFW. Implementing certain projects related to the Program Alternatives would also likely include compliance with local critical areas codes, zoning ordinances, and other land use requirements.

ESA-listed species were identified based on information from the USFWS endangered species web sites (USFWS, 2016a, 2016b). The statewide *Priority Habitat and Species* (PHS) *List* includes priority terrestrial and aquatic habitats, as well as priority habitat features (WDFW, 2008). The *WDFW PHS List* also identifies specific counties in Washington where priority species have been documented. Field visits were completed for some parts of the Icicle project area as indicated below.

## 3.10.1 Federal Threatened and Endangered Plant Species

There are three ESA-listed plant species identified by the USFWS (USFWS, 2016a) as potentially occurring within Chelan County: showy stickseed (*Hackelia venusta*), Ute ladies' tresses (*Spiranthes diluvialis*), and Wenatchee Mountains checkermallow (*Sidalcea oregana var. calva*). Of these, two species, showy stickseed and Wenatchee Mountains checkermallow have the potential to occur within the Alpine Lakes, Icicle Creek Corridor, and Wenatchee River Corridor as shown in Table 3-15 (USFWS, 2016b). Ute ladies tresses could potentially be found in the vicinity but is not likely to occur within the Icicle project area. Wenatchee Mountains checkermallow also has critical habitat within Chelan County, although none is located within the project area. The status and preferred habitats of federally listed and proposed plant species protected under the ESA as identified by USFWS, are presented in Table 3-15.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Common Name (Scientific Name)	Agency	Status <sup>1,2</sup>	Preferred Habitat <sup>3</sup>	Chelan County <sup>1</sup>	Alpine Lakes Area <sup>2</sup>	lcicle Creek Corridor Area <sup>2</sup>	Wenatchee River Corridor Area <sup>2</sup>	
Flowering Plants								
Showy stickseed ( <i>Hackelia</i> <i>venusta</i> )	USFWS	Endangered	Grows in openings of ponderosa pine ( <i>Pinus ponderosa</i> ) and Douglas fir ( <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> ) forests on loose, well-drained, granitic rocky or sandy soils. It is found on unstable talus slopes, and ledges or cracks on cliff faces at lower elevations.	х	х	х	Х	
Ute ladies' tresses ( <i>Spiranthes</i> <i>diluvialis</i> )	USFWS	Threatened	Adapted to early- to mid-seral, moist to wet conditions, where competition for light, space, water, and other resources is normally kept low by periodic or recent disturbance events. Major occupied habitat types include: 1) alluvial banks, point bars, floodplains, or ox- bows associated with perennial streams, with a high water table and short, perennial graminoid- and forb- dominated vegetation maintained by grazing, periodic flooding, or mowing; 2) river floodplain habitats that experience regular spring flooding and/or frequent large scale floods, but maintain relatively stable, moist to wet soil in summer, within moist meadow, riparian woodland, or riparian shrubland communities; 3) shores of lakes and reservoirs, in mesic meadow-type vegetation maintained by lake level fluctuations or seasonal flooding of gravel bars.	X				
Wenatchee Mountains checkermallow ( <i>Sidalcea</i> <i>oregana var.</i> <i>calva</i> )	USFWS	Endangered	Moist meadows with surface water or saturated upper soils into early summer. Sites generally dominated by perennial herbs and rhizomatous, perennial grasses; deciduous and coniferous trees and shrubs including ponderosa pine, Douglas fir, and quaking aspen ( <i>Populus tremuloides</i> ) may also be present. May occur along permanent or intermittent streams, near seeps, springs, or small drainages.	х	х	х	Х	

## Table 3-15Federally Listed and Proposed Plant Species

Notes: 1) USFWS 2016b; 2) USFWS, 2016a; 3) NatureServe, 2015

## 3.10.2 Federal Threatened and Endangered Wildlife Species

There are six ESA-listed wildlife species with the potential to be found within Chelan County: marbled murrelet (Brachyramphus marmoratus), northern spotted owl (Strix occidentalis caurina), yellow-billed cuckoo (Coccyzus americanus), Canada lynx (Lynx canadensis), gray wolf (Canis lupus), and grizzly bear (Ursus arctos horribilis). Wolverine (Gulo gulo) is proposed for listing as threatened (USFWS, 2016b). These seven species are identified by the USFWS as having the potential to occur within the Icicle project area as shown in Table 3-16. Each of these species is identified as potentially occurring in each portion of the Icicle project area with the exception of northern spotted owl, which USFWS does not identify as potentially occurring within the Wenatchee River portion of the project area (USFWS, 2016b). Given the existing habitat conditions within the Wenatchee River portion of the project area, the listed marbled murrelet, Canada lynx, gray wolf, grizzly bear, and wolverine species are very unlikely to occupy the available habitat but could potentially occur in the vicinity of this portion of the project area, per USFWS data. The status and preferred habitats of federally listed and proposed species protected under the ESA within Chelan County and the project area, as identified by USFWS, are presented in Table 3-16.

There are three ESA-listed species with designated critical habitat in Chelan County: marbled murrelet, northern spotted owl, and Canada lynx, and one proposal to list critical habitat for yellow-billed cuckoo (USFWS, 2016a). However, of those species with designated critical habitat in Chelan County, northern spotted owl is the only one that has critical habitat located within the Icicle project area. Northern spotted owl critical habitat covers most of the Alpine Lakes and Icicle Creek portions of the project area. Designated critical habitat for marbled murrelet, Canada lynx, and the proposed critical habitat for yellow-billed cuckoo are not located within the project area (USFWS, 2016b). This information is summarized in Table 3-17.

## 3.10.3 Federal Threatened and Endangered Fish Species

Wenatchee spring-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) are included in the upper Columbia ESU that is listed as endangered under the ESA (NOAA Fisheries, 2016; 64 FR 14308; 70 FR 37160; 76 FR 50448). Wenatchee summer-run steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) are included in the upper Columbia ESU that is listed as threatened under the ESA (NOAA Fisheries, 2016; 71 FR 834; 76 FR 50448). Various federal, state, county, and tribal regulatory mechanisms are in place to minimize or avoid habitat degradation by human uses, and a 5-year review by NOAA Fisheries has recommended specific future actions to improve habitat and sustainability of these species (NOAA Fisheries, 2016).

Bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) are listed as threatened under the ESA (76 FR 50448; 63 FR 42757). The Wenatchee River Watershed (including Icicle Creek and other tributaries) has been designated as one of 24 bull trout core areas within the Mid-Columbia Recovery Unit (USFWS, 2015). The Wenatchee River Watershed is one of four core areas that contain the healthiest and most stable bull trout populations and should be managed to maintain the populations and prevent introduction of new threats.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

# Table 3-16 Federally Listed and Proposed Species, ESA Status, and Preferred Habitats that Occur in Chelan County and the Alpine Lakes, Icicle Creek, and Wenatchee River Corridor Project Areas

Common Name (Scientific Name)	Agency	Status <sup>1,2</sup>	Preferred Habitat <sup>3</sup>	Chelan County <sup>1</sup>	Alpine Lakes Area <sup>2</sup>	lcicle Creek Corridor Area <sup>2</sup>	Wenatchee River Corridor Area <sup>2</sup>	
Birds								
Marbled murrelet (Brachyramphus marmoratus)	USFWS	Threatened	Mature, old-growth forests (nesting, roosting)	х	х	х	х	
Northern spotted owl (Strix occidentalis caurina)	USFWS	Threatened	Mature, old-growth forests (nesting, roosting, foraging); second-growth used for dispersal	х	х	х		
Yellow-billed cuckoo (Coccyzus americanus)	USFWS	Threatened (Western U.S. DPS)	Breed in open woodlands, parks, deciduous, riparian woodlands; nest in tall cottonwood and willow riparian woodlands, moist thickets, orchards, or overgrown pasture	х	х	Х	х	
Terrestrial Mammals								
Canada lynx ( <i>Lynx</i> <i>canadensis</i> )	USFWS	Threatened	Occurs in boreal and montane regions dominated by coniferous or mixed forest with thick undergrowth, but also sometimes enters open forest, rocky areas, and tundra to forage for abundant prey	х	х	Х	х	
Gray wolf (Canis lupus)	USFWS	Endangered	Security habitat is greater than 300 meters from roads; ungulate prey base	х	х	х	х	
Grizzly bear (Ursus arctos horribilis)	USFWS	Threatened	Now found mostly in arctic tundra, alpine tundra, and subalpine mountain forests; most populations require huge areas of suitable habitat	x	х	Х	х	
Wolverine (Gulo gulo)	USFWS	Proposed Threatened	Large expanse of minimally disturbed forest	Х	Х	Х	X	

Notes: 1) USFWS, 2016b; 2) USFWS, 2016a; 3) NatureServe, 2015

# Table 3-17Federally Listed and Proposed Species Critical Habitat Status thatOccur in Chelan County and the Alpine Lakes, Icicle Creek, and Wenatchee River Corridor Project Areas

Common Name (Scientific Name)	Agency	Critical Habitat Status <sup>3</sup>	Chelan County <sup>1</sup>	Alpine Lakes Area <sup>2</sup>	lcicle Creek Corridor Area <sup>2</sup>	Wenatchee River Corridor Area <sup>2</sup>		
Birds								
Marbled murrelet (Brachyramphus marmoratus)	USFWS	Designated	Х					
Northern spotted owl (Strix occidentalis caurina)	USFWS	Designated	Х	Х	Х			
Yellow-billed cuckoo (Coccyzus americanus)	USFWS	Proposed	Х					
Terrestrial Mammals								
Canada lynx ( <i>Lynx canadensis</i> )	USFWS	Designated	Х					

Notes: 1) USFWS, 2016; 2) USFWS, 2016; 3) NatureServe, 2015

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Pacific lamprey (*Entosphenus tridentatus*) and westslope cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki lewisi*) are designated as "species of special concern" by USFWS (2016b). While a petition to list Pacific lamprey under the ESA was determined not to be warranted, USFWS acknowledges that Pacific lamprey have declined in the Columbia River Basin and has published "Best Management Practices to Minimize Adverse Impacts to Pacific Lamprey (*Entosphenus tridentatus*)" (USFWS, 2010).

Several of the species described in Section 3.7, Fish, occur in the Icicle project area and are Washington State Priority Species, including the described salmon and trout species, Pacific lamprey, mountain sucker (*Catostomus platyrhynchus*), leopard dace (*Rhinichthys falcatus*), and Umatilla dace (*Rhinichthys umatilla*) (WDFW, 2008). State priority species are the focus of specific management recommendations intended to protect and enhance populations and relevant habitats.

For upper Columbia spring-run Chinook salmon and upper Columbia steelhead, areas of critical habitat affected by the Icicle Strategy include the mainstem of the Wenatchee River downstream of Icicle Creek and Icicle Creek upstream to the confluence with Frosty Creek (70 FR 52630), although the specific endpoints are not determined. These waters are shown in Figure 1-8. All of the areas of Wenatchee River, Icicle Creek, and tributaries to Icicle Creek that are accessible to bull trout are designated as bull trout critical habitat (75 FR 63897).

Locally adapted stocks of the listed spring-run Chinook salmon and summer-run steelhead are propagated in hatchery programs for conservation and reintroduction to the upper Wenatchee River Watershed, specifically the Chiwawa and Wenatchee Rivers and Nason Creek. Juveniles are overwintered at Chiwawa Hatchery and released directly to upper Wenatchee River tributaries, subsequently migrating downstream through the mainstem Wenatchee River. Additional information about fish within the Icicle project area is presented in Section 3.7, Fish.

## 3.10.4 WDFW Priority Habitats and Species

Of the 20 priority habitats recognized in Washington by WDFW, 11 occur in Chelan County (Table 3-18). Within the Alpine Lakes and Icicle Creek portions of the Icicle project area, six of these habitats are likely to be found. These include Biodiversity Areas, Riparian, Freshwater Wetlands, Instream, Old-Growth/Mature Forest, and Snags and Logs. The Wenatchee River Corridor includes these same priority habitat types with the exception of Old-Growth/Mature Forest and Snags and Logs. Given the mountain habitat of the Alpine Lakes, additional priority habitats that are likely to occur include Caves, Cliffs, and Talus (WDFW, 2008, 2009, and 2016).

Two of the eleven priority habitats that occur in Chelan County, Aspen Stands and Shrubsteppe, are not documented within the Icicle project area. Shrub-steppe habitat is located in the upland areas of the Wenatchee River Corridor in the vicinity of the project area. Aspen stands could occur in the vicinity of the project area in forested habitats.

The WDFW priority habitat types likely to occur within the Icicle project area are described below and the potential for occurrence within the project area is presented in Table 3-18.

 Table 3-18

 WDFW Priority Habitats that Occur in Chelan County and Potentially Occur within the Project Area

PHS Type	Chelan County <sup>1</sup>	Alpine Lakes Area <sup>3</sup>	Icicle Creek Corridor Area <sup>2</sup>	Wenatchee River Corridor Area <sup>2</sup>
Priority Habitats – Terrestrial Habitats <sup>1</sup>				
Aspen Stands	X			
Biodiversity Areas	Х	Х	Х	Х
Shrub-steppe	Х			
Old-growth/Mature Forest	Х	X	Х	
Riparian	Х	X	Х	Х
Priority Habitats – Aquatic Habitats <sup>1</sup>				
Freshwater Wetlands and Fresh Deepwater	Х	X	Х	Х
Instream	Х	X	Х	Х
Priority Habitat Features				
Caves	Х	X		
Cliffs	Х	X		
Snags and logs	Х	X	Х	
Talus	X	X		

Notes: 1) WDFW, 2008; 2) NatureServe, 2016; 3) WDFW, 2016

### 3.10.4.1 Biodiversity Areas

Biodiversity areas are defined as follows:

- a) The area has been identified as biologically diverse through a scientifically based assessment conducted over a landscape scale (e.g., ecoregion, county- or citywide, watershed, etc.). Examples include, but are not limited to, WDFW Local Habitat Assessments, Pierce County Biodiversity Network, and Spokane County's Wildlife Corridors and Landscape Linkages; or
- b) The area is within a city or an urban growth area (UGA) and contains habitat that is valuable to fish or wildlife and is mostly composed of native vegetation. Relative to other vegetated areas in the same city or UGA, the mapped area is vertically diverse (e.g., multiple canopy layers, snags, or downed wood), horizontally diverse (e.g., contains a mosaic of native habitats), or supports a diverse community of species as identified by a qualified professional who has a degree in biology or closely related field and professional experience related to the habitats or species occurring in the biodiversity area. These areas may have more limited wildlife functions than other priority habitat areas due to the general nature and constraints of these sites in that they are often isolated or surrounded by highly urbanized lands.

### 3.10.4.2 Corridors

Corridors are areas of relatively undisturbed and unbroken tracts of vegetation that connect fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, priority habitats, areas identified as biologically diverse (see attribute a above), or valuable habitats within a city or UGA (see attribute b above).

### 3.10.4.3 Riparian

The riparian habitat type is defined as the area adjacent to flowing or standing freshwater aquatic systems. Riparian habitat encompasses the area beginning at the ordinary high water mark and extends to that portion of the terrestrial landscape that is influenced by, or that directly influences, the aquatic ecosystem. In riparian systems, the vegetation, water tables, soils, microclimate, and wildlife inhabitants of terrestrial ecosystems are often influenced by perennial or intermittent water. Simultaneously, adjacent vegetation, nutrient and sediment loading, terrestrial wildlife, as well as organic and inorganic debris influence the biological and physical properties of the aquatic ecosystem. Riparian habitat includes the entire extent of the floodplain and riparian areas of wetlands that are directly connected to stream courses or other fresh water.

## 3.10.4.4 Freshwater Wetlands

The freshwater wetlands habitat type includes lands that are transitional between terrestrial and aquatic systems where the water table is usually at or near the surface or the land is covered by shallow water. Wetlands must have one or more of the following attributes: the land supports, at least periodically, predominantly hydrophytic plants; substrate is predominantly undrained hydric soils; and/or the substrate is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by shallow water at some time during the growing season of each year.

### 3.10.4.5 Instream

Instream habitat type includes the combination of physical, biological, and chemical processes and conditions that interact to provide functional life history requirements for instream fish and wildlife resources.

## 3.10.4.6 Old Growth/Mature Forest

#### Old-growth East of Cascade Crest

This habitat type includes stands that are highly variable in tree species composition and structural characteristics as a result of the influence of fire, climate, and soils. In general, stands will be greater than 150 years of age, with 25 trees per hectare (trees/ha; 10 trees/acre) that are greater than 53 centimeters (cm; 21 inches) diameter breast height (dbh), and 2.5 to 7.5 snags/ha (1 to 3 snags/acre) that are greater than 30 to 35 cm (12 to 14 inches) diameter. Downed logs may vary from abundant to absent. Canopies may be single or multi-layered. Evidence of human-caused alterations to the stand will be absent or so slight as to not affect the ecosystem's essential structures and functions.

#### **Mature Forests**

Mature Forest habitat types are defined as stands with average diameters exceeding 53 cm (21 inches) dbh; crown cover may be less than 100 percent; decay, decadence, numbers of snags, and quantity of large downed material is generally less than that found in old-growth; and are 80 to 200 years old west and 80 to 160 years old east of the Cascade Crest.

### 3.10.4.7 Snags and Logs

This habitat type occurs within a variety of habitat types that support trees. Trees are considered snags if they are dead or dying and exhibit sufficient decay characteristics to enable cavity excavation/use by wildlife. Priority snags have a dbh of greater than 51 cm (20 inches) in western Washington and greater than 30 cm (12 inches) in eastern Washington and are greater than 2 meters (m; 6.5 feet) in height. Priority logs are greater than 30 cm (12 inches) in diameter at the largest end, and greater than 6 m (20 feet) long. Abundant snags and logs can be found in old-growth and mature forests or unmanaged forests of any age; in damaged, burned, or diseased forests; and in riparian areas. Priority snag and log habitat includes individual snags and/or logs, or groups of snags and/or logs, of exceptional value to wildlife because of their scarcity or location in a particular landscape. Areas with abundant, well-distributed snags and logs are also considered priority snag and log habitat. Examples include large, sturdy snags adjacent to open water, remnant snags in developed or urbanized settings, and areas with a relatively high density of snags.

## 3.10.4.8 Caves

This habitat type includes caves, which are defined as a naturally occurring cavity, recess, void, or system of interconnected passages (including associated dendritic tubes, cracks, and fissures) that occur under the earth in soils, rock, ice, or other geological formations, and are large enough to contain a human. Mine shafts (a human-made excavation in the earth usually used to extract minerals) may mimic caves and abandoned
PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

mine shafts with actual or suspected occurrences of priority species should be treated in a manner similar to caves.

## 3.10.4.9 Cliffs

Cliffs are defined as being greater than 7.6 m (25 feet) high and occurring below 1,524 m (5,000 feet) high.

## 3.10.4.10 Talus

This habitat type consists of homogenous areas of rock rubble ranging in average size of 0.15 to 2.0 m (0.5 to 6.5 feet), composed of basalt, andesite, and/or sedimentary rock, including riprap slides and mine tailings. Talus may be associated with cliffs.

Overall, more than 45 priority species of birds, mammals, amphibians, and reptiles have been documented as occurring within Chelan County (WDFW, 2008, 2009). A variety of WDFW priority species have also been specifically documented within the Icicle project area (WDFW, 2016). A complete list of WDFW priority species documented within Chelan County and the project area is presented in Appendix F.

# 3.11Aesthetics

There are a number of visual resource programs used by various agencies to catalog and help prioritize the management of visual resources on public lands. These include the Scenery Management System (USFS, 1996), Visual Impact Assessment Guidelines (U.S. Department of Transportation, 2015), and the Visual Resource Management System (Department of the Interior, 1984). Application of the methods, concepts, and terms contained in these guidance documents provide a more standardized way to objectively evaluate aesthetic resources and potential changes affecting these resources.

In managing aesthetic values within public lands, these programs provide guidance on assessing the overall scenic quality of a particular landscape. This generally includes determining the visual character of an area, identifying any unique aesthetic features or views, and considering what sensitive viewer groups may be present.

To describe the visual character of an area, it is necessary to first define important viewpoints. Viewpoints are specific locations from which representative views of the overall area can be seen by sensitive viewer groups. Representative views are typically broken down into foreground (generally 0 to 0.25 miles from the viewer), middleground (0.25 miles to 2 miles), and background (greater than 2 miles). Within the foreground, viewers can detect surface textures and details. Middleground views emphasize the geometric landscape form over details, but development may still be noticeable if it contrasts in line, form, texture, or color with the surroundings. The background view loses all textural detail, and development tends to only be noticeable if change is of a larger scale and there is a stark contrast in form or line between the development and surrounding landscape.

Sensitive viewer groups can include residents, workers, recreationalists, and motorists. Their overall sensitivity to visual changes depends on the extent to which they are exposed to a particular view and how important the visual character is to their activity. In general, viewers are considered to be more sensitive to visual changes if they are repeatedly exposed to the same view and if that view contributes to the underlying activities.

Unique aesthetic resources or views include things like unique or different landscape features or formations. This can include built environments, such as city skylines, or natural features, such as mountains or lakes. Specific corridors can also be designated by the National Scenic Byway Program as having unique visual qualities.

In general, visual character refers to the overall feel or nature of a viewpoint. The character can be more natural with few man-made elements or more urban with many man-made structures. The character is based on the landscape elements found (e.g., landform, vegetation, rocks, water features).

Visual quality refers to how intact the visual character is. If there are conflicting visual elements, such as some man-made structures in an otherwise pristine natural landscape, the visual quality of that landscape would not be as high as areas where the landscape is more uniform.

# 3.11.1 Alpine Lakes

The Alpine Lakes are located in the northern Cascades in an area that features striking views provided through dramatic terrain, lakes, and creeks, and a wide-variety of ecotypes as a result of elevation and precipitation variability throughout the 400,000 acres.

Land uses and related activities within the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area (ALWA) are governed in part by the Wilderness Act of 1964 (16 United States Code [USC] 1131). In addition to allowing for certain land uses, including water resources management facilities, the act also designates scenic use as one of the six public purposes of wilderness. The Act requires wilderness character to be preserved consistent with other allowed uses (36 Code of Federal Regulations 293).

Sensitive viewer groups within this part of the Icicle project area consist of recreationalists and some IPID and USFWS staff who conduct periodic operations and maintenance activities at the lakes. Recreational use in this area is described in greater detail in Section 3.15, Recreation. In general, 150,000 visitors (USFS, 2017) hike into the lakes annually, mostly in the summer months, to camp and enjoy the wilderness.

Important viewpoints at each of the potentially affected lakes were selected based in part on recreational use data. In general, trailheads at each lake were selected because those are the areas where the most people arrive at the lakes and experience sweeping views of the lakes and surrounding mountains. Representative views of this area are shown in the figures below.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

As shown in Figures 3-11 to 3-13, which include a selection of photographs from the lakes, the Alpine Lakes visual character is defined by the lakes in the foreground, sloped conifer forests punctuated by snags in the middleground, and seasonally snow-capped mountain peaks in the background. In general, these views are relatively intact. The existing dams and outlet infrastructure are visible in certain views; however, most of the facilities are small in scale or compatible with the surrounding landscape (i.e., blend in) or are blocked by vegetation or landform from areas heavily accessed by recreationalists.



#### Figure 3-11. Eightmile Lake Vista

Figure 3-12. Klonaqua Lake Vista



#### CHAPTER 3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

<image>

#### Figure 3-13. Square Lake Vista

The anthropogenic features present in this part of the Icicle project area vary between the lakes but consist primarily of primitive campgrounds and trails (Figures 3-14 and 3-15), and water resources infrastructure such as valve or gate structures (Figure 3-16), exposed gate operators (Figure 3-17), and dam structures (Figure 3-18). The materials used in both the recreation and irrigation facilities tend to camouflage these features into the surrounding landscape, making the overall character appear more natural and visually intact.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Figure 3-14. Eightmile Lake Trail



Figure 3-15. Campsite near Klonaqua Lake



#### CHAPTER 3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT



Figure 3-16. Valve House and Outlet near Nada Lake

Figure 3-17. Gate Actuator and Gate Chamber near Klonaqua Lake



#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Figure 3-18. Dam Structure at Square Lake



# 3.11.2 Icicle Creek Corridor

Lower in the watershed, the upper portion of the Icicle Creek Corridor, particularly the portion located within the Wenatchee National Forest, has similar vegetative character as the Alpine Lakes; however, closer to the City of Leavenworth the visual character becomes more developed with urban and agricultural uses that include more man-made features, such as paved roads, parking areas, trails and trailheads, and rural residential development.

Outside of the national forest in the lower portion of the watershed near the City of Leavenworth, recreational vehicle (RV) campgrounds, extensive agriculture, and rural and residential development are present. Infrastructure development is extensive within the LNFH. Throughout the majority of the Icicle Creek Corridor, there are limited creek crossing bridges with the exception of trails, a few residential access bridges, hatchery structures, and the East Leavenworth Road. The creek bank includes a fairly continuous but relatively thin band of riparian vegetation, though gaps in this buffer occur in a few areas of the hatchery and along a few rural or agricultural properties south and east of the City of Leavenworth.

Important viewpoints along the Icicle Creek Corridor were selected based in part on recreational use data. In general, trailheads leading to the Alpine Lakes wilderness and public access routes within the LNFH were selected because these are the areas where the most people experience extended views of Icicle Creek. Representative views are shown in Figures 3-19 and 3-20.

#### CHAPTER 3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT



## Figure 3-19. Icicle Creek Boulder Field from Snow Lakes Trailhead

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT



Figure 3-20. Icicle Creek from Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, Structure 5

# 3.11.3 Wenatchee River Corridor

Further downstream, the Wenatchee River Corridor contains even more intensive residential and agricultural uses. This Wenatchee River Corridor also includes more intensive development, including residential, commercial, and recreational uses within the City of Leavenworth and other towns and cities. Icicle Road and Highway 2 both cross the Wenatchee River at bridges in the City of Leavenworth. Riparian vegetation within the City of Leavenworth is fairly intact, though gaps are present at the golf course and along some residential and agricultural properties. Downstream of the City of Leavenworth, the upland areas are dominated by agricultural activities, providing pastoral landscape views mostly characterized by orchard activities. In this segment of the Wenatchee River Corridor, several roads and bridges cross the river. A railroad and Highway 2 run along the Wenatchee River. Both the railroad and the highway cross the river on bridges at multiple locations. Local roads also cross the river on bridges near Peshastin, Dryden, Cashmere, and Monitor. Riparian vegetation on the riverbank persist, though the vegetation has gaps where there is development near the Town of Peshastin, the Peshastin Mill, and residential development within the Town of Dryden.

The Stevens Pass Greenway was designated a National Scenic Byway in 2005. This corridor includes Highway 2 beginning in the City of Monroe and extending to the orchards around the Town of Peshastin. The National Scenic Byway Program designates

specific corridors that contain unique visual qualities. These areas are regulated under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (23 USC 101). This program designates scenic transportation routes and encourages strategies for "protecting and enhancing the landscape and view corridors surrounding such a highway" (USFS, 2003).

Important viewpoints along the Wenatchee River Corridor were selected based on public water access locations and proximity to the scenic byway as these are the areas where the most people experience extended views of the Wenatchee River. Representative views are shown in Figures 3-21 and 3-22.



Figure 3-21. Wenatchee River at Icicle Road Bridge near Public River Access

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT



## Figure 3-22. Wenatchee River from Highway 2 Bridge at Town of Dryden

# 3.12 Air Quality

# 3.12.1 Regulatory Setting

The Federal Clean Air Act (CAA, U. S. Code Title 42, Chapter 85) is administered by the EPA. The EPA is mandated to set standards on air emissions considered harmful to public health (primary standards) and public welfare (secondary standards). These National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) are set for six criteria pollutants, which include carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulate matter<sup>3-18</sup>, and sulfur dioxide.

While the EPA is the primary regulatory authority, the CAA is largely implemented by the states and local and tribal authorities. The Ecology Central Regional Office is responsible for air quality control within Chelan County. The CAA requires states to classify air basins as either being in attainment or nonattainment with respect to the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Particulate matter is broken out into two categories: fine particulate matter 2.5 micrometers or smaller (PM 2.5), and large particulate matter less than 10 micrometers (PM 10).

criteria pollutants. In areas designated as nonattainment areas, the local or regional air quality authority must prepare a State Implementation Plan (SIP) that demonstrates how the area will achieve attainment by federally mandated deadlines.

In addition, the CAA includes provisions to maintain scenic vistas within federally designated Class 1 areas (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 81), which includes the Alpine Lakes (WAC 173-400-118). Ecology has developed a Regional Haze SIP to comply with requirements to minimize impacts on visibility within these designated areas. The SIP focuses on controlling emissions from fixed large facilities, such as smelters and other industrial facilities (Ecology, 2010).

Ecology has also identified Washington State Ambient Air Quality Standards (SAAQS) for the protection of human health (primary standards), which supplement the NAAQS and include limits for emissions of total suspended particulates, lead, particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, ozone, and nitrogen dioxide (Chapter 70.94 RCW). Several state regulations also apply to regulating air emissions from operations (e.g., stationary facilities) and construction activities consistent with these standards (Chapter 173-400 WAC).

# 3.12.2 Current Air Quality Environment

There are two current air quality monitoring stations within the Icicle project area. The first is in the City of Leavenworth and is operated by the USFS to monitor air quality in order to make decisions on initiating controlled burns. The second air quality monitoring station is in the City of Wenatchee and is operated by Ecology. The purpose of this station is to collect wind speed, wind direction, and temperature in support of PM 2.5 monitoring at the City of Wenatchee (Ecology, 2016a). Historically, Chelan County has not exceeded the NAAQS and is currently in attainment for criteria pollutants (Ecology, 2016b).

Within the Alpine Lakes portion of the Icicle project area, haze is a major concern and can affect the views that visitors to the lakes experience. An air quality monitor was established at the Snoqualmie Ski Area in 1993 to assess visibility impairment within the surrounding area. Based on the monitoring data, sulfates were the largest contributor to visibility impairment in the Snoqualmie Ski Area, followed by organic carbon, ammonium nitrate, and elemental carbon. With the implementation of the State Regional Haze SIP in this area, visibility improved 20 percent between 2000 and 2009. Visibility is anticipated to reach background levels (approximately 84 miles) by 2064 based on the current rate of improvement (USFS, 2013).

Major air pollution sources within the Icicle project area occur as the result of outdoor burning (year round, except during summer fire safety burn bans), wildfires, agricultural burning (spring and fall burn seasons), orchard heaters, smudge pots, silvicultural burning, and woodstove use. In rare instances, smoke from some burns may become entrained in evening downslope flow and settle in sheltered valleys (Ecology, 2015). Table 3-19 defines sources of pollutants that contribute to increased haze within the Icicle project area.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Pollutant	Anthropogenic Sources	Natural Sources
Sulfates	Coal-fired Power Plants, Diesel Engines, Industrial Boilers	Volcanoes
Organic Carbon	Incineration, Household Heating	Fire, Vegetation
Nitrates	Cars and Trucks, Off-Road Vehicles, Industrial Boilers, Agriculture	Soils, Lightning, Fire
Fine Soil	Off-Road Vehicles, Agriculture	Wind-blown Dust
Elemental Carbon	Soot, Diesel Engines	Fire
Fine Particulate Matter	Combustion Processes, Roads	Fire
Coarse Particulate Matter	Construction, Roads, Woodstoves, Fireplaces	Wind-blown Dust, Fire

Table 3-19Sources of Regional Haze Pollutants

Source: USFS, 2013.

Potentially sensitive receptors include any groups or individuals who are particularly vulnerable to air pollution. This typically includes children, the elderly, or any other persons with health complications. Potentially sensitive receptors within the Icicle project area are largely limited to the more urbanized areas, closer to the Cities of Leavenworth and Wenatchee.

# 3.13Climate Change

Climate change poses a challenge for water resource planning, protection, and use. This is because of increased uncertainty in timing, form, and distribution of precipitation and water demand. Climate change will impact water supplies within the region, affecting uses such as instream flows, municipal, and agricultural. This section discusses the current and projected climatic conditions regionally and within the Icicle project area. Additionally, predicted impacts of climate change on streamflow is provided for the Alpine Lakes Area and Icicle Creek sub-regions.

# **3.13.1 Current Climatic Conditions**

Climate in the Pacific Northwest is influenced by the interactions and seasonal variation of atmospheric circulation patterns, especially the seasonal migrations of the Aleutian Low pressure system and the North Pacific (Hawaii) High pressure system (CIG, 2004). These patterns generally lead to cold, wet winters and warm, dry summers, with local variation based on marine influences and elevation.

Climate in the valleys west of the Cascades follows the pattern of cool, wet winters and warm-dry summers. However, with the marine influence of this area, mild temperature regimes are dominant. Average annual precipitation in most places west of the Cascades is more than 30 inches. As a result of orographic lift, precipitation on the westerns slopes of the Cascades is extremely high, with most places receiving in excess of 100 inches per year (CIG, 2004).

Climate east of the Cascade crest is more continental, with warmer, drier conditions. This is in stark contrast to the maritime climate of the western portion of the region. The Cascade Mountains create this regional dichotomy in climate, with the rain-shadow effect driving the dry conditions in eastern Washington and creating a barrier between the maritime low pressure and the continental high pressure. In the eastern lowlands, average annual precipitation is generally less than 20 inches, with some places receiving as little as 7 inches (CIG, 2004).

The Wenatchee River Watershed is located on the eastern slopes of the Cascade Mountains. The headwaters, located at high elevations in the Cascades, receive considerable precipitation, which mostly falls as snow. Lower elevations of the Wenatchee River Watershed receive more modest amounts of precipitation. Table 3-20 lists average annual precipitation for weather stations located in and near the Wenatchee River Watershed.

Agency	Station No.	Name/Location	Period of Record	Average Annual Precipitation (inches)
NWS	458089	Stevens Pass	1950-1994	84.5
NWS	454446	Lake Wenatchee	1948-1985	39.3
NWS	456534	Plain	1948-Present	37.0
NWS	454572	Leavenworth 3 S	1948-1973; 1979- Present	25.3
NWS	450929	Wenatchee EXP STN	1950-1951; 1971-1997	10.3
NWS	459074	Wenatchee	1931-Present	8.9
NWS	459082	Wenatchee FFA AP	1959-Present	8.4

Table 3-20Available NWS Climate Records in/near Wenatchee River Watershed<br/>(adapted from Wenatchee Watershed Assessment, 2003)

This pattern holds true for the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Although, because of its elevation and location, the lowest elevations in the Icicle Creek Subbasin receive more precipitation than the lowest elevations in the Wenatchee River Watershed. The nearest weather station to the upper Icicle Creek Watershed is located at Stevens Pass, which is a little over 2 miles from the most northwestern reaches of the Icicle Creek Subbasin. As illustrated in Table 3-20, the average annual precipitation for Stevens Pass is 84.5 inches.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The City of Leavenworth 3 S is the lowest and eastern-most weather station in the Icicle Creek Subbasin and receives approximately 25.3 inches of precipitation annually.

# **3.13.2 Projected Future Climatic Conditions**

During the past 100 years, the Pacific Northwest has become warmer and wetter (Mote et al., 2005). Models predict a continuation of this trend. Temperatures will continue to increase within the Pacific Northwest region, along with small increases in precipitation, shifts in the seasonality of precipitation, and increased high precipitation events; however, to what degree depends on greenhouse gas emission scenarios (CIG, 2009). These climatic changes are likely going to decrease snow pack in the Cascades, with early snowmelt. The CIG predicted in their 2009 *Washington Climate Change Impacts Assessment*, that probable impacts are decreased April 1 snowpack (by as much as 40 percent in the 2040s), reduced reservoir storage, and increased stream temperatures. This will have profound effects on the Wenatchee River Watershed, which is characterized as a snow dominant basin (Tohver, 2016). By the 2040s, the Wenatchee River Watershed will likely be a rain/snowmelt transient watershed. This will mean lower snowpack, earlier run off, and more precipitation will fall as rain (Tohver, 2016). These future climate conditions are anticipated in the Icicle Creek Subbasin as well.

# **3.13.3 Implications for Stream Flow in Icicle Creek**

Modeling indicates the changes in climate discussed above will have substantial impacts on Icicle Creek streamflow (CIG, 2017). In Icicle Creek, the model predicts an average minimum flow would decrease by as much as 75-percent in 2050 for a 2-year return period (CIG, 2017). Conversely, the results indicate an increase percent change in peak flows in 2050 based on the 2-year return period: 22 percent, 20 percent, and 58 percent, respectively (CIG, 2017). This indicates that systems will become flashier, with lower low flows and higher peak flows. With warmer winters, run off will increase considerably in the early part of the water year, leaving less water instream during critical low flow months. Table 3-21 provides the average change in percentages by month for 2050.

Figure 3-23 through 3-28 details the impacts of these projected changes on the streamflow averages in Icicle Creek. As illustrated in the figures, by 2030 under low and high greenhouse gas scenarios, the model predicts higher flows from December through April, with lower flows from May through November. The model predicts that low flows will also be lower than what has been observed historically. The results indicate a reduced peak flow, which is predicted to occur in mid-April as opposed to June, when the average peak flow has historically occurred. As time progresses, the model predicts that these trends will become more extreme. In 2050, under low greenhouse gas emissions, the results indicate that peak flow will be reduced compared to the historical peak flow, with a greater volume of flow between the month of October and May. By 2080, the model predicts that this trend will be further exaggerated, with a much flatter hydrograph. The results indicate that average flows will increase dramatically in the winter months (October to April) and will be much lower from May to September. Under the high greenhouse gas scenarios, these trends are similar, but accelerated and exaggerated.

	Percentage Change Based on GHG Scenario			
Wonth	Low	Mid	High	
October	5	8	9	
November	27	32	55	
December	16	63	106	
January	14	63	201	
February	32	57	206	
March	41	67	244	
April	9	102	143	
May	-7	4	35	
June	-50	-28	9	
July	-71	-41	-28	
August	-75	-62	-31	
September	-41	-39	-20	

Table 3-21Streamflow Percentage Change Based on Climate Change Modeling 2050(CIG, 2017)

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT





## Figure 3-24. Icicle Creek Modeled 2030 (High Greenhouse Gas Emissions)



PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 3-25. Icicle Creek Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions)





GROUE

## Figure 3-26. Icicle Creek Modeled 2050 Flows (High Greenhouse Gas Emissions)

## Streamflow Site



GROUI

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 3-27. Icicle Creek Modeled 2080 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions)

## Streamflow Site



## Figure 3-28. Icicle Creek Modeled 2080 Flows (High Greenhouse Gas Emissions)

## Streamflow Site



#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

For the Alpine Lake catchments evaluated as part of the Icicle Strategy, the results predict a similar shift in peak flows from June to May, with a drop in peak flows and low flows. The biggest changes are predicted in the northwestern-most lakes, Klonaqua and Square. These catchments have the largest predicted drop in peak and low flows. However, all catchments appear to have an increase in flows during the winter months. This is likely tied to predicted changes in precipitation type and the timing of snow melt. As time progresses or under high greenhouse gas scenarios, these changes become more extreme. The 2030 modeling under low greenhouse gas scenarios predicts slightly higher winter flow, with peak flows occurring about a month earlier (May rather than June), a rapid decrease in flow from May through July, and low flows in August. Under the 2080 high greenhouse gas scenario, the results indicate much more wintertime flow (October through April), significantly reduced peak flow occurring in April, and severely reduced flows throughout the summer. Figures 3-29 through 3-35 show the predicted flow in these catchments in 2050 based on low greenhouse gas emissions.

## Figure 3-29. Colchuck Lake Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions)



PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 3-30. Eightmile Lake Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions)



## Figure 3-31. Klonaqua Lake Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions)



PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 3-32. Square Lake Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions)





Monthly Flows for Square Lake, 2050s

ROUI

#### Streamflow Site Monthly Flows for Nada Lake, 2050s Nada Lake 14 Decade 2030s **2050s** 12 2080s Dataset Cubic Feet per Second (CFS) 10 **bcMACA** )HB2860 MAACA 8 Greenhouse Gas Scenario Low (rcp4.5) 6 High (rcp8.5) Historical streamflow 4 Predicted streamflow: Ensemble average 2 GCM instance 0 August October April May June ylul March February September November January December LIMAT MPACT GROUI

## Figure 3-33. Nada Lake Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions)

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 3-34. Lower Snow Lake Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions)



## Figure 3-35. Upper Snow Lake Modeled 2050 Flows (Low Greenhouse Gas Emissions)



# 3.14 Noise

Noise is generally defined as unwanted sound. Sound is measured in terms of both pressure and frequency, based on the ear's sensitivity. The human ear is less sensitive to higher and lower frequencies than to mid-range frequencies. Therefore, sound level meters used to measure environmental sound generally incorporate a filtering system that discriminates against higher and lower frequencies in a manner similar to the human ear to produce noise measurements that approximate the normal human perception of noise. Measurements made using this filtering system are termed "A-weighted decibels," abbreviated as dBA. Sound levels referred to in this PEIS are stated as hourly equivalent sound pressure levels (Leq) in terms of dBA.

Sound levels decrease with distance from a sound source. The Leq sound level from a linear source, such as a road, will decrease by 3 to 4.5 dBA for every doubling of distance between the source and the receiver. The Leq sound level from a point source, such as a generator, will decrease by approximately 6 dBA for every doubling of distance between the source and the receiver. A 10-dBA change in noise level is perceived by most people to be approximately a doubling in loudness (e.g., an increase from 50 dBA to 60 dBA causes the perceived loudness to double). Generally, 3 dBA is the minimum change in outdoor sound levels that can be perceived by a person with normal hearing.

Ambient environmental sound is often described in using a day-night average sound level (Ldn). This metric measures sounds using an A-weight equivalent over a 24-hour period. It also uses an additional 10-dBA weighting for nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) to account for greater nighttime sensitivity to noise (EPA, 1978). The Program Alternatives are not anticipated to generate long-term sources of noise; however, short-term construction noise could be generated. Table 3-22 shows common types of sound generated by construction activities.

Maximum Noise Level (dBA) <sup>1</sup>	Notes
10	Barely audible
20	Extremely quiet
30	Very Quiet
40	One-eighth as loud as 70 dBA.
50	One-fourth as loud as 70 dBA.
60	Half as loud as 70 dBA. Fairly quiet
	Maximum Noise Level (dBA)1           10           20           30           40           50           60

Table 3-22Typical Construction Noise Levels

#### CHAPTER 3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Noise Source	Maximum Noise Level (dBA) <sup>1</sup>	Notes
Vacuum cleaner, gas lawn mower at 100 feet	70	Upper 70s are annoyingly loud to some people.
Garbage disposal; freight train (at 100 feet)	80	2 times as loud as 70 dBA. Possible damage in 8 hours of exposure.
Motorcycle at 25 feet; diesel truck at 50 feet	90	4 times as loud as 70 dBA. Likely damage in 8 hours of exposure
Construction site; jackhammer	100	8 times as loud as 70 dBA. Serious damage possible in 8 hours of exposure
Jet flyover (1,000 feet)	110	16 times as loud as 70 dBA.
Thunderclap; chain saw	120	32 times as loud as 70 dBA. Commonly accepted pain threshold.
Jet taking off (200 feet)	130	Painful

Modified from several sources including: https://www.chem.purdue.edu/chemsafety/Training/PPETrain/dblevels.htm; http://www.roads.maryland.gov/Index.aspx?PageId=827; OSHA, 2013

Notes: 1) Noise is measured as A-weighted decibels (dBA) at 50 feet from the source.

# 3.14.1 Regulatory Setting

## 3.14.1.1 Federal Noise Control Standards

The Federal Noise Control Act of 1972 (42 U.S.C. §4901 et seq.) established a national policy to protect people from noise that may be harmful to their welfare. This policy generally delegates responsibility for regulating noise to state and local governments (EPA, 2016).

# 3.14.1.2 State and Local Noise Control Standards

Ecology administers the State Noise Control Standards through Chapter 173-60 WAC, which adopted the Federal Noise Control Act of 1972 in order to establish maximum permissible noise standards based on zones. WAC 173-60-030 defines environmental designation for noise abatement (EDNA) zones into three classifications (A, B, C). Class A EDNA is typically where people reside and sleep, and include residential areas and recreational areas, such as camps, parks, camping facilities, and resorts. Class B areas include those requiring protection against noise interference with speech, such as commercial, retail, and recreational facilities, including theaters or amusement parks. Class C areas include those where economic activities are of such a nature that higher noise levels than experienced in other areas is normally to be anticipated, such as industrial areas or warehouses.

Maximum permissible noise levels are established in WAC 173-60-040. Table 3-23 below shows maximum dBAs from a source and the maximum dBAs that can be received within the three classifications. Exemptions are listed in WAC 173-60-050 and include construction noise generated between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

EDNA of Noise Source (dBA)	EDNA of Receiving Property		
	Class A	Class B	Class C
Class A	55	57	60
Class B	57	60	65
Class C	60	65	70

 Table 3-23

 Maximum Permissible Noise Levels for Non-Exempt Activities

Source: WAC 176-60-040

Note: All numbers are in A-weight decibels (dBA)

Along with the maximum permissible noise levels described in Table 3-23, there are additional limitations to Class A lands, where a reduction of 10 dBA is required between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

Chelan County regulates noise standards through Title 7 of the Chelan County Code. Below are applicable excerpts from Title 7 of the Chelan County Code relating to noise:

## 7.35.030 Public disturbance noises.

It is unlawful for any person to unreasonably cause or make, or for any person in possession of property to allow to originate from the property, sound which is a public disturbance noise. Public disturbance noises include the creation of loud, raucous, frequent, repetitive or continuous sounds that exceed a reasonable person standard so as to disturb or interfere with the peace, comfort and repose of another. (Res. 2012-36 (part), 4/30/12).

## 7.35.040 Exceptions.

(a) The provisions of this chapter shall not apply to:

(1) Regularly scheduled community events conducted on property owned by a governmental agency or public school district and conducted with the express permission of an authorized representative of the property owner; and

(2) Preparation for and action of regularly scheduled events held in the County of Chelan and authorized by an appointed representative of the county.

(b) The ordinary and usual ringing of trolley bells by a mass transit carrier, e.g., Link trolley bus.

(c) Sounds from construction activity during the hours of seven a.m. to ten p.m. and any activity necessary for the preservation of the public health, safety and welfare.

(d) Sounds that are the result of agricultural activities.

# 3.14.2 Current Noise Environment

The Icicle project area for noise includes the Alpine Lakes and the Icicle Creek and Wenatchee River Corridors. The Alpine Lakes portion of the Icicle project area is remote and exposed to little man-made noise. Noise sources in this area are predominantly associated with natural conditions, periodic recreational activity, and periodic noise for operation and maintenance of the IPID facilities. The primary sensitive noise receptors in this area include recreationalists who are hiking to and camping around the lakes. Moving away from the lakes down the watershed, development becomes increasingly more urbanized with higher density agricultural, residential, and commercial land uses (Chelan County, 2016). The predominant noise sources include intermittent sounds related to rural residential and agricultural noise with increasing noise related to urbanization moving closer to the Cities of Leavenworth and Wenatchee. Within the more urbanized areas, typical sound includes traffic noise and noise from commercial activity. Sensitive receptors to noise changes within the more urbanized areas include residents, workers, and recreationalists. Their sensitivity to changes in the noise environment would depend on the relative change in noise conditions and how close to and for how long they are exposed to the change.

# 3.15 Recreation

Outdoor recreationists are attracted to the project area by the quality of the scenery and by the variety of recreation opportunities, including fishing, hiking and backpacking, horseback riding, rock climbing, white-water kayaking and rafting, river tubing, skiing, snowshoeing and other related activities such as camping, picnicking, and wildlife viewing. Public demand for access to rivers, streams, lakes, and trails continues to increase each year.

A review of existing recreation opportunities and conditions is presented below and broken into the three sub-regions of the project area: the Alpine Lakes Area, Icicle Creek, and the Wenatchee River Corridor.

# 3.15.1 Alpine Lakes Area

The upper reaches of the Icicle project area include popular recreational destinations. All of the Alpine Lakes sub-region is located within the ALWA. The ALWA encompasses approximately 394,000 acres in the Central Cascades Region (USFS, 2017)<sup>3-19</sup>. The ALWA is accessed by 47 trailheads and 615 miles of trails.

The ALWA is visited by nearly 150,000 people each year (USFS, 2017a)<sup>3-20</sup>. Permits are required for all visitors between May 15 and October 31. The maximum group size is 12

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> https://www.fs.usda.gov/recarea/okawen/recarea/?recid=79432

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> ALW Regulations Booklet:

https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5407053.pdf

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(combined people and stock), except for the Enchantment Permit Area, which is located in the project area, where the maximum group size is 8. Additional restrictions apply to camping, campfires, and stock use. A valid Recreation Pass is required for vehicles parked at trailheads.

Within the ALWA, the Enchantment Permit Area (Figure 3-36) is a particularly popular backpacking destination. The Enchantment's Permit Area is within the Icicle project area and includes Eightmile, Colchuck, Nada, and the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes.



Figure 3-36. Enchantment Permit Area Zones (USFS, 2017b)<sup>3-21</sup>

## 3.15.1.1 Hiking

Trails were the original transportation system in the Alpine Lakes Area (Alpine Lakes Management Plan, 1981). Most of the trails on the east side of the Cascades were established near the turn of the century by herdsmen moving sheep through the high mountain country. In the early 1900s, following establishment of the National Forests, the trail system became the transportation network between fire lookouts and guard stations. Today, trail use is predominantly for recreation and supports hiking, climbing, backpacking, stock, and other backcountry uses.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Interactive map on recreation.gov: accessed January 2017

<sup>(</sup>https://www.fs.fed.us/ivm/index.html?minx=-13711415&miny=5848140&maxx=-13124379&maxy=6175290)

The USFS maintains a network of trails that provide access into the ALWA for hiking, climbing, and backpacking. Within the Enchantment Permit Area (Figure 3-35), the Stuart Lake Trail (#1599) provides access to the Stuart Zone, and to the Colchuck and Core Enchantment zones via the Colchuck Lake Trail (#1559.1/1559A). The Snow Lakes Trail (#1553) provides access to the Snow Zone, and the Eightmile Lake Trail (#1552) provides access to the Eightmile/Caroline Zone and to areas outside the Permit Area via the Eightmile-Trout Creek Trail (#1554).

According to the USFS, day-use hiking in the Enchantment Permit Zone continues to increase in popularity each year (Table 3-24). The USFS reports that compliance with dayuse permit applications ranges from 50 to 75 percent, depending upon the time of year (USFS, 2016<sup>3-22</sup>). Table 3-24 provides use numbers for self-registered day users at two popular trailheads, Snow Lake Trailhead and Stuart/Colchuck Trailhead. Specific information about final user destination was not readily available, so it is unclear from this dataset how many visitors went to Colchuck Lake vs. Stuart Lake. Although information from local users indicate Colchuck Lake is the more popular destination of the two. Additional permit information was not available for Eightmile Lake, which is one of the most popular destinations in the ALWA.

Year	Snow Lakes Trailhead	Stuart/Colchuck Trailhead	Total
2012 <sup>2</sup>	850	1,350	2,200
2013	900	2,900	3,800
2014	1,000	3,400	4,400
2015	1,100	4,600	5,700

Table 3-24 Approximate Number of Day-Use Permits in Enchantment Permit Area Zone<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Permits are for groups, which may contain up to 8 persons

<sup>2</sup> Severe fires in 2012 resulted in closure of Enchantments for over a month

Within the project area, hiking to Klonaqua and Square Lakes also occurs. Day-use permits are required and are self-issued at the trailhead. These areas are outside of the Enchantment Permit Area Zone, and details on the number of day-use permits for these areas was not readily available. However, because these lakes are more remote and not included in the Enchantment Permit Area Zone, it is likely these areas have a much lower number of visitors. The Klonaqua Lake Trail (Trail #1563) is located 7.2 miles up the French Creek Trail, with the total one-way distance to Lower Klonaqua Lake of 10.8 miles. The Square Lake Trail (Trail #1567) is accessed via Icicle Creek and Leland Creek Trails, with a total one-way distance to the lake of approximately 13 miles. Trail reports indicate that Square Lake Trail is difficult to hike on due to downed trees and lack of maintenance, which may also discourage use.

Figure 3-37 provides an inventory of recreational facilities and use areas and existing conditions at these sites within the Alpine Lakes Area. These data were collected and provided by USFS.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Numbers provided to Aspect via 20161220 USFS PEIS Data Gap Action Plan.doc
PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 3-37. Recreation Sites and Existing Conditions within the Alpine Lakes Area



(Source: USFS geospatial files)

### 3.15.1.2 Horseback Riding and Stock Use

Horseback riding and use of stock animals (e.g., llamas and mule) is permitted in the ALWA but not on the Snow Lakes Trail or the Stuart Lake Trail (except from the Saturday following Labor Day to January 1). Additionally, access to the Klonaqua Lakes is prohibited to stock. Stock are allowed on the Eightmile Lake Trail and Square Lake Trail; however, overnight stock use is prohibited. Additionally, Square Lake Trail has had limited maintenance since the 2003 Square Lake Fire, and trail conditions are rough and not recommended for stock. Restrictions for stock use in the ALWA include containment at least 200 feet from lakes, use of processed feed, and use of designated camps near certain lakes and meadows.

### 3.15.1.3 Backpacking/Camping

Overnight camping in the ALWA requires a permit from the USFS. Maximum length of stay is 14 consecutive days. For areas outside the Enchantments Permit Area, permits are self-issued at the trailhead. For camping within the Enchantments Permit Area between May 15 and October 31, applicants must submit a request to an online, pre-season lottery. Any permits not allocated by the lottery are available on a first come, first served basis through the recreation.gov advance reservation system. Additionally, 25 percent of permits are held by the Leavenworth Ranger District for day-of trips (i.e., walk up lottery).

Demand for overnight permits in the Enchantment Permit Area far exceeds the number available. In 2016, the USFS received 19,646 lottery applications for overnight stays. Even when the available quota of permits was reduced in 2014 and 2015 because of an increasing amount of observable impacts (e.g., widening trails, loss of fragile vegetation, development of new social trails and campsites, proliferation of switchback cuts), the total number of people camping increased as a result of increasing party size. In 2015, an estimated 10,200 people camped in the Enchantment Permit Area. No site-specific numbers are available for Colchuck, Eightmile, or Snow Lakes, however Table 3-25 and Table 3-26 provide details on permit applications by year.

Year	Number of Applications
2009	1,770
2010	
2011	+3,000
2012	
2013	+4,000
2014	+8,000
2015	12,034
2016	19,646

Table 3-25Lottery Applications by Year

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Table 3-26				
2015 Enchantment Zone Permit Area I	Data			

Awarded Permits	1,946
Total Applications	12,034
Success Rate	16%

### 3.15.1.4 Recreational Fishing

There is a non-tribal sport fishery for resident trout in the ALWA. Prior to human settlement, most of the high lakes were barren of fish (Alpine Lakes Area Management Plan). The WDFW has stocked the lakes in the ALWA and Enchantments Permit Area in the past. No stocking currently occurs in Colchuck, Eightmile, Klonaqua, Square, Nada, or Upper and Lower Snow Lakes (Table 3-27).

Table 3-27WDFW Trout Stocking in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area

Lake	Species	Last Year Stocked	Next Year to Stock	Comments
Colchuck	СТ	2000	Discontinued	May have been discontinued due to loss of funding for aircraft
Eightmile	RB,CT,LT	2005	Discontinued	May have been discontinued due to loss of funding for aircraft and presence of lake trout
Klonaqua (lower)	RB,CT	1970	Discontinued	May have been discontinued due to loss of funding for aircraft
Klonaqua (upper)	СТ	1970	Discontinued	May have been discontinued due to loss of funding for aircraft
Nada	EB	?	Discontinued	Stocking discontinued due to sufficient natural reproduction of eastern brook trout
Snow (lower)	EB,CT	?	Discontinued	Stocking has been discontinued due to sufficient natural reproduction, or lack of funding to plant with aircraft
Snow (upper)	EB,CT	?	Discontinued	Stocking has been discontinued due to sufficient natural reproduction, or lack of funding to plant with aircraft
Square	CT,RB	1979	Discontinued	Stocking has been discontinued due to sufficient natural reproduction

Notes: CT = Cutthroat Trout; RB = Rainbow Trout; EB = Eastern Brook Trout; LT = Lake Trout

Table data provided by T. Maitland, email communication between Dan Haller and Travis Maitland (WDFW).

Fishing for trout in the many of the Alpine Lakes is managed by WDFW. In addition to possessing a freshwater fishing license, anglers age 15 and over must comply with specific size limits, gear restrictions, and bag limits (WDFW, 2017). Eightmile, Square, Klonaqua, and Colchuck Lakes are open to fishing year-round, while access to Nada and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes is limited by seasonal access into the Core Enchantment Zone. For additional information on fish within this part of the project area, see Section 3.7, Fish.

### 3.15.1.5 Water-Based Recreation

Swimming within the Alpine Lakes likely occurs in conjunction with hiking and backcountry camping activities during the summer. However, this use is likely limited by water temperatures, which are relatively cold even during the summer months.

### 3.15.1.6 Winter Recreation

Information about wintertime recreation in this portion of the project area is somewhat limited. However, Eightmile Creek Trail is used for snowshoeing. Additionally, Colchuck and Eightmile Trails are known as winter climbing and backcountry skiing destinations, with regular but low density use. Motorized recreation use is prohibited year-round, and skiing and snowshoeing routes are not groomed.

## 3.15.2 Icicle Creek Corridor

### 3.15.2.1 Hiking and Stock Use

Six trailheads provide access from Icicle Road to the network of backcountry trails in the project area and beyond: Fourth of July (#1579), Chatter Creek (#1580), Jack Creek (#1558), Jack Pine (#1597), Black Jack Ridge (#1565), and Icicle Creek (#1551) (USFS, 2017<sup>3-23</sup>). Additionally, three trails provide hiking opportunities near and along Icicle Creek: Icicle Gorge (#1596), Jack Pine (#1597), and Bruce's Boulder (#6723). Trails within this part of the program area that provide access to other trails include the Icicle Creek Trail and Icicle Gorge Trail.

Horseback riding and use of stock animals (e.g., llamas and mules) from trailheads along Icicle Creek is permitted, although not on all trails. Stock use is permitted on Icicle Creek Trail.

### 3.15.2.2 Camping

The campgrounds in this part of the project area are heavily used by paddlers, rock climbers, mountain bikers, and hikers. The USFS operates eight campgrounds along Icicle Creek (Table 3-28). These areas provide campsites for tents and RVs between April and October. Campgrounds range in size from 56 sites (Johnny Creek) to 6 sites (Bridge Creek). Blackpine Creek horse camp provides pull-through sites for horse trailers and related amenities suitable for horseback riders.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> USFS Interactive visitor map\*

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Campground Name	Number of Sites	Operational Period
Eightmile	45 sites for tents or RVs, one large site that can accommodate up to 70 people and 25 vehicles	April to October
Bridge Creek	6 single sites, one large site that can accommodate up to 70 people and 35 vehicles	April to October
Icicle Group Campground	one large site that can accommodate up to 30 guests and 6 vehicles	June to October
Johnny Creek	65 sites for tents or RVs	May to October
Ida Creek	10 sites for tents or RVs	May to October
Chatter Creek	12 sites for tents only, one large site that can accommodate up to 45 people and 12 vehicles	May to October
Rock Island	22 sites for tents or RVs	May to October
Blackpine Creek Horse Camp	10 sites for tents or RVs to	May to October

Table 3-28USFS Campgrounds along Icicle Creek

### 3.15.2.3 Recreational Fishing

There are two non-tribal sport fisheries in Icicle Creek: the spring-run Chinook salmon fishery that runs from mid-May through July 31, and the resident trout fishery that occurs from the Saturday before Memorial Day through October 31 (WDFW, 2016<sup>3-24</sup>). Fishing in Icicle Creek is managed by WDFW (WDFW, 2016<sup>3-25</sup>). Targeted species include hatchery-origin spring-run Chinook salmon returning to LNFH, steelhead/rainbow trout, eastern brook trout, westslope cutthroat trout, and mountain whitefish.

WDFW actively conducts creel surveys for the spring-run Chinook salmon fishery in order to gather data for producing estimates of angler effort, harvest, and incidental catch and release of other species such as steelhead and bull trout. This fishery has been a mainstay for many years and can be very popular for both local and out of area anglers. Between 2001 and 2015, an annual average of 2,918 anglers fished approximately 15,187 hours each year and harvested 907 hatchery-origin spring-run Chinook salmon (Table 3-29).

WDFW does not actively creel survey the resident trout fishery. This fishery is mainly composed of rainbow trout, but there are occasional catches of cutthroat, eastern brook, and bull trout; this information is gained through anecdotal angler reports as well as hook-and-line sampling efforts conducted by WDFW.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Personal communication (email) between Dan Haller and Travis Maitland, WDFW District 7 Fish Biologist

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/01818/wdfw01818.pdf

Year	Fishery Season	Anglers	Hours Fished	Fish Harvested
2001	May 7 – July 22	2,932	13,194	2,260
2002	May 16 - July 31	3,811	17,150	1,201
2003	May 16 - July 31	4,016	29,133	935
2004	May 16 - July 31	1,339	9,187	347
2005	May 28 - July 31	1,108	8,130	103
2006	May 26 - June 14 <sup>1</sup>			
2007	May 22 - July 31	1,058	7,754	115
2008	May 15 - July 31	1,147	7,144	347
2009	May 22 - July 31	1,530	8,235	640
2010	May 13 - July 31	5,231	23,549	996
2011	May 21 - July 31	9,201	45,642	3,622
2012	May 19 - July 31	4,922	21,492	971
2013	May 18 - July 31	1,979	9,644	323
2014	May 23 - July 31	1,587	7,299	406
2015	May 20 - July 18	990	5,064	433
	Average:	2,918	15,187	907

 Table 3-29

 Sport Fishery Effort for Hatchery-origin Spring-run Chinook Salmon

 on Icicle Creek (WDFW)

<sup>1</sup> Early closure of fishery related to theft of 200 broodstock from LNFH on June 9, 2006 (http://www.outdoors-411.com/news/fishing/060613-hatchery-fish-theft.html)

-- no information found

In addition to possessing a freshwater fishing license, anglers age 15 and over must comply with specific size limits, gear restrictions, and bag limits when fishing in Icicle Creek. Fishing for salmon and steelhead requires a Columbia River Salmon/Steelhead Endorsement. Seasonal regulations apply to three distinct geographic reaches:

- From between the closure signs located 800 feet upstream of the mouth to 500 feet downstream of LNFH, hatchery-origin spring-run Chinook salmon may be targeted from mid-May through July, and when permitted under special rule changes.
- From the shoreline markers where Cyo Road intersects Icicle Creek at the Sleeping Lady Resort upstream to the IPID footbridge, trout and game fish may be targeted from the Saturday before Memorial Day through October; hatchery-origin spring-run Chinook salmon may be targeted from May through July.
- From the IPID footbridge to Leland Creek, and all tributaries (including Leland Creek), trout and other gamefish may be targeted from the Saturday before Memorial Day through October.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

### 3.15.2.4 Water-Based Recreation

Whitewater kayaking occurs between Rock Island Campground and LNFH, a distance of approximately 20.4 miles (American Whitewater, 2017). Kayaking occurs when flow is between 700 and 2,000 cfs. Difficulty ranges from Class II to V+ under normal flow conditions.

The upper section of Icicle Creek includes a mix of Class II to V+ rapids. This run is accessed at Rock Island Campground and ends at Johnny Creek Campground. This section includes the Class V rapid at Icicle Gorge. The middle section of Icicle Creek is classified as an expert run (Wenatchee Outdoors). Popular access points along this reach include Eightmile Campground, Bridge Campground, and Johnny Creek Campground. There are additional pullouts at Snow Creek Trailhead and Ida Creek that can be used as access. The lower section of the Icicle Creek run starts at the Snow Creek trailhead and ends upstream of the dam at LNFH. At normal flows, this run is considered a class IV+ (advanced whitewater experience).

During the summer, at low-flow conditions, stand-up paddleboards (SUP) and tubes are a popular activity on lower Icicle Creek downstream of LNFH. Many local outfitters rent SUPs and tubes and provide shuttle service between access and take-out points. These activities draw many visitors to Icicle Creek.

Portions of Icicle Creek suitable for recreational swimming are generally located between LNFH and the confluence with the Wenatchee River. Recreational swimming is not a well-monitored activity in Icicle Creek, so its popularity is unknown. However, SEPA scoping comments indicate that recreational swimming does occur. It is likely that swimming is generally associated with river tubing and SUP activities or camping during the summer.

## 3.15.3 Wenatchee River Corridor

### 3.15.3.1 Hiking and Stock Use

The majority of land along the Wenatchee River is privately owned. However, there are several parks that provide access to walking and hiking along the Wenatchee River. These parks include the City of Leavenworth's Enchantment Park, Blackbird Island Park, and Waterfront Park, Cashmere's Riverside Park, the Port of Chelan's public use trail in Peshastin, and Confluence State Park in Wenatchee.

### 3.15.3.2 Camping

The majority of land along the Wenatchee River is privately owned. Limited camping opportunities exist in the adjacent uplands. Chelan County operates the Wenatchee River County Park campground near the Town of Monitor, which includes tent and RV sites, picnic areas, and riverfront access. This park is a popular take-out point for river tubers. Confluence State park also provides camping at the confluence of the Wenatchee and Columbia Rivers.

### 3.15.3.3 Recreational Fishing

Fishing in the Wenatchee River for salmon and steelhead is managed by the WDFW (WDFW,  $2016^{26}$ ). Targeted species include summer-run Chinook salmon and steelhead, when permitted.

In addition to possessing a freshwater fishing license, anglers must comply with specific size limits, gear restrictions, and bag limits when fishing in the Wenatchee River. Fishing for salmon and steelhead requires a Columbia River Salmon/Steelhead Endorsement. Seasonal regulations apply to one distinct geographic reach:

• From the mouth to Icicle River Road Bridge, salmon may be targeted during August and September, and when permitted under special rule changes. Within this reach, the Wenatchee River is closed from 400 feet below Dryden Dam upstream to Peshastin Creek.

### 3.15.3.4 Water-Based Recreation

The Wenatchee River is a popular destination for whitewater kayakers and rafters during high-flow periods, and for tubers during summer low-flow conditions. Up to 15 commercial rafting companies offer guided whitewater rafting trips on the Wenatchee River during the spring and summer. The City of Cashmere has developed Riverside Park with accommodations for whitewater enthusiasts, including a take-out ramp for commercial and private rafters to exit the river, restrooms, picnic areas, and parking.

During the summer, swimming, tubing, kayaking, and stand up paddleboarding are popular activities on the Wenatchee River. Popular access sites include parks in Leavenworth, Cashmere, and Peshastin, and Confluence State Park. Several local outfitters rent tubes and provide shuttle service between access and take-out points. WDFW also maintains eight access sites on the Wenatchee River, that are heavily used for water-based recreation during the summer months.

## 3.16 Land Use

The broad range of land use activities in the project area can be attributed to the highly variable landscape over which surface waters flow, from wilderness area, to forested hills, through orchards in the Wenatchee River Valley, to the shrub-steppe of the eastern watershed at the confluence of the Wenatchee and Columbia Rivers.

The land uses in the rural areas of the project area, as a whole, are primarily forest management and production, orchard production, scattered residences, agricultural support facilities, and small home-based industries. Nearly all land in the Alpine Lakes Area is congressionally designated wilderness area.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/01818/wdfw01818.pdf

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This section addresses the regulatory framework of land use within the project area, this includes the current land uses and ownership.

## 3.16.1 Regulatory Setting

The following Federal, state, and local regulations and policies apply specifically to land uses within the project area. Additional regulations applicable to other resources within the project area are presented in Chapter 1.

- The Wilderness Act
- The National Forest Management Act
- State Shoreline Management Act
- The Forest Practices Act
- Zoning
- Comprehensive land use planning
- Sensitive areas ordinances.

These policies and regulations are described in more detail below. The following subsections are organized based on jurisdiction.

### 3.16.1.1 Federal Land Use Regulations

#### Wilderness Act, 1964

The Wilderness Act of 1964 (Wilderness Act) established the National Wilderness Preservation System. Additionally, wilderness uses and rules are established in the Wilderness Act. As noted in Section 3.15, Recreation, part of the upper reaches of the project area includes the ALWA, which was established under the Wilderness Act and under the Alpine Lakes Management Act of 1976. Much of the lands within the upper portions of the project area are governed by these acts. The regulation of wilderness lands is discussed in greater detail in the Section 3.17, Wilderness Area.

#### National Forest Management Act, 1976

Every forest managed by the USFS must develop a Forest Plan, as mandated in the National Forest Management Act. The upper portions of the project area are located within the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest. Methods for developing and revising the plan are outlined in the Act, including required content. The direction of the planning document provides the basis for any land-use decisions made within the National Forest. The Wenatchee National Forest's plan, adopted in 1990, is currently being revised and updated as the Okanogan-Wenatchee Forest Plan. The Alpine Lakes Management Plan, adopted in 1982, is the plan used to manage the lands within the ALWA.

## 3.16.1.2 State Land Use Regulations

### Washington Shoreline Management Act

Shorelines of the state (defined in RCW 90.58.030(2)) are regulated through the Shoreline Management Act (SMA) of 1971; as amended. The SMA is administered by Ecology, who delegates authority to local jurisdictions to manage their shorelines through the preparation and implementation of a Shoreline Master Program (SMP). Within the project area, Chelan County and the Cities of Leavenworth, Wenatchee, and Cashmere all have accepted SMPs. The intent of each jurisdiction's approved SMP is ensure protection of shoreline ecosystems, public access, and water uses. The permitting matrix located in Section 5-3 (Table 5-1) provides details on which projects being considered under the Icicle Strategy are subject to the SMA.

### **Washington State Forest Practices Act**

Forest practices on all non-federal and non-tribal lands in Washington are regulated by means of the Forest Practices Act. The Washington Forest Practices Board governs forestry practices by adopting rules and regulations such as maintenance and restoration of aquatic and riparian lands. These rules are implemented and enforced by WDNR.

### **Growth Management Act**

The Growth Management Act, Chapter 36.70A RCW is a state regulation that requires local governments to designate urban growth boundaries, creating critical area ordinances, and developing comprehensive plans.

## 3.16.1.3 Local Land Use Regulations

### **Critical Areas Ordinance**

Under the Growth Management Act, Chelan County developed a Critical Areas Ordinance to protect wetlands, areas with critical recharging effects on aquifers, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, frequently flooded areas, and geologically hazardous areas. These areas have been incorporated into the County zoning codes, which includes setback requirements.

### **Comprehensive Plan and Zoning**

In Washington State, counties manage land use through comprehensive planning and zoning. In Chelan County, these activities are conducted by the Community Development Department. Under the framework provided in the Growth Management Act, Chelan County adopted its Comprehensive Plan in 2000, which was updated in 2007, and is currently undergoing another update. Included in the comprehensive planning process was the establishment of urban growth areas to promote contiguous and orderly development. Each of the municipalities within the project area have an established urban growth area. Comprehensive planning and zoning designates the geography, frequency, and density of land uses. Table 3-30 describes the types of land uses regulated by Chelan County.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Land Use Designation	Area (acres)	
Agriculture In Open Space (Chapter 84.34 RCW)	9,300.1	
Agriculture Related Activities	87.2	
Agriculture-Not In Open Space	6,562.7	
Aircraft Transportation	20.5	
All Other Residential	1,556.9	
Amusements	4.8	
Automobile Parking	2.6	
Business Services	9.5	
Communication	19.9	
Contract Construction Services	39.3	
Cultural Activities	0.0	
Designated Forest Land (Chapter 84.33 RCW)	64,606.6	
Educational Services	98.4	
Fabricated Metal Products	1.4	
Finance, Insurance/Real Estate Services	4.2	
Food/Kindred Products	8.8	
Furniture and Fixtures	0.6	
Governmental Services	344,757.1	
Highway/Street Right-Of-Way	15.4	
Hotels/Motels	119.7	
Household 2-4 Units	13.8	
Institutional Lodging	82.5	
Lumber/Wood Prod Exc Furniture	148.2	
Mining Activities	487.9	
Miscellaneous Manufacturing	2.5	
Miscellaneous Services	3,284.8	
Mobile Home Parks/Courts	76.2	
Multi-Units 5 Or More	14.5	
Non-Residential Condominiums	0.2	
Noncommercial Forest	23,590.9	
Open Space (Chapter 84.34 RCW)	544.0	
Other Cultural & Recreational	3.0	
Other Resource Production	4,812.7	
Other Retail Trade	10.1	
Other Trans, Comm, & Utilities	2.9	
Other Undeveloped Land	259.2	
Parks	435.5	
Personal Services	6.2	
Petroleum Refining/Related Industries	9.6	
Primary Metal Industries	7.9	

Table 3-30Zoning designations in Chelan County

#### CHAPTER 3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Land Use Designation	Area (acres)
Professional Services	15.9
Public Assembly	356.7
Railroad/Transit Trans	118.9
Recreational Activities	428.2
Repair Services	10.6
Residential Hotels-Condominium	7.3
Resorts and Group Camps	382.0
Retail Trade-Apparel/Access	0.2
Retail Trade-Bld. Mat., Farm Eqpt	18.8
Retail Trade-Eating/Drinking	41.8
Retail Trade-Food	31.1
Retail Trade-Furniture	666.5
Retail Trade-Gen Merchandise	4.6
Retail Trade-Trans/Accessories	3.2
Rubber/Misc Plastic Products	1.1
Single Family Units	16,807.1
Stone, Clay & Glass Products	2.4
Timberland in Open Space (Chapter 84.34 RCW)	2,017.7
Undeveloped Land	38,040.6
Utilities	1,060.6
Vacation and Cabin	7,344.2

In addition to county planning and zoning, each municipality within the project area has zoning ordinances and urban area comprehensive plans that have been developed under the framework provided in the Growth Management Act.

### 3.16.1.4 Current Land Use

Table 3-31 provides a breakdown of the primary land uses within the project area.

Table 3-31 Land Use in Acres	
Land Use Type (Zone Districts)	Area (Acres)
Forest lands	13,1380.2
Rural public lands and facilities	170.7
Rural residential	5,376.0
Rural village	0.3
Rural waterfront	0.4
Water	119.3

In the project area, land use generally falls within two major categories, Federal and private. These uses are described in more detail below.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

### 3.16.1.5 Federal Ownership and Land Use

The USFS manages 87 percent of the land in the Icicle Creek Subbasin, which makes up a large portion of the project area. Much the land located within the Alpine Lakes Area and Reach 1 through 3 of the Icicle Creek Corridor is under federal management, with most land in the Alpine Lakes Area being managed under the Alpine Lakes Management Plan. However, there are private in-holdings within the Alpine Lakes Area, which are not subject to the management requirements in the Alpine Lakes Management Plan.

The other major area of Federal ownership within the project area includes the LNFH, which is located along the Icicle Creek Corridor and is owned and operated by USFWS. The current target species for the hatchery is spring Chinook salmon. The CTCR and the YN are partners in the operation of the LNFH (Chelan County Shoreline Inventory and Analysis, 2009). LNFH operates as mitigation for Grand Coulee Dam with an interim release target of 1.2 million fish, and a long-term target release goal of 1.625 million fish.

To support the operation of LNFH, USFWS owns 157.69 acres in the lower Icicle watershed, near Icicle Creek RM 2.7. This includes the hatchery itself and administrative buildings. Additionally, USFWS owns the majority of lands associated with the Nada/Snow Lakes systems within the ALWA. These lands, shorelines, and lakes are operated to provide water for fish propagation at the hatchery. The ownership and operation of the lands are described in more detail in Section 3.6, Water Use, and 3.17, Wilderness Area.

### 3.16.1.6 Private Ownership and Land Use

Much of the project area located in the Wenatchee River Corridor and Reach 5 of the Icicle Creek Corridor is privately owned. Private land use is primarily agriculture and residential. In addition to the private land in Reach 5 and the Wenatchee River Corridor, there are approximately 50 private creek-side parcels located in the Icicle Island development in Reach 2. Land Use Planning

### 3.16.1.7 Comprehensive Planning

As discussed in section 3.16.1.3, Comprehensive Planning, which is required under the state's Growth Management Act, occurs at the county and municipality level. Comprehensive planning provides guidance and direction to the County and City governments on development and land use. Comprehensive Plans within the project area include the Chelan County Comprehensive Plan, the City of Leavenworth Comprehensive Plan, the City of Cashmere Comprehensive Land Use Plan, and Wenatchee Urban Area Comprehensive Plan.

## 3.16.1.8 Upper Wenatchee Community Lands Plan

The Upper Wenatchee Community Lands Plan is a proposal to look at how community ownership of high-priority parcels can benefit the community while supporting diverse stakeholder needs related to the properties. The initial phase began in December 2014 and concluded in September 2016. The process was led by the Trust for Public Land, along with Chelan County, The Nature Conservancy, and the Chelan-Douglas Land Trust. Together with local stakeholders, these groups created a vision for future growth within the plan study area, that includes in part the project area. The plan study area reaches from City of Cashmere to Stevens Pass. Broken into the following three sub-regions, each is characterized by a checkerboard of both private and public land ownership:

- Nason Ridge/Lake Wenatchee
- Peshastin/Blewett Pass
- Chumstick Valley/Leavenworth

The plan identifies the following goals that are also consistent in part with the Icicle Strategy Guiding Principles.

- **1.** Sustainable forests that support biodiversity, are maintained to reduce fire intensity, and increase resilience to climate change.
- 2. Working lands for a thriving economy.
- **3.** Existing access to public land to be maintained while also increasing year-round recreation opportunities.
- **4**. Lands that support wildlife (habitat, including for fish).
- 5. High-quality water resources (and sufficient quantity).
- 6. Private property availability (for development, business, and other uses).

It is likely, any projects developed through the Icicle Strategy targeting habitat enhancement would be achieved through a partnership with the Community Lands Plan program.

More detail about the Upper Wenatchee Community Plan can be found on Chelan County's website<sup>27</sup>.

## 3.17 Wilderness Area

As noted in Section 3.16, Land Use, a large part of the project area's Alpine Lakes Area sub-region is within the federally designated ALWA (Figure 3-38). Designated wilderness is the highest level of conservation protection for federal lands. Congress has directed four federal land management agencies—USFS, Bureau of Land Management, USFWS, and National Park Service—to manage wilderness areas to preserve and, where possible, to restore their wilderness character.<sup>28</sup> Therefore, this section addresses more specifically, the management and use of wilderness lands within the project area.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/uwclp-minutes?parent=planning

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> https://wilderness.nps.gov/faqnew.cfm

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT Figure 3-38. Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area



## 3.17.1 Wilderness Act History

In 1964 Congress passed the National Wilderness Act for purposes of protecting federal lands. In 1976, the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Management Act was passed, setting aside over 300,000 acres as federally designated wilderness.<sup>29</sup> In 2014, the ALWA was expanded to include over 414,000 acres.

### 3.17.1.1 Pre-Wilderness Act Use

The ALWA was originally designated the Alpine Lakes Limited Area in 1946 when the Regional Forester set aside 256,000 acres of federal lands for protection and study until they could be further classified and management designation could be assigned.<sup>30</sup> This designation did not offer protection from resource extractions and was exclusively regulated by the USFS.<sup>31</sup> The region and adjacent areas were being extensively used for mining and timber extraction.<sup>32</sup> Efforts to further protect the lower valley forests of the Alpine Lakes began in the 1950s through the 1960s.

### 3.17.1.2 Wilderness Act History and Designation

The Wilderness Act, signed into law in 1964, created the National Wilderness Preservation System and recognized wilderness as "an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain." The Act further defined wilderness as "an area of undeveloped federal land retaining its primeval character and influence without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions...."<sup>33</sup>

The Wilderness Act prohibits permanent roads and commercial enterprises, except for commercial services that may provide for recreational or other purposes of the Wilderness Act. Wilderness areas generally do not allow motorized equipment, motor vehicles, mechanical transport, temporary roads, permanent structures, or installations. Wilderness areas are to be primarily affected by the forces of nature, though the Wilderness Act does acknowledge the need to provide for human health and safety, protect private property, control insect infestations, and fight fires within the area.<sup>34</sup> Wilderness areas are managed under the direction of the Wilderness Act, subsequent legislation (such as the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act), and agency policy.

## 3.17.1.3 Alpine Lakes Management Act

The purpose of the 1976 Alpine Lakes Management Act was to "...provide for public outdoor recreation and use and for economic utilization of commercial forest lands,

- <sup>30</sup> 1979 Wenatchee National Forest (N.F.)/Mt. Baker National Forest (N.F.)/Snoqualmie National
- Forest (N.F.), Alpine Lakes Area Acquisitions: Environmental Impact Statement

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> https://www.wilderness.net/NWPS/documents/publiclaws/PDF/94-357.pdf

<sup>(</sup>https://books.google.ca/books?id=7zw3AQAAMAAJ&dq=In+1946,+256,000+acres+was+designated +as+the+Alpine+Lakes+Limited+Area+by+the+Forest+Service.&source=gbs\_navlinks\_s)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> http://www.washington.edu/uwpress/search/books/MARDRC.html

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> http://www.washington.edu/uwpress/search/books/MARDRC.html

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> https://wilderness.nps.gov/faqnew.cfm

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> https://wilderness.nps.gov/faqnew.cfm

#### PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

geological features, lakes, streams and other resources...by present and future generations..." For administrative purposes, the Management Act considers the Alpine Lakes area as three subareas: the Alpine Lakes Wilderness, the Intended Wilderness, and the Management Unit (Figure 3-39). The federal lands in the ALWA are administered in accordance with the 1976 Management Act and the 1964 Wilderness Act. The Intended Wilderness is adjacent non-federal land that becomes federal land upon acquisition. A peripheral Management Unit area surrounds the ALWA and Intended Wilderness and is administered in accordance with laws and regulations applicable to national forests.

### 3.17.1.4 Intended Wilderness

In an effort to acquire Intended Wilderness, Congress appropriated Land and Water Conservation Fund funds to purchase three in-holdings: Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway (BNSF), Pack River Company, and IPID. BNSF and Pack River were purchased. IPID sold and exchanged some lands within the Wilderness Area.

As part of the IPID land sale and exchange agreement, IPID and the USFS entered into a contract in 1986 that stipulated which land would be exchanged by the two entities and what rights IPID would reserve on sold and exchanged lands. In 1990, IPID and USFS executed the land exchange. The result was USFS acquisition of several key parcels of land around Klonaqua, Eightmile, and Colchuck Lakes and the Snow Lakes trailhead with IPID reserving several rights to the properties associated with Klonaqua, Eightmile, and Colchuck Lakes:

"a nonexclusive, perpetual easement across, through, along, and upon the property described herein for the purposes of maintenance, repair, operation, modification, upgrading and replacement of all facilities presently located in or upon the property described herein, together with a nonexclusive right of ingress to and egress from all such facilities for all such purposes, in accordance with Rules and Regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, 36 CFR 251.17 and 251.18, attached hereto and made a part hereof, in such manner as not unreasonably to interfere with its use by the United States, its authorized users or assigns, or cause substantial injury thereto.

The Grantor [IPID] may exercise the rights hereunder by any means reasonable for the purposes described, including but not limited to the use of motorized transportation and equipment, or aircraft. These rights include the right to regulate water level of all facilities located upon the property described herein. In performing maintenance, repair, operation, modification, upgrading and replacement of facilities located in or upon the property described herein, the Grantor will not without prior written consent of the Forest Service, which consent shall not unreasonably be withheld, materially increase the size or scope of the facilities."

#### CHAPTER 3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

OHOMISH COUNT **Alpine Lakes Area Management Unit Boundary** Intendeo Wilderness Square 7 Lake Intended Wilderness Icicle Klonaqua Lakes Cree Leavenworth Peshastin е d ne S Intended Wilderness Dryden Cashmere Cashmere Snoqualmi North Bend Eightmile Lake Colchuck Nada Lake Upper Snow-Lake River Intended Sunnyslope Wilderness Intended Park Wenatchee h Wilderness Lake Easton State Park 16 0 Ronald Aspect Roslyn Miles

#### Figure 3-39. Alpine Lakes Management Act Area

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Additionally, the USFS issued agriculture irrigation and livestock watering easements for those portions of Colchuck Lake that were not covered by the easement described above and Square Lake. These easements grant IPID the right to operate and maintain their water facilities with consultation and concurrence from the USFS. Before the issuance of these easements, Square Lake was operated by IPID under a special use permit because USFS determined Square Lake was not under the jurisdiction of Washington State DNR because of navigability criteria.

The land exchange documents and easements are provided in Appendix F

USFWS owns the shorelines and potentially the lakebed of Upper Snow, Lower Snow, and Nada Lakes. In 1971, USFWS and USFS investigated the possibility of USFS obtaining ownership of these lands. However, this investigation found that USFS acquisition of these lands was prohibited by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1934. In 1971, USFS and USFWS drafted a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) regarding management around these lakes. A copy of the unsigned MOA is provided in Appendix F however, it is unclear whether or not this MOA was executed and confirmation was not obtained prior to publication of this document.

## 3.17.2 Use

## 3.17.2.1 Wilderness Use

The intent of wilderness areas, as designated in the 1964 Wilderness Act, is to preserve wilderness character rather than to establish any particular use. Thus, descriptions of use in the 1964 Wilderness Act and 1976 Management Act generally focus on prohibitions of use. The Wilderness Act prohibits permanent roads or commercial enterprises, except where they provide for recreation or other purposes of the Act, and generally prohibits the use of motorized equipment; however, certain nonconforming uses are permitted as described within the act. These uses include access to non-federal inholdings, as has been the case for IPID's maintenance of existing water infrastructure, and the use of aircraft or motor boat, where these uses have already become established.

The Wilderness Act also provides for non-wilderness uses within wilderness areas, such as the construction of transmission lines, roads, and new reservoirs. However, these non-wilderness uses are special provisions to the Act that require presidential authorization.

## 3.17.2.2 Non-Wilderness Use

Non-wilderness uses that are authorized and do occur within the boundaries of the ALWA include reservoir operations and use of motorized equipment for maintenance of these reservoirs and helicopter transport to and from the reservoirs. These non-wilderness uses are permissible under various ownership structure and agreements, easements, and permits, with helicopter transport being approved in a 1981 Environmental Assessment (USFS, 1981). Table 3-32 provides a description of the various use authorities for select lakes where proposed activities may occur: Eightmile, Upper Klonaqua, Lower Klonaqua, Colchuck, Square, Upper Snow, Lower Snow, and Nada Lakes. Additionally, this section discusses those authorities.

#### CHAPTER 3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Lake	Operator	Current Owner	Former Owner	Primary Use Authority	Additional Authority	Key Language in Use Authority
Eightmile	IPID	USFS	IPID	1990 Special Warranty Deed	n/a	Excepting and reserving the right to overflow and inundate
Lower Klonaqua	IPID	USFS	IPID	1990 Special Warranty Deed	n/a	the bed and shore; water rights granted; perpetual
Upper Klonaqua	-	USFS	IPID	1990 Special Warranty Deed	n/a	easement across, through, along, and upon the property
Colchuck	IPID	USFS	IPID/ USFS	1990 Special Warranty Deed	2000 Agriculture Irrigation and Livestock Watering System Easement and Special Use Permit	for maintenance, repair, operation, modification, upgrading, and replacement of all facilities presently located in and upon the property. IPID may exercise the rights by any means reasonable including motorized transport and equipment or aircraft. These rights include regulating water level. Grantor will not without the prior written consent of the Forest Service, which consent shall not unreasonably be withheld, materially increase the size or scope of the facilities
Square	IPID	USFS	USFS	2000 Agriculture Irrigation and Livestock Watering System Easement	Special Use Permit	Authorizes right-of-way and water conveyance systems; does not authorize extension or enlargements; authorizes operation and maintenance of facilities with consultation and concurrence from USFS.
Upper Snow	USFWS	USFWS	USFWS	Ownership	MOA	USFWS owns these lakes or owns easement from the state for the shorelines,
Lower Snow	USFWS	USFWS	USFWS	Ownership	MOA	depending on whether the lakes are navigable. Ownership grants USEWS
Nada	USFWS	USFWS	BOR/USFWS	Ownership	MOA	the ability to manage the lakes in compliance with applicable local, state, and federal laws. Documents obtained from the USFS through a FOIA request indicates there may be an MOA between USFWS and USFS regarding the management of trails near the shoreline of these lakes. However, a signed copy of an MOA was not made available through the FOIA request.

 Table 3-32

 Easement and Permit Summary for Select Alpine Lakes

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

### Ownership

There are parcels within the ALWA that are not owned by the USFS. Such parcels that are related to the Icicle Strategy are those owned by USFWS. Ownership of these lakes provides USFWS continued use of these lakes as reservoirs and provides them the right to maintain and upgrade their facilities in compliance with applicable regulations and permits.

### Easements

When conveying land to a new owner, a property owner can reserve rights or easements to that land. As discussed above, this was the case when USFS acquired IPID lands within the Wilderness Area boundary. IPID reserved the right to continue operating the lakes in accordance with their water rights. Additionally, IPID reserved the right to maintain and upgrade the facilities. Based on background documents between IPID and USFS from the 1980s and 1990s, this includes the use of motorized equipment for work on the facilities and access to the sites.

### **USFS Special Use Permit**

The USFS special use authorization is a legal document, such as a permit, lease, or easement, that allows occupancy, use, rights, or privileges on USFS land. Special uses within the project area currently allowed by USFS include the following:

- Square Lake and the northern section of Colchuck Lake were historically operated under special use permits. In 2000, USFS issued an Agriculture Irrigation and Livestock Water System Easement that permits the use of these lakes for irrigation operations. These easements authorize right-of-way and water conveyance systems. Any extension or enlargement of the lakes is not authorized. Additionally, operation and maintenance of the facilities must occur with concurrence from the USFS.
- The Icicle radio repeater station is located outside the ALWA on Icicle Ridge. The station is on USFS land and is operated with a special use permit. Implementation of Alternative 1 and Alternative 4 may require the use of this radio repeater station for the automation project, although locations on private land are also being considered.

## 3.17.3 Wilderness Character

As established in the 1964 Wilderness Act, wilderness preservation is "for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character." There has been no legal definition of wilderness character since the 1964 Wilderness Act; however, four distinct and necessary "qualities" of wilderness character have been identified by wilderness scholars <sup>35</sup>. These four qualities—naturalness, opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation, undeveloped, and untrammeled—were selected to link local conditions and management with the statutory language of the 1964 Wilderness

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> In Focus: Wilderness Character, Landres, Vagias, Stutzman, 2012,

ttps://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs\_other/rmrs\_2012\_landres\_p001.pdf

Act.<sup>36</sup> A summary of these four attributes are presented below.<sup>37</sup> For the ALWA, no scientific or systematic approach has been developed or referenced to date to specifically depict the condition of this wilderness area's wilderness character.

### Natural

The natural quality defines wilderness as containing ecological systems that are substantially free from the effects of modern civilization. This quality is degraded by the intended or unintended effects of modern people on the ecological systems inside the wilderness since it was designated.

#### Solitude

The solitude, or primitive and unconfined recreation quality, defines wilderness as containing outstanding opportunities to experience solitude, remoteness, and primitive recreation free from the constraints of modern society. This quality is degraded by settings that reduce these opportunities, such as visitor encounters, signs of modern civilization, recreation facilities, and management restriction on visitor behavior.

#### Undeveloped

The undeveloped quality defines wilderness as an area without permanent improvements or modern human occupation. This quality is degraded by the presence of nonrecreational structures and installations, habitations, and by the use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or mechanical transport, because these increase people's ability to occupy or modify the environment.

#### Untrammeled

The untrammeled quality is the degree to which wilderness is unhindered and free from modern human control or manipulation. The untrammeled quality is degraded by actions that intentionally manipulate or control ecological systems, whereas the natural quality is degraded by the intentional and unintentional effects from actions taken inside wilderness, as well as from external forces on these systems.

## 3.18 Shorelines

Shorelines of the State (defined in RCW 90.58.030[2]) are regulated through the SMA of 1971, as amended. The SMA is administered by Ecology, who delegates authority to local jurisdictions to manage their shorelines through the preparation and implementation of a SMP.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> https://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs\_other/rmrs\_2012\_landres\_p001.pdf

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> Landres, P., C. Barns, J.G. Dennis, T. Devine, P. Geissler, C.S. McCasland, L. Merigliano, J. Seastrand, and R. Swain. 2008. Keeping it Wild: An Interagency Strategy to Monitor Trends in Wilderness Character Across the National Wilderness Preservation System. 81 pages. USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-212, Fort Collins, Colorado.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Within the Icicle project area, Chelan County and the Cities of Leavenworth, Wenatchee, and Cashmere all have approved SMPs. Specific SMP policies applicable to the Icicle project area include, among other things, protections to address flood hazards and regulate frequently flooded areas.

Frequently flooded areas, as designated by these local jurisdictions, are defined in part by mapping, studies, and guidance from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). FEMA mapping and studies delineate an area with a 1 percent annual chance of flooding as the 100-year flood zone or floodplain. For development to be approved in the 100-year floodplain, it is typically required that a qualified professional certify that there will be no net loss of flood storage capacity and that the development results in no increase ("zero rise") in water surface elevation during a flood.

Higher potential for flooding can also contribute to increased risk or erosion along these waterways. In general, surface water moves across land or within stream channels at higher velocity during flood or peak flow events, increasing the water potential to pick up sediment and transport it to other areas. To some extent these processes are natural; however, during high flow events, large amounts of sediment can be moved and, depending on the extent of erosion, can cause damage to streambanks, impact aquatic habitat, degrade water quality, and in some cases, damage private property.

## 3.18.1 Alpine Lakes

As discussed in greater detail in Section 3.3, Surface Water Resources, the primary waterbodies in this part of the Icicle project area include several high-altitude lakes that are fed by rain and snowmelt. Located in the uppermost portion of the Icicle Creek Basin, they drain into adjacent streams that are tributaries to Icicle Creek, which is a tributary to the Wenatchee River.

As noted in Section 3.17, Wilderness Area, the USFS owns and administers the ALWA, which encompasses the lakes within the Icicle project area. IPID has an easement agreement with the USFS that was established when the Wilderness Area was created and the lakes were transferred to the USFS. The easement establishes additional rights for use, management, maintenance, and operation of the lakes by IPID. The USFWS owns the property adjacent to Upper and Lower Snow Lakes and Nada Lake within the ALWA and has landowner rights related to the use, management, maintenance, and operation of those lakes. In addition, Chelan County has jurisdiction over Shorelines of the State in this part of the project area.

The shorelines of these lakes are generally rocky. In some cases, there are steeper slopes leading up to the lake edge, consisting of loose rocks and talus. In other areas, the shoreline is more gradual and consists of larger boulders and vegetation, mainly pine trees, growing up to the shoreline. Important shoreline functions within this part of the Icicle project area include flood retention and habitat and ecosystem functions and values.

Under existing conditions, these lakes are managed to store and release flows for downstream uses. IPID manages Eightmile, Klonaqua, Square, and Colchuck Lakes for

downstream irrigation use. The USFWS manages Nada and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes for downstream use by the LNFH. Small dams and related infrastructure (e.g., gates, pipes) were constructed at the outlets of each lake in the early half of the twentieth century to control the releases into adjacent streams.

Current IPID operating procedures result in the release of water from one to two of the IPID-managed lakes each year beginning in early summer (July) until early fall (October). The length and extent of releases depends on water conditions in Icicle Creek near the IPID diversion facilities. During drought years, water may be released from all of the IPID-managed lakes. The USFWS service releases water from Upper Snow Lake through a tunnel, penstock, and release valve to Nada Lake. Releases from Upper Snow Lake typically occur between July and October. Lake levels at the lakes that are targeted for release are typically drawn down over a period of approximately 2 to 3 months before release valves or gates are closed, rain and snow increases, and lake levels begin to rise again. Lake levels in all of the lakes are typically highest in the spring and early summer and lowest in the late summer and early fall.

In this part of the Icicle project area, managed and natural flows from the lakes result in fluctuating water levels that influence the potential for erosion and flooding along the lakeshores and in downstream tributaries. Under existing conditions, erosion and flooding potential along the lakeshores is relatively small because the shorelines are typically rocky and the watershed is adapted to seasonal fluctuations in lake levels. When a lake is full, excess water in the lake spills over the small dam structure and flows downstream at a flow rate that matches the natural inflow from the watershed above the lake. Most of the lakes are typically full during the spring and early summer and water flows through the lakes without any attenuation from the storage volume in the lake. Lake draw down occurs slowly over a period of 2 to 3 months during the late summer, which results in relatively minor, if any, lakeshore erosion. Flows from the lakes contribute to typical patterns of erosion in downstream tributaries with the potential being highest at all lakes in the spring when the lakes are full and natural runoff rates are at their peak.

Because the lakes are fed by rainwater and snowmelt, during years where precipitation is higher than average, lake levels increase and the lakes fill earlier in the spring. When the lakes are full, there is greater potential for localized flooding and erosion because peak flows are not attenuated by the storage capacity in the lakes. When the lakes are not full and peak flow events occur, the storage volume in the lake is available to capture inflows and attenuate flow rates downstream to reduce potential for downstream flooding and erosion. However, the lakes are not generally managed to reduce downstream flooding or attenuate peak flow rates. They are managed to capture water for release in the late summer to meet downstream water supply needs.

## 3.18.2 Icicle Creek Corridor

As discussed in greater detail in Section 3.3, Surface Water Resources, Icicle Creek is one of the primary tributaries to the Wenatchee River. It is primarily fed by rain and snowmelt from the ALWA and other forest areas.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Depending on the specific location, shoreline jurisdiction along Icicle Creek is granted to Chelan County or the City of Leavenworth. The shoreline typically consists of large boulders and rocks with some riparian forested vegetation, consisting of vegetation very similar to the Alpine Lakes in the higher altitudes. Further downstream and closer to the City of Leavenworth, the shoreline becomes less rocky and less heavily vegetated with larger trees. Shoreline vegetation in the lower reaches of Icicle Creek includes more shrubs and smaller trees. Important shoreline functions within this part of the Icicle project area include flood retention and habitat and ecosystem functions and values.

Similar to the Alpine Lakes tributaries, the timing and volume of flows along Icicle Creek influence the potential for localized flooding and erosion. In general, this system is adapted to a range of flow rates, with higher flows in the winter and spring, and lower flows in the late summer and early fall. Under typical conditions, minor streambank erosion occurs in a manner typical to stream systems with peak spring flows resulting in increased stream turbidity. Because the lakes in the upper watershed and diversion facilities downstream are typically operated to manage flows and water supply in the late summer, their operation does not have as much impact on peak flow rates in Icicle Creek, which typically occur during the winter or spring.

During years when precipitation is higher than average, increased creek flows may contribute to increased localized flooding, erosion, and stream turbidity. Areas with a higher risk of flooding include areas along the banks and floodplain of Icicle Creek from the Boulder Field at RM 5.6 to the City of Leavenworth. Floodplain mapping within the Icicle Creek corridor has not yet been updated by FEMA. Based on the available floodplain mapping, the 100-year floodplain (area with 1 percent annual chance or greater of flooding) is generally limited to a narrow corridor in the canyon upstream of LNFH that includes the banks of a limited floodplain area along Icicle Creek. The 100-year floodplain expands farther upland where Icicle Creek enters the broader valley near LNFH and expands downstream of the LNFH to the City of Leavenworth (FEMA, 2016).

## 3.18.3 Wenatchee River Corridor

Shoreline jurisdiction along the Wenatchee River near its confluence with Icicle Creek is granted to Chelan County or the Cities of Leavenworth, Cashmere, or Wenatchee, depending on the specific location. Near the City of Leavenworth, the shoreline is generally similar to Icicle Creek. As the river flows downstream toward its confluence with the Columbia River, the shoreline becomes less densely vegetated and more open with some areas of sandy beach. Important shoreline functions also include flood retention and habitat and ecosystem functions and values.

Similar to the upper watershed, this river system is also adapted to a range of flow rates, with higher flows occurring in the winter and spring and lower flows occurring in the late summer and early fall. Under typical conditions, minor streambank erosion occurs in a manner typical to river systems with peak spring flows resulting in increased stream turbidity. During peak storm events, the potential for flooding and erosion increases. Floodplain mapping within the Wenatchee River Corridor has not yet been updated by FEMA. Based on available floodplain mapping, the 100-year floodplain (area with 1

percent annual chance or greater of flooding) generally includes the river banks and a narrow floodplain area along the Wenatchee River from Icicle Creek to the Columbia River. The extent of the 100-year floodplain extends farther upland as the valley broadens toward the City of Wenatchee (FEMA, 2016).

## 3.19 Utilities

This section discusses utilities within the Icicle project area. Most public utilities are provided by Chelan County, cities, special districts such as public utility districts, and private suppliers. These utilities include water service, solid waste, water treatment, and electricity.

Water service utilities are the most likely to be impacted by the Icicle Strategy and the Program Alternatives and are the focus of this section. However, several other utilities are in the project area, especial the lower portion of the Icicle Creek Corridor sub-region and the Wenatchee River Corridor sub-region. These utilities include electricity provided by Chelan County PUD, wastewater services provided by Chelan County PUD, City of Leavenworth, City of Cashmere, and City of Wenatchee. They are mainly concentrated in more developed areas and may need to be addressed during project construction.

## 3.19.1 Water Purveyors

### 3.19.1.1 City of Leavenworth

City of Leavenworth is the only major municipal water purveyor that uses Icicle Creek surface water as part of their water supply. Details of the City of Leavenworth water right and diversionary infrastructure is provided in Section 3.6.1, Water Rights. This section details their municipal water production.

### **Historical Water Use**

In 1988, Leavenworth produced 501 million gallons of water from its water treatment plant and wells for 986 service connections (WSP, 2011). The number of service connections increased to 1,380 in 2013 while the production of water decreased to 279 million gallons<sup>38</sup>. Both the service connection increase and the production decrease have been fairly steady over the period of record. This downward trend in water use can be attributed largely to a variety of conservation efforts the City of Leavenworth has implemented. Although this significant reduction could also be related to structural improvements, implementation of metering, and other operational changes.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> Data from City of Leavenworth 2013 Water Use Efficiency Annual Performance Report submitted to Washington State Department of Health May 4, 2014

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

### Water Conservation

Since 2008, the City of Leavenworth has invested approximately \$3.6 million to improve distribution, storage, and metering of water to decrease water loss and improve accountability. A breakdown of these projects is listed below in Table 3-33.

Increased water conservation by the City of Leavenworth is one of the projects included in the Program Alternatives of the Icicle Strategy, with the exception of the No-action Alternative. These conservation efforts are detailed in Section 2.5.4, Domestic Conservation, and is anticipated to save up to 400 acre-feet per year, which will be made available for additional water service by the City of Leavenworth.

Year	Project	Cost
	Icicle Road Reservoir Reconstruction	\$2,212,618
2009	9th Street Watermain	\$295,258
2008	Commercial Street Watermain	\$134,539
	Meter Upgrades	\$3,336
2009	Meter Upgrades	\$10,648
2010	Meter Upgrades	\$12,714
2012	Meter Upgrades	\$8,370
	Front/Div - 14th Watermain	\$233,708
	Source Water Meters	\$5,453
	Meter Upgrades	\$1,483
2013	East Leavenworth Road Watermain	\$681,009
	Front Street Watermain	\$9,900
	Source Water Meters	\$1,877
Total		\$3,610,913

Table 3-33 Capital Improvement Projects Made by the City of Leavenworth to Improve Conservation and Accountability of Water Use (Aspect, 2014)

### **Current Water Use**

In 2017, the City of Leavenworth served approximately 1,404 connections (Varela & Associates, 2018). The City of Leavenworth's water comes from both groundwater wells and surface water diversions from Icicle Creek. The City maintains dual sources for supply redundancy. Surface water withdrawals from Icicle Creek are routed through the City's water treatment plant, which treats approximately 2.0 million gallons per day (gpd) during peak demand in the summer irrigation season. Conservation efforts have decreased usage from 389 gpd per Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) in 2002 to 304 gpd per ERU in 2012, a decrease of 85 gpd per ERU or approximately 22 percent (Aspect, 2014). The City of Leavenworth recently revised their water system plan (WSP) and found the average gpd per ERU in 2016 to be 266 gpd/ERU (Varela & Associates, 2018). Table 3-11 shows the number or parcels and the size class of those parcels for the City of Leavenworth and other water purveyors who divert from Icicle Creek.

### **Projected Future Need**

The City of Leavenworth WSP projects long-term population and water demand growth (Varela & Associates, 2018). Based on this analysis, projected water demanded in 20yeas is estimated at 495 million gallons annually (Varela & Associates, 2018). Production in 2017 was 320 million gallons. However, implementation of water use efficiency efforts may impact this demand projection.

### 3.19.1.2 Group A Water Systems

In addition to the City of Leavenworth, there are several small group A water systems within the affected environment. All of these water systems are located downstream of the confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River and are within the Wenatchee Corridor. Below is a complete list of these water systems.

- Upper Ski Hill Water Association
- Peshastin Domestic Water Association
- Dryden Independent Plaza & RV
- River Bend Mobile Park LLC
- West Cashmere Water System
- Chelan County Fairgrounds
- Cashmere Water Department
- Towns Mobile Home Park
- Northwest Wholesale
- East Monitor Water Association
- Wenatchee River County Park
- City of Wenatchee

## 3.20 Transportation

This section addresses transportation networks throughout the Icicle project area. Transportation facilities include trails, roadways, railways, water transport, and air transport. Not all of these transportation types are located in the sub-regions discussed in this section (Alpine Lakes, Icicle Creek, Wenatchee River) and will be omitted from the subsections as appropriate.

## 3.20.1 Alpine Lakes

Trails were the original transportation network throughout the upper Icicle Creek Subbasin in the Alpine Lakes region and remains one of the few ways to access the Alpine Lakes today. This area contains several hundred miles of trails. Some of the trails contained in the subbasin are well maintained and frequently used while others have fallen into disrepair or have been covered by debris as a result of fires in the region. Trail use is closely tied to outdoor recreation and discussed further in Section 3.15, Recreation.

Air transport via helicopters is the only way other than trails to access the Alpine Lakes area. Helicopter use is limited in this area because of wilderness regulations, as discussed in Section 3.17, Wilderness Area. Helicopters are used for emergency purposes and for maintenance and operation transport for IPID. In 1981, the USFS conducted an environmental assessment on IPID's helicopter use and found it permissible.

## 3.20.2 Icicle Creek Corridor

Icicle Creek Road runs from the City of Leavenworth near the confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River for approximately 18 miles up Icicle Canyon. This road is used primarily for recreational purposes as it accesses various trailheads, climbing routes, and swimming areas along Icicle Creek. There are also USFS roads that diverge from Icicle Creek Road and meander through the Wilderness Area. Except for the City of Leavenworth, Icicle Creek Road and the adjoining USFS roads are the only roadways within the Icicle Subbasin. Because Icicle Creek Road comes to a dead end after 18 miles up the Icicle Canyon, it is not a primary transportation route and generally exists for recreational purposes.

## 3.20.3 Wenatchee River Corridor

The Wenatchee River Corridor contains several major roadways. These include federal Highways 97 and 2, and a small portion of State Route 209. There are also several county and city roads located in this area. Highway 2, which runs along the Wenatchee River, is designated as a National Scenic Highway, which is discussed in more detail in Section 3.11.3, Wenatchee River Corridor [Aesthetics].

There is also one railroad that runs parallel to the Wenatchee River from the City of Leavenworth to City of Wenatchee. This rail line is owned by BNSF and serves both passengers and freight. This rail line connects the Wenatchee area to City of Seattle and City of Spokane.

# 3.21 Cultural Resources

Cultural resources can be buildings and other man-made structures or objects, or a site, landscape, or district associated with human use in the past. For the purposes of this evaluation, cultural resources are considered to be those eligible for listing in local, state, or national preservation registers. Tribal resources within the Icicle project area are addressed in Section 3.22, Indian Sacred Sites, and Section 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest.

## **3.21.1 Environmental Context**

The Icicle project area is in the Wenatchee River Watershed on the east slopes of the Cascade Range. The project area includes the Alpine Lakes in the Icicle Creek Basin, Icicle Creek to its confluence with the Wenatchee River, and the Wenatchee River from just upstream of Icicle Creek to its confluence with the Columbia River. The area is part of the Northern Cascades physiographic province, characterized by deeply dissected mountains with glacially created features, crossed by east- and west-flowing streams (Franklin and Dyrness, 1973:17-20). Bare rock outcrops are common.

The upper portion of the Icicle project area is characterized by high relief and relatively sparse vegetation. Soils are typically thin and formed in glacially derived sediments, colluvium, and volcanic ash (NRCS, 2016). The lower portion of the project area, extending to the Wenatchee River Corridor, is characterized by landforms and vegetation more common in the valley bottoms. Soils can be much deeper and formed in alluvium and loess as well as glacial till (NRCS, 2016).

Prior to historic-era and modern changes, the alpine terrain in the upper Icicle project area would have been a source of toolstone for local communities and certain faunal species such as bighorn sheep. The valley-bottom terrain in the lower elevations would have hosted a wider variety of large mammals, as well as anadromous and resident fish, birds, and various species of edible and usable plants.

## 3.21.2 Cultural Context

The Icicle project area is located within the Columbia Plateau. General cultural histories have been developed for the plateau as a whole (Chatters and Pokotylo, 1998), as well as various sub-regions and drainages. Most are focused on river valleys where larger sites are more plentiful (e.g., Grabert, 1968). Because the prehistory of the mountain regions of Washington is poorly understood compared to the coasts and riverine lowlands, this section is primarily based on the better-understood riverine valley cultures; however, these communities also likely used the surrounding mountains as part of their seasonal movements.

At the end of the Pleistocene, hunters of large mammals fanned out across North America. This culture is known in the Columbia Plateau as Paleoindian (Ames and Maschner, 1999:64 66), and dates to the Early Period, about 12,000 to 8,000 years ago. The earliest Paleoindian sites recorded in the Columbia Plateau are attributed to the Clovis culture, a regional expression of Paleoindian. Clovis sites are rare across the region, and in mountain environments "game density would have been too low, and exploitation costs too high relative to the lowlands to have attracted significant use" (Burtchard, 2007: 17). However, there are a few sites near the Icicle project area, including the Ritchey-Roberts Clovis cache in nearby East Wenatchee, dating to 12,250 before present (BP) (Mehringer and Foit, 1990). An undated Clovis projectile point has also been found near Cle Elum, near Snoqualmie Pass (Burtchard, 2007).

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

After the brief but widespread Clovis occupation, a "broad-spectrum" hunter-gatherer culture developed in the Columbia Plateau region and persisted until the middle Holocene, around 5,300 years ago. A number of dated sites in the Cascade Range are attributed to this period, primarily lithic quarries and scatters (Mierendorf, 1986).

A shift toward more permanent settlement began around 6,000 years ago. Known as the Late Middle Period in the Columbia Plateau, this period lasted until the beginning of the early Holocene around 3,000 years ago (Chatters and Pokotylo, 1998; Ames et al., 1998). In Cascade Mountain environments, there is an increase in dated sites consistent with the expectation of more intensive resource use (Burtchard, 2007).

Late Holocene cultures in the Columbia Plateau region exhibit a "shift in adaptations...to storage-dependent collector strategies" (Chatters and Pokotylo, 1998:76), which are characterized by intensive salmon fishing and associated storage features, social inequality, large permanent winter villages, and diverse tool assemblages. The Cascade Range continued to be used during this time, despite some expectation that long-range travel might decrease as villages became more important (Schalk, 1984). Some sites contain multiple non-local toolstone types, indicating that they may have functioned as larger camps (Mierendorf, 2004). The late Holocene archaeological cultures correlate with historic ethnographic descriptions.

The Icicle project area is in the traditional territory of the Wenatchee (Wenatchi) Tribe, a Middle Columbia Salishan group speaking Columbian, an Interior Salishan language. The cultural pattern in the Columbia River Basin at the time of historic contact was based on a seasonal round that took advantage of fish runs, abundant game, and root resources, as well as trade, kinship ties, and intermarriage among groups (Walker, 1998). Prior to historic resettlement, permanent winter villages anchored the seasonal round. Villages often contained a large communal structure or "longhouse," as well as smaller auxiliary structures (Miller, 1998). Before the adoption of the horse, these structures were semi-subterranean, but after about anno domini (AD) 1720, even winter village structures were aboveground mat houses. Villages were the basic political unit (Miller, 1998).

The communities of the southern Columbia Plateau began to see the effects of Euro-American contact decades before the first explorers and traders arrived in the area. These effects, beginning around AD 1600, included introduced diseases, trade goods, and the introduction of the horse (Walker and Sprague, 1998).

The Wenatchee Tribe signed the Yakima Treaty in 1855 at Walla Walla, which was followed by several years of warfare (Wilma, 2006; Yakama Nation, 2016). Many descendants are now part of the YN while others belong to the CTCR (Wilma, 2006). Additional information about tribal resources is provided in Sections 3.22, Indian Sacred Sites, and 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Tribal Fish Harvest.

Prospectors, traders, and missionaries began to arrive in the Wenatchee River area in the 1860s and 1870s, followed by homesteaders. The railroad arrived in 1892, and the City of Wenatchee incorporated the same year (Wilma, 2006). With construction of the railroad and the growth of irrigation, the Wenatchee River area became primarily agricultural, known as the "Apple Capital of the World" (Wilma, 2006).

The Wenatchee National Forest was created by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1907, headquartered in the City of Leavenworth. Shortly thereafter, forester Albert "Hal" Sylvester began surveying the new forest and assigning place names (Bentley, 2010). Sylvester named Icicle Creek and Icicle Ridge after the Columbian language name *na-sik-elt*, which means "narrow canyon" (Bentley, 2010). A guard station was constructed at Chatter Creek in 1916, and a bridge in 1922 (Beidl, 2010).

Water quickly became the single most important factor restricting the success of the agricultural industry. The earliest cooperative irrigation projects in the Peshastin area began in the 1800s, and IID and PID were formed in the early 1900s (Grubb, 2016). The Reclamation Act of 1902 allowed the federal government to manage water use. Early projects were primarily agricultural, but in the 1930s, large hydroelectric dams were constructed, including those on the Columbia River (Reclamation, 2010). The LNFH was built in 1939 as partial mitigation for impacts to fish resulting from the construction and operation of the Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River.

Water storage and release systems were constructed for irrigation, including facilities at Colchuck, Klonaqua, Square, and Eightmile Lakes. The facilities at Colchuck Lake were constructed in the early 1920s and Klonaqua Lake in the early 1930s—though the dam at Colchuck Lake appears to have been replaced in the 1950s (Jantzer, 2016). The water release systems at Square Lake and Eightmile Lake were built later, in the 1930s and 1940s (Jantzer, 2016). IID and PID constructed the facilities jointly and have historically shared the operation and maintenance of the systems. The systems generally consist of a low rock-masonry dam and a combination of pipes or tunnels with gates that control the release of stored water from the upper portions of each lake. The water released augments flow in Icicle Creek for maintenance of withdrawals by IPID. The dams have been altered and maintained throughout the decades, with various components of the infrastructure upgraded and replaced (Jantzer, 2016).

Water is also managed at Upper Snow, Lower Snow, and Nada Lakes by the USFWS. A tunnel runs from the northeast corner of Upper Snow Lake to a gatehouse containing control valves that release water to Nada Lake. There is also a small rock-masonry dam at Upper Snow Lake where it connects to Lower Snow Lake, another at Lower Snow Lake at its outlet to Snow Creek, and a reinforced concrete structure at the outlet of Nada Lake. These were originally constructed in the 1930s and early 1940s by the USBR for the USFWS to maintain the supply of cold surface water to LNFH (USFWS, 2014). The tunnel and valve unit were designed and built by USBR Engineer Louis Ackerman (USFWS, 2014).

The ALWA was designated in 1976. The Okanogan National Forest and the Wenatchee National Forest were administratively joined in 2000 and became the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest (USFS, 2016).

## **3.21.3 Previously Recorded Resources**

Within the Icicle project area, there are 19 documented archaeological sites and 4 historic structures according to DAHP's Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Data (WISAARD) lists. Four of these resources have been determined to be

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)<sup>39</sup>. These are the LNFH, the Chatter Creek Guard Station, and culturally modified trees (cedars that have been peeled to harvest the bark) locations (sites FS1624 and FFS1573). The peeled cedars and the Chatter Creek Guard Station are not in the vicinity of any of the proposed projects that compose the Program Alternatives and are not discussed further.

Potential changes at the LNFH are included in all the Program Alternatives. The property is NRHP-listed under Criterion A because of its association with the history of fish conservation and restoration, and under Criterion C because it embodies the distinctive characteristics of hatchery conception and design between 1939 and 1941 (Speulda, 1997).

WISAARD indicates that 17 cultural resources surveys have been completed within the upper portions of the Icicle project area, including the Alpine Lakes and Icicle Creek. Of those, most are outside the area that would likely be affected by any of the Program Alternatives. Five of the surveys were conducted at the LNFH, and none revealed any significant historic, archaeological, or cultural resources other than the LNFH complex itself.

In lower portions of the Icicle project area, including the Wenatchee River Corridor, 75 cultural resources surveys have been conducted, resulting in the identification of 21 archaeological sites (5 precontact sites, 10 historic sites, 4 precontact isolates, and 2 sites with both precontact and historic components). There are also four recorded cemeteries and one burial. None of these resources are in the vicinity of any of the Program Alternatives.

## 3.21.4 Archaeological Survey

To provide additional information about the potential to encounter cultural resources within the Icicle project area, an archaeological survey at four of the Alpine Lakes was completed in July 2016 (Bundy, 2017). This survey included a pedestrian survey and recordation of irrigation structures.

The survey revealed no cultural resources along the existing Eightmile Trail. At four lakes—Colchuck, Square, Klonaqua, and Eightmile—historical water release systems were recorded. The four water release systems were evaluated for their NRHP eligibility, individually and as a historic district. The systems share similar structure and serve the same function of providing water to the City of Leavenworth and surrounding agricultural areas. The water release systems are recommended NRHP-eligible both individually and as a historic district. The structures are recommended eligible under the following:

- Criterion A for their association with historically significant and controversial water management in Chelan County
- Criterion B for the unique style influenced by the extremely difficult terrain and constraints of mid-century construction methods

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> To be eligible for listing in the NRHP, a property must retain its integrity and meet one or more of four criteria for significance: association with broad patterns of history, direct association with a historically important person(s), masterful design or engineering, or the potential to yield important data.

• Criterion D for the potential to yield data about early twentieth century engineering and construction

Although the systems have been upgraded and modified through the decades, this sort of maintenance is common for industrial and agricultural historic properties. The water release systems retain integrity of location and setting because they are in their original locations and the surrounding landscape has changed little. They retain integrity of design, workmanship, and materials, with the local stone, concrete, and timber components consistent—even between structures built 30 years apart. They retain integrity of feeling and association, which is expressed in the contrast between the rustic construction (native stone, hand-cranked machinery) and the wilderness setting.

In addition to the four water release systems, a construction work camp was observed at Klonaqua Lake. This site is also potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP both individually and as contributing to the historic district under Criterion D. The site has a surface artifact scatter and remnant structure, and potentially buried artifacts and features. It has the potential to yield data important to the study of working conditions and methods in an alpine environment in the early twentieth century.

The dams at Upper and Lower Snow Lakes have not been surveyed and no recommendation for eligibility in the NRHP has been made. Photos show simple rock-masonry structures, similar to those constructed at the IPID water release systems.

## 3.22 Indian Sacred Sites

Sacred sites may include ceremonial areas and natural landmarks that are religious or symbolic representations. Indian Trust Assets, including Usual and Accustomed Areas, are addressed in Section 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest.

Sacred sites are considered cultural resources and require consideration under the State Environmental Policy Act. Sacred sites can also be recorded as Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, which applies to projects involving federal actions (Parker and King, 1998).

The Icicle project area is in the traditional territory of the Wenatchee (Wenatchi) Tribe. The Wenatchee Tribe signed the Yakima Treaty in 1855 at Walla Walla (Wilma, 2006; Yakama Nation, 2016). Many descendants are now part of the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, while others belong to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation or other tribes (Wilma, 2006).

No sacred sites or TCPs have been recorded in the Icicle project area in Washington State DAHP's database; however, Indian tribes may have written or oral records of sacred sites that are not recorded in the DAHP database.

The Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation are members of the Icicle Work Group. Coordination with tribes and tribal organizations will continue throughout the program.

# 3.23 Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest

This section describes Indian Trust Assets (ITAs), including Usual and Accustomed (U&A) Areas with the potential to be affected by the Program Alternatives. ITAs are legal interests in property held in trust by the United States for federally recognized Indian tribes or individual Indians. ITAs may include land, minerals, federally reserved hunting and fishing rights, federally reserved water rights, and instream flows associated with trust land. U&A Areas are areas where tribes have historically hunted, gathered, and fished.

Information about the specific tribes and other tribal resources within the Icicle project area is presented in Section 3.22, Indian Sacred Sites. Information about fisheries in general is presented in Section 3.7, Fish.

## **3.23.1 Legal Framework for Protection**

Beneficiaries of the Indian trust relationship are federally recognized Indian tribes with trust land, and the United States acting as trustee. By definition, ITAs cannot be sold, leased, or otherwise encumbered without approval of the U.S. government.

The federal government has a trust relationship with Indian tribes, and federal agencies are required to engage and consult federally recognized tribal governments on a government-to-government level when their actions affect ITAs. This relationship is governed by treaties, statutes, federal judicial decisions, and the historical evolution of the trust doctrine.

The U.S. Department of Interior (DOI) Departmental Manual Part 512.2 delegates the responsibility for ensuring protection of ITAs to the heads of bureaus and offices (DOI, 1995). The DOI is required to "protect and preserve ITAs from loss, damage, unlawful alienation, waste, and depletion" (DOI, 2000). Depending on federal involvement for individual projects, there could be a requirement to formally consult with potentially affected federally recognized tribes. Additionally, state-funded capital construction projects or land acquisition projects for the purpose of capital construction require Governor's Executive Order 05-05 review. This order requires all state agencies to integrate Washington State DAHP, the Governor's Office of Indian Affairs, and concerned tribes into the capital improvement project planning process to protect the public interest in historic and cultural sites.

In 1854 to 1855, representatives of the U.S. government negotiated separate treaties with the tribes and bands of the Columbia River Basin, which included the YN. The treaty between the YN and the U.S. government protects the YN's rights to continue traditional fishing practices and reserves to the tribes the right to take "fish at all usual and accustomed places in common with citizens of the United States" within their respective reservations, at

all U&A fishing sites on lands ceded to the U.S. government, and at all U&A fishing sites outside the reservation or ceded areas (YN and U.S. Government, 1855).

Although the CTCR did not sign a treaty during the 1855 council between tribes and the U.S. government, non-treaty agreements made with U.S. government representatives protect similar fishing rights of CTCR tribal members (CTCR, 2016).

## 3.23.2 Usual and Accustomed Areas

U&A Areas include areas where tribes have historically hunted, gathered, and fished. Within the Wenatchee River Watershed, there are U&A fishing areas for the YN and CTCR. The YN also has U&A fishing places in many locations along the Columbia River and outside of the Columbia River Basin in accordance with treaty fishing rights (YN, 2009). Both the YN and CTCR maintain fishing rights in Icicle Creek, targeting non-listed spring-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), returning to the LNFH in the area adjacent to LNFH downstream to the confluence with the Wenatchee River (YN, 2009; CTCR, 2011), including the plunge pool immediately downstream of the LNFH Hatchery Channel spillway.

In the mainstem Wenatchee River, the YN maintains fishing rights within a mile of Dryden Dam (not within 25 feet of any fishway), in mid-summer targeting summer-run Chinook salmon and summer-run steelhead (*O. mykiss*) (YN, 2009). The CTCR maintains a summer Chinook salmon fishery in Tumwater Canyon and mainstem Wenatchee River (CTCR, 2011). Since the reintroduction of coho salmon (*O. kisutch*) to the upper Wenatchee River and Icicle Creek drainages, tribal subsistence fisheries for coho salmon have been opened when runs are large and surplus fish are available (CRITFC, 2011). Upriver sockeye salmon (*O. nerka*) and upriver summer-run Chinook salmon (including the Wenatchee stocks) are harvested by treaty tribes (including the YN) in the mainstem Columbia River, prior to ascending their natal rivers.

It is the policy of the YN and CTCR fishery codes to sustainably manage fishery resources and enhance fish and habitat off the Yakama and Colville Reservations to support tribal harvest for subsistence, recreational, and economic needs of tribal members (YN, 2009; CTCR, 2011). The harvest of trout, salmon, and steelhead is allowed only by fishery regulation passed by tribal fish and wildlife committees. Harvest rates and fishery openings are determined annually by tribal and state fishery co-managers based on preseason run-size estimates and in-season observations of numbers of fish entering the Lower Columbia River. From 1999 to 2003, the YN harvest in Icicle Creek averaged 2,905 spring-run Chinook salmon per year and an average of over 3,000 surplus adults returning to LNFH were provided directly to Columbia River tribes (YN, CTCR, Spokane Tribe, and Kalispell Tribes) and food banks. In 2015, CTCR anglers caught 113 hatchery-origin spring-run Chinook salmon from mid-May to early June (Rayton, 2016).

The harvest of whitefish, sucker, pikeminnow, and other native resident fish and nonnative species are open year-round to tribal members unless restricted by specific regulation (YN, 2009). Pacific lamprey (*Entosphenus tridentatus*) is a culturally and commercially important species for the tribes and is a tribal trust species. Pacific lamprey are a traditional delicacy harvested by many Northwest Indians for use as food,
ceremonial, and medicinal purposes. Efforts are underway to restore harvestable lamprey populations in the Wenatchee River Watershed (YN, 2016).

# 3.24 Socioeconomics

This section provides information on the social and economic conditions within the Icicle project area to provide context for comparing the costs and benefits of the Program Alternatives to each other and to the No-action Alternative. This section provides an overview of the regional economy, including the labor force, employment by industry, and wages and income. This section also includes a discussion of OCR investment considerations relevant to evaluating the costs and benefits associated with large-scale fish recovery efforts. Information for this section was gathered from the U.S. Census Bureau; the Chelan County Auditor's Office; Chelan and Douglas Counties Profile, prepared by the Washington Employment Security Department (ESD; 2015); and from the Washington State Department of Ecology's Office of Columbia River.

## 3.24.1 Regional Economic Setting

The Icicle project area is located within the Wenatchee Metropolitan Statistical Area (WMSA), which is composed of Chelan and Douglas Counties. The WMSA relies on agriculture as the main source of employment. In Chelan County, agriculture is the largest industry, making up 24.1 percent of total employment, followed by private health care services (13.5 percent). In addition, other substantial sources of employment include government, retail, and leisure and hospitality. Tourism plays a large part in the local economy in Chelan County due in part to attractions like Lake Chelan and the City of Leavenworth (ESD, 2015).

As the largest source of employment, agriculture is the primary economic driver for the region. In particular, tree fruit, including apples, cherries, pears, and peaches, provides a significant contribution to the local economy. Grape production and wineries also contribute to both agriculture and tourism. Agricultural employment also directly links to nonfarm employment through support services such as food processing, packaging, and distribution (ESD, 2015).

Flows from Icicle Creek support agricultural uses in the Icicle project area as well as a range of other demands, including providing water for domestic uses and habitat for fish. Taken together, these demands are often greater than the water supply needed to meet them, resulting in the need to collaboratively and collectively identify solutions to balance water resource needs with the County's needs for economic growth and security.

# 3.24.2 Population, Housing Stock, and Property Values

The total population in Chelan County in 2015 was 75,644. This represents a 10 percent increase over the 2005 population of 68,747. In comparison, the Washington State

population increased by 14 percent over the same period, from 6,257,305 to 7,170,351 (Census, 2017a, 2017b).

The increase in housing stock was similar to the increase in population in Chelan County. In 2005, there were 32,738 housing units. In 2015, there were 36,452 housing units, an increase of 11 percent. Housing stock in Washington State also increased by 11 percent over that period of time, from 2,691,015 to 2,991,484 (Census, 2017a, 2017b).

Property values in Chelan County have increased significantly over the past 10 years. In 2016, the total taxable assessed value was \$9.7 billion. This represents a 60 percent increase over the 2006 total taxable assessed value of \$6.1 billion. However, property tax revenue only increased by 37 percent between 2006 and 2016, from \$75 million to \$103 million, respectively (Walter, 2016).

Table 3-34 provides a summary of changes in population, housing stock and property values in Chelan County.

	2005	2015	% Change
Population	68,747	75,644	10%
Housing Units	32,738	36,452	11%
	2006	2016	% Change
Total Taxable Assessed Value	6,066,908,249	9,709,253,746	60%
Total Property Tax Revenue	75,220,200	103,275,501	37%

 Table 3-34

 Chelan County Population, Housing Stock, and Property Value Changes

## 3.24.3 Labor Force

The recent recession had a delayed effect on the WMSA labor market with the worst impacts occurring primarily in 2009 and 2010. Nonfarm employment in the two-county WMSA peaked at an average of 40,200 jobs in 2008, then declined until bottoming out in 2010 with 38,100 jobs (ESD, 2015).

In 2014, the WMSA's nonfarm economy averaged 40,600 jobs, which was a 3.2 percent growth rate from the previous year and back to pre-recession conditions. The statewide job growth rate was 2.7 percent for the same period. Over 75 percent of the jobs added in 2014 were in construction, health services, and leisure and hospitality (ESD, 2015).

## **3.24.4 Employment by Industry**

More than 66 percent of all jobs in 2014 in Chelan County fall into five industries: agriculture, health services, local government, retail trade, and accommodations and food services. Table 3-35 shows jobs by industry and the percent of employment it represents.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Sector	Number of Jobs	Share of Employment
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	9,962	24.1%
Health services	5,602	13.5%
Local government	4,766	11.5%
Retail trade	4,379	10.6%
Accommodations and food services	4,097	9.9%
All other industries	12,539	30.3%
Total covered employment	41,345	100%*

 Table 3-35

 2014 Chelan County Employment

Source: Washington Employment Security Department, 2015

\* Values do not equal 100% due to rounding.

## 3.24.5 Wages and Income

In 2014, Chelan County's workers received \$1.48 billion in wages. Although agriculture was the largest job provider in Chelan County in 2014, agricultural wages represent a proportionally lower percentage of the County's total wage income. Table 3-36 presents the payroll and the percentage of total wages for each industry within Chelan County.

Industry Payroll Share of Payrolls Health services \$304,232,620 20.5% Local government \$234,376,378 15.8% Agriculture, forestry and fishing \$228,904,393 15.4% Retail trade \$115,390,841 7.8% Wholesale trade \$103,679,515 7.0% All other industries \$498.177.888 33.6% Total covered payrolls \$1,484,761,635 100%

Table 3-362014 Chelan County Wages

Source: Washington Employment Security Department, 2015

#### \* Values do not equal 100% due to rounding.

## **3.24.6 Costs and Benefits**

In 2006, Washington State passed legislation establishing the Columbia River Management Program, which tasked Ecology to seek out new water supplies within the state of Washington for instream and out-of-stream uses, leading to the development of the OCR. Since that time, OCR has improved water supply in eastern Washington through the development of additional water sources, totaling 410,000 acre-feet with an additional 337,878 acre-feet to be developed in the near term (Ecology 2016). OCR has funded numerous projects to meet its directive. The costs to develop water supplies, which have to do with making the water physically and legally available for instream flows or out-of-stream allocations, ranges considerably depending on project specifics, but the average is \$500/acre-foot. These costs typically include project conceptualization, appraisal, feasibility study, pre-design, design, environmental review, stakeholder outreach, construction, and permitting to authorize the source of water.

Implementation of the Icicle Strategy would require similar costs to develop the additional water supply. This would mainly result in short-term costs in exchange for longer-term benefits.

The costs and benefits specific to each Program Alternative are discussed in Section 4.24, Socioeconomics. Relevant to this discussion, implementation of the Icicle Strategy is anticipated to affect the following components of socioeconomic conditions within the Icicle project area:

- Land value and annual property tax revenue
- Jobs and labor income
- Increased instream values

### 3.24.6.1 Land Value and Annual Property Tax Revenue

In Washington State, all real and personal property is subject to taxation, unless specifically exempted by law. There are many taxing districts in Chelan County, including fire districts, the regional library, cities, county government, roads, hospitals, ports, and many others. The amount of money that taxing districts raise is determined by the local government and its budget-making authority. As land value changes, so can the revenue generated for each taxing district.

### 3.24.6.2 Jobs and Labor Income

Investment in public projects creates jobs; however, the actual increase in jobs at the regional level depends on the funding source. If the construction funding is entirely local and from existing sources, the effect can be small because funds may be diverted from other efforts. If the funding is from external sources, the effect can be greater. However, with large-scale construction projects in rural areas, much of the labor and materials can come from outside the local and regional economies, muting the potential benefit. Nonetheless, increases in construction at the local level contributes to greater economic activity as workers spend more of their labor income in the local economy.

### 3.24.6.3 Increased Instream Values

Although the concept is difficult to quantify or monetize, a clear connection between healthy aquatic ecosystems and the economic livelihood of local communities is identified by the National Research Council in the book *Valuing Ecosystem Services: Toward Better Environmental Decision-Making* (NRC, 2005). As described by EPA in their report *Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services: A Report of the EPA Science Advisory Board*, the value associated with increased instream flows is a function of how ecological goods and services contribute to human well-being (EPA, 2009). However, there

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

is "non-use value" that must also be considered. The idea of "non-use value" has to do with the preference for a public good or service that is not derived directly from its use, as explored by Mansfield in her report *Klamath River Basin Restoration Nonuse Value Survey* (RTI, 2012). That is, some people will value recovery of a fish run not because they want to consume the fish, but rather because they value the existence of the fish run.

# 3.25 Environmental Justice

Environmental Justice is the fair treatment of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income. Fair treatment means that disadvantaged populations do not bear disproportionate adverse impacts from a particular action compared to the rest of the population. For the purposes of this analysis, this section looks at minority and low-income data for the Icicle project area using data provided by the U.S. Census Bureau and the Washington Office of Financial Management (OFM). Information about tribal resources within the Icicle project area, including the potential for Indian Sacred Sites and Indian Trust Assets and Fish Harvest, are described in Sections 3.22, Indian Sacred Sites, and 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest, respectively.

## **3.25.1 Minority Populations**

Table 3-37 provides statistics on the minority population composition for the State of Washington, Chelan County, and within the Icicle project area defined as Census Tracts 9602, 9605, 9606, 9607, 9608.01, and 9608.02<sup>40</sup>. As shown, minority populations within the Icicle project area are generally proportionate to those in the county and state,<sup>41</sup> with the exception of a slightly higher percentage of Hispanic or Latino populations. However, these differences are not assumed to be substantial because of the wide margin of error posed by the data used for this study. Additionally, as discussed in greater detail in Section 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest, potentially affected minority populations include members of area Indian groups. While census data are available for recognized Indian reservations, specific data for tribal members are not. Tribal members may be affected regardless of whether or not they reside on their reservations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> Census tracts selected include those located within the Icicle Creek Basin and Wenatchee River Watershed where the proposed projects composing the Program Alternatives are focused. Census tracts that include the Alpine Lakes are not listed because project activities are proposed for areas where no residences are allowed. As noted, tribal resources with the potential to be affected are addressed in Section 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> For context, the U.S. EPA considers impacts on minority populations to be disproportionate if the minority population exceeds 50 percent of the study area population or if the minority population percentage of the study area is meaningfully greater than the minority population percentage in the general population or the reference area (Council on Environmental Quality, 1997).

	State of Washington	Chelan County	Icicle Project Area <sup>a</sup>
Total Population	7,061,410	75,030	31,304
One Race			
White	5,698,518	70,669	29,600
	(81%)	(94%)	(95%)
Black or African	278,360	409	127
American	(4%)	(<1%)	(<1%)
American Indian	130,780	1,337	469
and Alaska Native	(2%)	(2%)	(2%)
Asian	562,903	779	355
	(8%)	(1%)	(1%)
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	50,698 (<1%)	169 (<1%)	83 (<1%)
Two or more races	340,151	1,667	671
	(5%)	(2%)	(2%)
Hispanic or Latino <sup>a</sup>	879,410	21,501	6,375
	(13%)	(29%)	(20%)

Table 3-37 Race and Ethnicity

Source: OFM, 2015; percentages are rounded.

Notes: a) The lcicle project area includes Census Tracts 9602, 9605, 9606, 9607, 9608.01, and 9608.02. b) As defined by the OFM, Hispanic or Latino race included as subset of White category.

## **3.25.2 Low-income Populations**

Table 3-38 provides information about low-income populations for the same geographic areas. Similar to data presented for minority populations, low-income populations within the Icicle project area are proportionate to populations at the state- and county-level.

	State of Washington	Chelan County	Icicle Project Area <sup>a</sup>
Income			
Median household Income	\$60,294	\$50,876	\$58,158
Per capita income	\$37,640	\$25,619	\$29,613
Percent Below Poverty			
Individuals	13.5%	14.8%	14.9%
Percent unemployed	8.8%	9.2%	12.8%

Table 3-38Income, Poverty and Unemployment

Source: ACS, 2014

Notes: a) The lcicle project area includes Census Tracts 9602, 9605, 9606, 9607, 9608.01, and 9608.02.

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

# 4.1 Introduction

This chapter of the PEIS describes the short- and long-term impacts of the Program Alternatives. Short-term impacts are those that are limited in duration and are not permanent or ongoing, and are often related to construction. Long-term impacts are those that would occur as a result from project operation. This chapter also identifies mitigation measures that would help to address short-term and long-term impacts.

Because this is a programmatic EIS, the level of project descriptions varies. The impacts discussed are based on a conceptual understanding of many of the proposed project elements. Some projects may require a project-level EIS if additional significant adverse impacts are identified over the course of project development.

This chapter discusses probable environmental impacts associated with the Program Alternatives and the no-action Alternative for each of the resources described in Chapter 3. Each section provides a description of the impacts of each alternative, with a detailed project-by-project discussion of the potential impacts associated with the individual project elements. Projects that are common to more than one alternative are only described once, in the first alternative where they are included, and subsequent mentions are cross-referenced to this description.

Potential mitigation measures are described at the end of each environmental element section to address both short- and long-term impacts. Overall, cumulative and unavoidable adverse impacts are described near the end of this chapter, along with environmental commitments.

# 4.2 Earth

This section addresses potential short-term and long-term impacts of the Icicle Strategy's Program Alternatives to Earth elements including topography, geology, and soils.

## 4.2.1 No-action Alternative

### 4.2.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various construction and maintenance activities of individual entities would continue that could result in short-term impacts to Earth elements. This is anticipated to entail construction of water diversions modifications, general habitat enhancement projects, LNFH improvements, required fish screening upgrades, modernization of infrastructure at the Alpine Lakes including the restoration of

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

the Eightmile Lake Dam, and improvements to existing domestic and irrigation water use systems.

Ground-disturbing activities have the greatest potential to increase erosion and sedimentation, particularly when they occur near water courses. These impacts would be localized at construction sites on lower Icicle Creek and at the Alpine Lakes, resulting from construction of new water diversion and flow control structures, various types of fish passage improvements, and improvements to irrigation canal and pipe systems. The modification of existing structures would occur at the Alpine Lakes as gate infrastructure and outlet works are improved and the Eightmile Lake Dam is repaired to historic working conditions. Construction activities along the banks of streams and lakes and in adjacent uplands would likely result in the removal of vegetation, disturbance of soil, and the stockpiling of materials in areas near the work sites. Such activities could cause local, temporary increases in erosion potential.

The agencies or entities implementing projects under the No-action Alternative would be required to comply with applicable local, state, and federal environmental review requirements and permits as described in Section 1.9, Related Permits, Actions, and Laws, as is the case with all alternatives contemplated in this document. Applicable permits would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce impacts on water quality, such as implementing construction BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion (Section 4.5.7, Mitigation Measures). Therefore, the No-action Alternative would not be expected to result in significant short-term impacts.

### 4.2.1.2 Long-term Impacts

The long-term impacts to earth elements under the No-action alternative are expected to be less than the Program Alternatives because fewer projects would be implemented. However, construction of water diversions modification, general habitat enhancement projects, LNFH improvements, required fish screening upgrades, modernization of infrastructure at the Alpine Lakes including the restoration of the Eightmile Lake Dam, and improvements to existing domestic and irrigation water use systems are expected albeit for potentially different purposes than described in the Guiding Principles. The primary long-term impacts include erosion and sedimentation resulting from increased streamflow. However, the increase in streamflow would be on the order of 32 cfs, which is well within the range of naturally occurring variability, and would restore flow to more natural conditions in the late summer.

## 4.2.2 Alternative 1

The short-term and long-term impacts of Alternative 1 are primarily related to construction activities and increased streamflow in Icicle Creek and its tributaries, respectively. The primary construction-related impacts involve ground disturbance and erosion. The primary long-term impacts include erosion and sedimentation resulting from increased streamflow. However, the increase in streamflow is within the range of

naturally occurring variability and would restore flow to more natural conditions in the late summer. The increased stream flow would mostly occur during the low-flow period when erosion, sedimentation, and bedload transport are least likely to occur. The impacts to Earth elements are expected to be less than significant. The following section describes the potential impacts associated with individual project elements proposed as part of Alternative 1.

### 4.2.2.1 Short-term Impacts

### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Improvements to lake infrastructure would involve hand labor construction methods resulting in minor ground disturbance over small areas. Ground-disturbing activities would include excavations of footings and borrow/placement of fill for building small enclosures to house control equipment. Modifications to existing concrete head gate control towers at Klonaqua and Colchuck Lakes could require partial demolition of the structures and disposal of demolition materials onsite. While some ground disturbance would occur, the scale of the activities is minimal and is not likely to result in significant increases in erosion.

Ground-disturbing impacts can be mitigated by completing construction during periods when lake levels are drawn down to allow the majority of construction staging to occur on the lake bed as opposed to upland and shoreline areas. Use of on-site sources of fill material would reduce the number of haul trips to/from the site. Construction would occur in the dry season when the lakes are drawn down and BMPs would be used to minimize erosion.

### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

IPID Irrigation Efficiencies would include construction of conservation project, including canal to pipeline conversion and canal lining. The projects would use heavy equipment construction methods resulting in ground disturbance along affected canal alignments. Multiple access routes would be anticipated for ingress/egress of equipment and import material including pipe, aggregate and fill material, and concrete. One or more staging areas are likely. Grading along the alignment could increase the potential for erosion and sediment transport. Slope stability of the earth along the canal alignment could be impacted in areas where the canal traverses steep slopes or otherwise unstable ground because of new loading from material used to backfill along the pipeline. No impacts to Earth elements are anticipated for the on-farm efficiencies component of this alternative.

Ground-disturbing impacts from the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project can be mitigated by identifying pre-existing ingress/egress and haul routes, such as ditch access routes. Construction would, which means when irrigation facilities are not in use, and temporary erosion and sedimentation control BMPs would be used to minimize impacts and prevent transport of sediment to nearby streams and other surface water bodies. Slope stability considerations would be mitigated by adhering to geotechnical engineering practices. PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange would use heavy equipment construction methods resulting in ground disturbance associated with constructing a new pump station near the confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River and along the COIC canal and lateral alignment, where existing facilities would be replaced with pressurized pipelines. Impacts associated with these activities are the same as for the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project except that construction of a new pump station could require excavation below the water table and below the ordinary high water mark on Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River, requiring dewatering techniques such as coffer dams.

Ground-disturbing impacts of the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project can be mitigated by identifying pre-existing ingress/egress and haul routes, such as public right-of-way and ditch access routes. Construction would likely occur when irrigation facilities are not in use and temporary erosion and sediment control BMPs would be used to minimize erosion and prevent transport of sediment to nearby streams and other surface water bodies. BMPs would also be implemented where construction would take place below ordinary high water to protect adjacent surface water. Slope stability considerations would be mitigated by adhering to geotechnical engineering practices. Work below ordinary high water in streams would occur during low water periods and in accordance with applicable regulations.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Short-term impacts resulting from the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project would include the potential for increased erosion resulting from ground disturbance activities associated with repairing leaky infrastructure, including water mains, and replace meters.

These impacts would be mitigated by performing construction in the dry season and implementing BMPs to minimize erosion.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Restoration of the Eightmile Lake Storage would include removal of the existing concrete dam structure, excavation and removal of the low-level outlet pipeline, and placement of new materials for construction of a new low-level outlet pipeline and dam facilities. This work would require use of some heavy mechanized construction equipment. The site is a relatively remote location without road access within ALWA. The volume of earth material and large boulders that would need to be moved at the site would require use of an excavator. Depending on the construction means and methods used, a small tracked loader and some type of mechanical sorting equipment may also be needed to sort, move, and place earth and rocks.

Impacts to Earth elements would include ground disturbance at the dam site and staging areas. The largest construction challenge for the project would be determining how to mobilize an excavator and other heavy equipment to the site. A few options for this were evaluated as part of the *Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Feasibility Study* (Anchor

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

QEA 2017) prepared concurrently with this PEIS and included in Appendix C. Mobilization of heavy equipment to the site would likely either require transport by a large helicopter, which would limit the size of equipment that can be transported to a small excavator, or mobilization overland via ingress/egress route that more or less would parallel follow the Eightmile Lake Trail. Ground-disturbing activities at the dam site would include excavation of remaining existing concrete and earth fill dam structures, excavation to remove the low-level outlet pipeline, excavation of footings for a new dam, excavation of borrow material, placement of concrete and earth materials for a new dam, backfill for a new low-level outlet pipeline and associated control equipment, and staging for equipment and material. Erosion and stability of construction slopes, borrow locations, and stockpiles could also impact Earth elements by increasing sediment transport to water bodies and increasing slope instability.

Ground-disturbing impacts can be mitigated by completing construction during periods when lake levels are drawn down to allow construction staging to occur "in the dry". Rock and earth materials used for embankment construction and backfill would be sourced locally, to the extent possible, from areas that are already cleared or have been disturbed in the past. Re-use of on-site sources of fill material including any demolitionrelated concrete would reduce the need for excavation from borrow areas and the number of haul trips to/from the site. Excess excavated material and stockpiled soils would be used to reclaim on-site borrow areas. Construction would occur in late summer and fall, when snow is not on the ground, and BMPs would be used to minimize erosion and prevent transport of sediment to nearby surface water bodies at the dam site and along the excavator ingress/egress route. Adherence to geotechnical design standards and Ecology Dam Safety Office regulations would be required to minimize stability concerns to natural and constructed slopes.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The focus of this project is to ensure that there would be no adverse effect on tribal fishing as a result of implementing other projects as part of the overall Icicle Strategy. The specifics of this project are not yet determined but would involve elements of restoration along the Lower Icicle Creek that could result in localized ground disturbance activities. At this stage, the primary options under consideration include the construction of facilities, such as a plumbing to create a bubble curtain, a sprayer, or other minor modifications to the Hatchery Channel spillway at LNFH to promote favorable fishing conditions in the pool at the bottom of the spillway. Depending on the extent of the disturbance, there is the potential for some short-term increase in erosion. However, as noted in Section 4.2.6, Mitigation Measures, work within Icicle Creek would require compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, which would require BMPs to ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project would use heavy equipment and hand labor construction methods. Constructing engineered logjams and performing other stream restoration activities, such as anchoring large woody debris or stream channel modification, would require heavy equipment that would impact Earth elements through ground-disturbing construction activities. These activities would include excavating and placing anchors, modifying stream beds, establishing routes for ingress/egress and for hauling material, and constructing staging areas. Much of this work would be performed below ordinary high water in water bodies. Establishing riparian plantings could be performed by hand labor assisted by heavy equipment to haul material, grade topography, and remove undesirable vegetation. These activities could result in short-term erosion and sedimentation to water bodies.

Any adverse impacts would be likely minor because compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant long-term impacts, such as ensuring that stream channel morphology would not adversely affected (see Section 4.2.6, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

The Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project is administrative in nature and does not involve construction. No short-term impacts to Earth elements would occur.

### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements Project would use heavy equipment construction methods to implement on-site re-use, effluent pump-back, and well field enhancements. These actions could impact Earth elements through ground-disturbing construction activities occurring at the hatchery site near the raceways, at the well field, and on Hatchery Island. Staging areas and access for hauling and equipment ingress/egress would mostly occur along established access routes in paved or graveled areas. Excavations and placement of fill near the raceways would mostly occur in paved areas having controlled drainage to water bodies. Drilling new wells or modifying existing ones could require equipment access to areas that may not have established access routes, but these activities are otherwise not anticipated to result in major ground disturbance. Construction of a groundwater gallery on Hatchery Island would consist of excavations below the water table, requiring dewatering, pipeline construction, backfill, and grading.

Ground-disturbing impacts would be mitigated by maximizing use of pre-existing ingress/egress and haul routes and staging areas away from water bodies. Construction would occur in the dry season and BMPs would be used to minimize erosion and prevent transport of sediment to adjacent surface water bodies.

Because this facility is owned by the USBR and operated by USFWS, an additional evaluation of the potential short-term impacts under NEPA will be completed.

#### **Fish Passage**

The Fish Passage Project would use heavy equipment construction methods to modify instream structures to improve passage, including those at LNFH and the Boulder Field. Boulder Field modification impacts to Earth elements would include ground disturbance from construction and slope instability during construction. Ground-disturbing activities would include modifying the Boulder Field using heavy equipment. This work would occur below the ordinary high water of Icicle Creek and on the bank above the creek. The hill slope between Icicle Road and Icicle Creek would be regraded to increase stability following Boulder Field modification. A water line for the City of Leavenworth would be relocated. Excavations, regrading, stockpiles, placement of fill, access routes, and staging areas could contribute to ground disturbance that results in erosion and sedimentation in the adjacent creek. Stability of temporary slopes could be impacted during construction.

Any adverse impacts would be likely minor because compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant long-term impacts, such as ensuring that stream channel morphology would not adversely affected (see Section 4.2.6, Mitigation Measures).

### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project would use heavy equipment construction methods to replace existing screens at major diversions on Icicle Creek. Impacts to Earth elements include ground disturbance from construction activities occurring near the stream bank and below ordinary high water. Ground-disturbing activities would include excavation at existing structures and footings of new structures, pouring concrete, backfill, grading, access routes for ingress/egress, and staging areas.

Ground-disturbing impacts would be mitigated by identifying pre-existing ingress/egress and haul routes and through off-site staging away from stream banks and water bodies. Work below ordinary high water in streams would occur during low water periods and in accordance with applicable regulations. Construction would occur in the dry season and BMPs would be used to minimize erosion and prevent transport of sediment to adjacent surface waters, including where construction would take place below ordinary high water.

#### Water Markets

The Water Markets Project does not require construction. No short-term impacts to Earth elements would occur.

### 4.2.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Long-term impacts to Earth elements from changing outflow patterns from the Alpine Lakes could include increased erosion of stream beds and stream banks, and increased sedimentation Icicle Creek and its tributaries. However, because flow rates released from reservoirs would be far less than natural peak flows and increased late summer flows

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

would restore flows to a more natural condition, there is low risk of increased erosion sedimentation. Additionally, the increased stream flow would mostly occur during the low-flow period when erosion, sedimentation, and bedload transport are least likely to occur. The long-term impacts of this project are anticipated to be less than significant.

### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Long-term impacts to Earth elements from the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project could improve slope stability along canal alignments. Slope stability could decrease locally in areas having steep slopes along IPID canal alignments because of increased loading where open canal is replaced by backfill and pipeline. However, slope stability is anticipated to increase overall as a result of decreased seepage of water into the subsurface, which would result in decreased subsurface erosion. Potential impacts of increased slope load would be mitigated by adhering to geotechnical engineering practices.

### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

The long-term impacts of the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project would be similar to the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies with the exception of construction of a pump station near the confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. The new COIC pump station and intake facilities would have the potential to change instream flow dynamics that could contribute to increased potential for shoreline erosion.

Any adverse impacts would be likely minor because compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant long-term impacts, such as ensuring that stream channel morphology would not be adversely affected (see Section 4.2.6, Mitigation Measures).

### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Replacing leaking water mains and upgrading meters would have a positive impact on Earth elements. Addressing and preventing leaks can decrease underground erosion that can undermine soils as a result of catastrophic pipe failure. In addition to decreasing erosion, fixing leaking pipes can increase slope stability by decreasing soil water content in areas having unstable slopes.

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would restore water levels in Eightmile Lake to the historic maximum water surface elevation. The water surface has decreased over time due to erosion of the earthen embankment portion of the dam. Long-term impacts of restoring the maximum water surface elevation would be minimal because the shoreline consists mostly of exposed, shallow bedrock, and impacts would be similar to those experiences under past conditions.

Adhering to geotechnical design standards and Ecology Dam Safety Office regulations would mitigate stability concerns to natural and constructed slopes. Shoreline erosion could be mitigated by limiting periods when the water levels are at their peak. Lake bed erosion and instability can be mitigated by managing water level draw down rates.

### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The purpose of this project is to protect and enhance the tribal fishery, which, depending on the specific actions, could result in long-term changes to stream channel that could increase the potential for erosion and sedimentation. Projects within Icicle Creek and near its shoreline would require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant long-term impacts affecting shorelines (see Section 4.2.6, Mitigation Measures). These requirements would be developed once project-specific details were available.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

Implementing actions associated with Habitat Protection and Enhancement could have long-term impacts on Earth elements. Construction of engineered logjams and stream bed modifications, and planting riparian vegetation could improve local stream morphology, reduce erosion, and protect stream banks.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

No long-term impacts to Earth elements are anticipated from this project.

### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

The potential long-term adverse impacts on Earth elements could occur in areas where new facilities were constructed near Icicle Creek that could change stream morphology or bank erosion. Potential adverse impacts would likely be minor because work within the shoreline would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations, including NEPA, which would address the need for mitigation to reduce potential long-term impacts (see Section 4.2.6, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Fish Passage**

The Fish Passage Project could have long-term impacts to Earth elements. Modifications to Lower Icicle Creek to improve passage could change local stream morphology, increase stream erosion and sedimentation. However, work within the Icicle Creek would require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant long-term impacts affecting erosion and sedimentation in Icicle Creek (see Section 4.18.6, Mitigation Measures).

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project could have long-term impacts to Earth elements. Modifying diversion structures to allow for fish screen improvements could change local stream morphology leading to increased erosion. Work within Icicle Creek would require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant long-term impacts affecting erosion. These requirements would be developed once project-specific designs and details were available.

#### Water Markets

The Water Markets Project would provide instream flow benefit in reaches of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River, from retired water rights to the out-of-stream mitigation locations. In non-drought years, this project would provide instream flow benefit throughout Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. This increased streamflow could result in increased erosion of stream channels and banks in higher gradient reaches and increased sedimentation in lower gradient reaches. However, this would not be significant because streamflow increases would be far below peaks and would restore flow to more natural conditions.

## 4.2.3 Alternative 2

Most of the projects in Alternative 2 are common to Alternative 1, with the exception of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project, which is not included in Alternative 2, and the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project, which is included in Alternative 2. Because of these commonalities, the overall short-term and long-term impacts to Earth elements are similar. This section provides details on the impact of the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project to Earth elements. Impacts of the other projects are available in Section 4.2.2, Alternative 1.

### 4.2.3.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would use heavy equipment construction methods resulting in ground disturbance associated with constructing a new pump station on the right bank of the Wenatchee River near Dryden and new pipeline alignment connecting to the PID and IID canals. Access routes would be anticipated for ingress/egress of equipment and import material, including pipe, aggregate and fill material, and concrete. One or more staging areas are likely. Grading along the alignment could increase the potential for sediment delivery to the nearby river system. Some work below ordinary high water in the Wenatchee River is anticipated.

Work within and near the Wenatchee River would require compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, which would require BMPs to ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

### 4.2.3.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

The project would result in new pump station and intake facilities constructed along the right bank of the Wenatchee River. Depending on the specific location, long-term impacts could potentially affect Earth elements by increasing the potential for stream bank erosion and flooding over the long term.

Any adverse impacts would be likely minor because compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant long-term impacts, such as ensuring that stream channel morphology and floodplain storage capacity are not adversely affected (see Section 4.2.6, Mitigation Measures) and that no increase in flood elevations result from the proposed project.

## 4.2.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 has many of the same projects and thus many of the same impacts of Alternative 2. Under this alternative, the Eightmile Lakes Storage Restoration Project would be replaced with Legislative Changes Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3, which is not anticipated to have any short- or long-term impacts to Earth elements.

### 4.2.4.1 Short-term Impacts

Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

No short-term impacts to Earth elements are anticipated from this project.

### 4.2.4.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

No long-term impacts to Earth elements are anticipated from this action.

## 4.2.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 has many of the same projects as Alternative 1, with the addition of three storage enhancement projects, and the removal of the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project. Construction-related impacts are expected for all three storage enhancement projects, with the primarily long-term impacts including erosion and sedimentation associated with increased instream flows. However, as discussed under Alternative 1, increased streamflow would be much lower than peak flow, and increasing late summer streamflow would result in more natural flow conditions. The impacts to Earth elements resulting from Alternative 4 are expected to be less than significant.

## 4.2.5.1 Short-term Impacts

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

Short-term impacts to Earth elements and mitigation measures for the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would be the similar to for the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project, as described in Section 4.2.2.1. However, the facilities would be larger and so the area of disturbance, the volumes of earthwork, and other construction impacts would be greater.

In addition, as noted in Section 4.2.6, Mitigation Measures, work within and around the lakes would require compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, which would require BMPs to ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

### Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

With Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project being at the conceptual stage, it is unclear if heavy equipment or hand labor construction methods would be used. However, given the magnitude of the project, it is likely that heavy construction equipment would be required.

The resulting ground disturbance associated with this project would include bedrock excavation of an outlet tunnel or clearing to install a siphon to allow for additional releases from Upper Klonaqua Lake to Lower Klonaqua Lake. Additional disturbance could be caused by clearing and excavation required for borrow/placement of fill for a head gate control structure, a small enclosure housing control equipment, and diesel pumps for drawing down lake levels for construction. Tunnel cuttings would be disposed on-site. If a pipeline is not constructed within the tunnel, erosion would occur during initial discharge operations along the bottom of the outlet tunnel and in the outlet channel transporting sediments to Lower Klonaqua Lake. Bedrock topography would be impacted by construction of a new tunnel and disposal of cuttings. Stability of bedrock could be impacted by tunnel excavation.

Ground-disturbing impacts can be mitigated by completing construction after Upper Klonaqua Lake levels are pumped down the majority of construction staging to occur on the lake bed as opposed to upland and shoreline areas. Use of on-site sources of fill material including any demolition-related concrete would minimize the need for establishing borrow areas and the number of haul trips to/from the site. Excess excavated material and stockpiled soils could be used to reclaim on-site borrow areas. Construction would occur in the dry season and BMPs would be used to minimize erosion. Adhering to geotechnical design standards and Ecology Dam Safety Office regulations would mitigate slope stability concerns.

In addition, as noted in Section 4.2.6, Mitigation Measures, work within and around the lakes would require compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, which would require BMPs to ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Short-term impacts and mitigation measures for Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would be similar to those for the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration project, except that there is no ancient landslide impounding the lake. Heavy construction equipment would likely be required for construction of these improvements, similar to what would be required for the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration project.

In addition, as noted in Section 4.2.6, Mitigation Measures, work within and around the lakes would require compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, which would require BMPs to ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

### 4.2.5.2 Long-term Impacts

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would result in water levels that are higher than historical levels, leading to long-term impacts on Earth elements. Increasing lake levels could increase bank erosion potential and decrease stability of upland slopes and the ancient landslide mass impounding the west end of the lake. However, this impact is expected to be less than significant because of the bedrock structure of the shoreline. Any potential decreased stability to the landslide mass at the west end of the lake would be mitigated through adhering to geotechnical design standards and Ecology Dam Safety Office regulations would mitigate stability concerns to natural and constructed slopes.

The project would also allow for the lake to be drawn down below existing lake levels to an elevation of 4,619 feet, which is approximately 24.4 feet lower than the existing low. This change would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed, mainly in the later summer month and early fall up to the point when the water would no longer be drawn down, generally around the end of September. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect Earth elements by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity

### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would result in lake levels that are drawn down below the historical range, which would have long-term impacts on Earth elements. Drawing the lake down further than currently practiced could cause increased lake bed erosion and decreased stability of lake bed slopes. However, these impacts would be unlikely and less than significant because of the bedrock structure of the shoreline and lake bed at Upper Klonaqua Lake.

Drawing the lake down further than currently practiced could cause turbidity in stream. However, because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months, it is expected that increased turbidity would be less than substantial. PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

The Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would result in water levels that are higher than historical levels, which would have long-term impacts on Earth elements. Increasing lake levels could increase bank erosion. However, this impact is considered less than significant given that the lake beds and shorelines are composed of bedrock. Drawing the lake down further than currently practiced could cause turbidity in stream. However, because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months, it is expected that increased turbidity would be less than substantial.

## 4.2.6 Alternative 5

Most of the projects in Alternative 5 are common to Alternative 1, with the exception of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies, which is replaced by the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project. Because of these commonalities, the overall short-term and long-term impacts to Earth elements are similar. This section provides details on the impact of the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project to Earth elements. Impacts of the other projects are available in Section 4.2.2, Alternative 1.

### 4.2.6.1 Short-term Impacts

### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

The IPID Full Piping Pump Exchange Project would use heavy equipment construction methods resulting in ground disturbance associated with constructing pump stations at three locations on the Wenatchee River and new pipeline alignment connecting to the PID and IID canals. Open canals would be replaced with pressurized pipeline. Access routes would be anticipated for ingress/egress of equipment and import material, including pipe, aggregate and fill material, and concrete. One or more staging areas are likely. Grading along the alignment could increase the potential for sediment delivery to the nearby river system. Some work below ordinary high water in the Wenatchee River is anticipated.

Work within and near the Wenatchee River would require compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, which would require BMPs to ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

### 4.2.6.2 Long-term Impacts

### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

The project would result in three new pump stations and intake facilities constructed along the Wenatchee River. Depending on the specific location, long-term impacts could potentially affect Earth elements by increasing the potential for stream bank erosion and flooding over the long term.

Any adverse impacts would be likely minor because compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant long-term impacts, such as ensuring that stream

channel morphology and floodplain storage capacity are not adversely affected (see Section 4.2.7, Mitigation Measures) and that no increase in flood elevations result from the proposed project.

# 4.2.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

### 4.2.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Short-term impacts to Earth elements related to increased erosion would be mitigated by complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal regulations and project-specific permits and approvals, including local building, grading, state stormwater construction permits, Shoreline Management Act shoreline permits, HPAs, and CWA Section 404 permits and their associated Section 401 Water Quality Certificates, among others. Common permit conditions are likely to include working in a manner to minimize soil disturbance, implementing BMPs to control erosion and prevent transport of sediment to surface water bodies, and, to the extent possible, completing work in the summer and fall when water levels are low and the potential for impact is reduced.

Short-term impacts related to slope stability would be minimized through adherence to geotechnical design standards and Ecology Dam Safety Office Regulations.

### 4.2.7.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts on Earth elements would be mitigated by complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal regulations and project-specific permits and approvals, as described above.

# 4.3 Surface Water

This section describes the potential short- and long-term impacts of the Program Alternatives on surface water quantity. The short-term impacts are related to construction impacts, with long-term impacts being impacts resulting from the operation of projects. The primary long-term impact to surface water associated with the Icicle Strategy is increased instream flows. These instream flow changes are summarized in Table 4-1. Greater detail on changes to surface water are noted in the subsections below. Impacts affecting water quality are presented in Section 4.5, Water Quality and impacts to water rights and use are presented in Section 4.6, Water Use.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Alternative	Instantaneous Change (cfs)	Annual Change (ac-ft)
No-action	32	18,094
Alternative 1	88	28,458
Alternative 2	83	24,478
Alternative 3	70	23,978
Alternative 4	131	34,585
Alternative 5	195	55,458

Table 4-1 Instream Flow Changes

Notes: Instantaneous water quantities are expressed in cfs and represent the amount of water moving downstream at a moment in time. Annual water quantity is expressed in ac-ft and represent the instantaneous quantity accrued over a year. Instantaneous increases would occur in the summer.

## 4.3.1 No-action Alternative

### 4.3.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various entities and agencies would undertake individual actions that could result in short-term impacts on water quality in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area. This is anticipated to entail construction of water diversion modifications, general habitat enhancement projects, LNFH improvements, required fish screening upgrades, modernization of infrastructure at the Alpine Lakes including the restoration of the Eightmile Lake Dam, and improvements to existing irrigation systems to support agricultural reliability.

In-water, streambank, and lakeshore work would likely include the modification of existing features, construction of new water diversion and flow control structures, various types of fish passage improvement work, and improvements to irrigation canal and pipe systems. The modification of existing structures would occur at the Alpine Lakes as gate infrastructure and outlet works are improved and the Eightmile Lake Dam is repaired to working conditions. Work would likely require the placement of temporary cofferdams in water bodies to isolate work areas and could also involve the temporary diversion of stream flow or construction dewatering.

These impacts would be temporary, and the duration and timing are currently unknown.

### 4.3.1.2 Long-term Impacts

The No-action Alternative would provide some instream flow benefit. Projects that are likely to move forward would provide up to an estimated 32 cfs of instream flow benefit in Reach 3 and 4. Up to 20 cfs of this increased streamflow will be available year-round, in Reach 3 and 4. Approximately 11 cfs of this instream flow benefit would be available during the irrigation season, when flows are often at their lowest, in Reach 3, 4 and 5.

While construction and upgrades at the IPID dam sites would likely occur, releases would occur on a rotational basis and under drought-year scenarios, which is consistent with the current operation schedule. Water releases would not be optimized for instream flows and fish benefit, meaning there would not be an additional 30 cfs of flow benefit to lower Icicle Creek in Reaches 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 during most years.

While the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project and IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project might be implemented under the No-action Alternative, the focus and project goals would be primarily for agricultural reliability, and instream flow benefit might not occur. This would be a lost opportunity to increase streamflow during the irrigation season by 10 and 25 cfs, respectively.

Although some type of reconstruction of the Eightmile Lake dam would likely occur under the No-action Alternative, it is unclear what the scale of the reconstruction would be, and it is unlikely that water would be made available to instream flow and new uses. This would be a lost opportunity to increase stream flow by 12.6 cfs in Reach 1.

## 4.3.2 Alternative 1

Alternative 1 is expected to increase instream flows in Icicle Creek by up to 88 cfs or 28,458 acre-feet, with smaller benefits in tributaries to Icicle Creek depending on project location. The duration of flow improvement would primarily be during the irrigation season, with emphasis in the late summer/early fall time period. Some projects may also include year-round benefit where adaptation to low wintertime instream flows is possible. Short-term impacts discussed are related to construction activities and would include the use of cofferdams and dewatering.

### 4.3.2.1 Short-term Impacts

### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Construction activities at the dam sites would include work on gates and outlet tunnels, and installation of solar panels, actuators, flow monitoring equipment, and other new equipment. Lakes would need to be drawn down for construction activities, which would provide flow benefit in Prospect, Leland, Klonaqua, French, Colchuck, Mountaineer, and Eightmile Creek, as well as Reaches 1 through 5 of Icicle Creek. These impacts are not considered new, as they are part of the current conditions and operations at the lakes, which are drawn down at least once every five years for maintenance activities.

Dewatering during construction would not likely be required.

### **IPID Irrigation Efficiency**

Under this project, the Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan would be updated, and irrigation efficiency upgrades would be implemented, as recommended in the plan. The update of the IPID Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan is currently under way. The recommended irrigation efficiency projects would likely involve piping and lining sections of canal and increasing on-farm application efficiency. Construction activities

### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

would occur within the area of current canals and outside the irrigation season when the canals are dry. There are no anticipated construction impacts to surface water.

### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

This project consists of replacing the existing COIC system with a pressurized delivery system, relocating the point of diversion to a location near the confluence of the Wenatchee River and Icicle Creek, and intake facilities at that location. In general, the majority of the impacts would be similar to the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies. Construction of the COIC pump station would involve instream work below the ordinary high water on the Wenatchee River or Icicle Creek. Impacts to surface water would likely include the use of coffer dams and temporary dewatering at the construction site.

### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

The Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project would improve domestic water use efficiency by the City of Leavenworth through pipe replacements, water meter installation, a voluntary lawn buyback program, and other water use conservation efforts. It would also improve domestic efficiency in rural Chelan County by providing conservation incentives and education. These construction activities are not anticipated to have impacts on surface water.

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration would require demolition and reconstruction of the dam, installing a new low-level outlet pipeline, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures. The lake would need to be drawn down for construction activities, which would provide flow benefit in Eightmile Creek, as well as Reaches 1 through 5 of Icicle Creek. This impact is not considered new, as it is part of the current conditions and operations at Eightmile Lake, which is drawn down at least once every five years for maintenance activities.

The use of cofferdams and dewatering could be required for some of the reconstruction work.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The focus of the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project is to ensure that there would be no adverse effect on tribal fishing as a result of implementing other projects as part of the overall Icicle Strategy. Specific projects may include installing a sprayer to provide cover for fish, or other minor modifications at the Hatchery Channel spillway. Short-term impacts would be determined during project-level review, once project location and details are known.

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project involves the restoration and enhancement of habitat in the Icicle Creek Subbasin through riparian plantings, engineered log jams, and conservation easements. Some construction may require temporary dewatering or rerouting water.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

There are no construction activities proposed under the Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project and, therefore, no potential short-term impacts on surface water.

### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

The LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements Project includes various elements geared toward improving water quality and hatchery rearing conditions at the LNFH. In general, construction of these elements has the potential to affect surface water, depending on the specific location and type of disturbance. Likely short-term impacts would include the use of cofferdam to temporarily reroute water, and dewatering activities for construction on the diversion intake. Because this facility is owned by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and operated by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, an evaluation of the potential short-term impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined.

#### **Fish Passage**

Removing fish passage barriers could require instream construction work and the use of cofferdams to temporarily reroute water, and dewatering activities.

### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The installation of fish screens would require instream construction work and could require the use of cofferdams and dewatering activities.

#### Water Markets

There are no construction activities proposed under the Water Markets Project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on surface water.

### 4.3.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Implementation of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would allow for remote control releases from the lakes, providing more frequent and more precise releases of water to Icicle Creek. One objective of this project is to release water from the lakes in response to streamflow conditions. This would increase flows in Reaches 1 through 5 during low flow conditions. Additionally, this project would provide additional cold water and increase streamflow to tributaries downstream of the dam sites: Prospect, Leland, Klonaqua, French, Colchuck, Mountaineer, and Eightmile Creeks. It is anticipated that this project would add 30 cfs and 5,465 acre-feet of water to Icicle Creek and its tributaries during the late summer, when stream flow are below targets. This increase in streamflow would be within the naturally occurring range of stream flows in Icicle Creek. The timing and quantities of these flows would be a beneficial change to the riverine system. In drought-years, IPID would exercise their current water rights for irrigation use as needed.

In the Alpine Lakes, the frequency of draw-down would increase from approximately 1in-5 years to nearly every year. During high water years, it is possible that not all storage from the lakes would be utilized to enhance streamflow. Despite the increased draw down frequency, the Automation Appraisal study found that the lakes are still expected to fully refill each spring (Aspect, 2015). These findings indicate that this project would not have a significant impact on the water quantity within the Alpine Lakes and their catchments.

### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Improving IPID's efficiency through system upgrades is expected to increase flow during the irrigation season, which typically occurs from April through October. This period includes low flow months in late summer and early fall, as identified on the Icicle Creek hydrograph (Figure 3-2). The estimated flow benefit resulting from this project is approximately 10 cfs and 3,000 acre-feet per year. Because IPID diverts water from Icicle Creek and exports it to the Wenatchee Valley, project benefits would occur in all the reaches of Icicle Creek downstream of IPID's point of diversion at RM 5.7 (Reaches 2 through 5).

Reach benefit would continue into the Wenatchee River, to the point where return flows typically enter the system. Because IPID's irrigated lands parallel the Wenatchee River over a long distance, return flows likely occur from near RM 28 to RM 5. Benefit would diminish between these two points and end near RM 5. Figure 2-25 provides an overview of lands served by IPID and the location of increased instream flows.

### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

The COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project is expected to increase flows in Icicle Creek from RM 4.5 to the location of the new point of diversion. This benefit would occur from approximately April through October, which includes the low flow period in late summer and early fall. The estimated benefit in Icicle Creek is 8.0 to 11.9 cfs and 2,100 to 3,500 acre-feet. The variation in this number is based on COIC's historical and future water use.

The primary source of instream flow benefit from this project is moving the COIC point of diversion from Icicle Creek to a location near the confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. The proposed pump station would be at one of the following locations:

- On the right bank of the Wenatchee River just upstream of the Leavenworth Road Bridge, approximately 0.8 miles upstream of its confluence with Icicle Creek
- On the right bank of the Wenatchee River on a bend in the river approximately 0.3 miles upstream of its confluence with Icicle Creek
- On the left bank of Icicle Creek on a bend in the creek approximately 0.75 miles upstream of its confluence with the Wenatchee River

Locating the pump station near Icicle Road would create an impact on Wenatchee River flows equal to the benefit to Icicle Creek flows between the new pump station and the confluence with Icicle Creek. This would be an 8.0 to 11.9 cfs reduction in flows for

approximately 0.8 miles of the Wenatchee River. The second location would result in a similar impact, but only on 0.3 miles of the Wenatchee River. The third location provide flow benefit on Icicle Creek from the historical point of diversion to the location of the new pumps station.

### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Under the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project, domestic conservation would increase, and water made available through this process would be used for new domestic use. Depending on the location of conservation and new use, this project could result in some reach benefit in Icicle Creek.

Increasing domestic conservation in the City of Leavenworth and putting conserved water to new uses could result in a minor decrease in the amount of excess water, or return flow, discharged to the Wenatchee River from the City of Leavenworth's wastewater treatment plant (Figure 2-27). This would lead to slight reductions to instream flows in the Wenatchee River. However, these impacts would be offset by benefit from other projects.

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Under the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project, storage volumes would be restored to historical levels that occurred before Eightmile Dam partially eroded, which reduced usable storage by 900 acre-feet. This additional 900 acre-feet of water would be used for improving domestic reliability and instream flows. The primary impact of this project on surface water would occur in Eightmile Lake, Eightmile Creek, and Reach 1 of Icicle Creek.

Under this project, accessible water storage in the Eightmile catchment would be restored to 2,500 acre-feet, as depicted on the adjudicated certificate. The Eightmile Lake maximum water surface elevation would be restored to the historical spillway elevation (4,671 feet). That represents an increase of 4 feet over the current maximum operating water surface, 4,667 feet. This storage limitation is a result of erosion that has occurred over the embankment portion of the dam. Draw down would increase by 22.4 feet. Impacts to Eightmile Lake levels are presented in Figures 2-28. Based on evaluations conducted for the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Feasibility Study (Anchor QEA, 2017), Eightmile Lake would still be expected to fully refill each spring, even in dry years. These findings indicate that this project would not have a significant impact on the water quantity within the Eightmile catchment.

This project would provide for the release of an additional 12.6 cfs and 900 acre-feet from Eightmile Lake into its tributary, Eightmile Creek, and Reach 1 of Icicle Creek. Flows could be adaptively managed to reduce low flow impacts in late summer or winter. These increase flows would be within the natural occurring range of flows and would be beneficial.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The preservation and enhancement of tribal fisheries is not expected to result in longterm impacts on surface water in Icicle Creek, its tributaries, or the Wenatchee River.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

The Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project includes activities such as grading and installing engineered logjams with the goal of creating better ecological conditions in Icicle Creek. Long-term impacts of installing habitat improvement projects may include alteration of stream velocity and characteristics in Icicle Creek. There are no anticipated long-term impacts on the quantity of water in Icicle Creek resulting from this project.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

The long-term impacts of amending the Instream Flow Rule is decreased streamflow in Icicle Creek by 0.4 cfs. It is unclear at this time where reach impacts would occur, although they would likely appreciate from Reach 1 to Reach 5. These impacts are expected to be offset by instream flow benefit provided by other projects.

There are no long-term streamflow impacts anticipated in the Wenatchee River because amending the Instream Flow Rule would move part of the Wenatchee Reserve into Icicle Creek. This would be a net neutral impact to the Wenatchee River.

### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

The LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements Project would likely impact surface water by increasing flow between RM 4.5 and 2.7 (Reaches 3 and 4). Anticipated impacts are up to 20 cfs and 14,454 acre-feet increase in flows year-round. This would include the low-flow periods experienced in Icicle Creek in late summer and early fall, as well as the winter (see Figure 3-2). These increased flows would be beneficial to Icicle Creek. However, flow benefit would not be measured at the Ecology Gage in Reach 5, which is the control point for the Instream Flow Rule, because operations at LNFH are primarily non-consumptive and benefits would not occur downstream of the hatchery outfall.

#### **Fish Passage**

Altering instream structures to improve fish passage is not anticipated to have long-term impacts on surface water.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

Compliance with current fish screening regulations is not expected to result in long-term impacts on surface water.

#### Water Markets

The Water Markets Project is expected to have a net neutral impact on surface water in years when the Instream Flow Rule is not met, and interruptible water users would be ordered to turn off. This is because the water market would provide mitigation in those instances to allow interruptible water users to continue irrigating. Depending on where

senior water rights are retired to seed the water bank, there may be a reach benefit in Icicle Creek. However, this benefit is expected to be offset by withdrawals downstream in the Wenatchee River Watershed.

In years when the Instream Flow Rule is met, the water bank would not be used as mitigation to offset interruptible water users, and instream flow benefits would occur in Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. The increase in streamflow would be 3.4 cfs and 1,000 acre-feet. These benefits would occur during the irrigation season, including the critical low flow period of late summer to early fall.

## 4.3.3 Alternative 2

The overall expected surface water impact associated with Alternative 2 is an increase of up to 83 cfs and 24,478 acre-feet in instream flow in Icicle Creek, with smaller benefits in tributaries to Icicle Creek depending on project location. Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1, with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would also be included and the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would not be included. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. The impacts of all other Alternative 2 projects are discussed under Alternative 1.

### 4.3.3.1 Short-term Impacts

### IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project includes the construction of a pump station to divert water to IPID from the Wenatchee River and would involve instream work on the Wenatchee River. Impacts to surface water would likely include the use of cofferdams and dewatering at the construction site.

### 4.3.3.2 Long-term Impacts

### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

The primary long-term impact of implementing the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project is increased streamflow in Icicle Creek, Peshastin Creek, and the Wenatchee River. This pump station would reduce IPID's diversion on Icicle Creek by as much as 25 cfs. The instream flow benefit from this project would occur during the irrigation season, which typically occurs from April through October. This period includes low flow months in late summer and early fall, as identified on the Icicle Creek hydrograph (Figure 3-2). These increased flows would benefit Icicle Creek downstream of IPID's point of diversion at RM 5.7 in Reaches 2 through 5. Releases from ALWS storage would still be required to sustain diversion quantities at the new pump station location. The benefit would continue into the Wenatchee River to the location of the new pump station near RM 16.2. Reach benefits can be seen in Figure 2-43.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

There would also be additional benefit to Peshastin Creek, as water currently diverted by IPID from this creek would also be replaced by this project.

# 4.3.4 Alternative 3

The overall expected surface water impact associated with Alternative 3 is an instream flow benefit of up to 70 cfs and 23,978 acre-feet in Icicle Creek, with smaller benefits in tributaries to Icicle Creek depending on project location. Alternative 3 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 2, with the exception that the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 would also be included and the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would not be included. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 projects of all other Alternative 3 projects are discussed under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

### 4.3.4.1 Short-term Impacts

### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

The Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority Project does not have a construction component. Consequently, there are no anticipated short-term impacts.

## 4.3.4.2 Long-term Impacts

### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

Under the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project, the small number of out-of-stream uses proposed by the IWG cannot be perfectly matched with the much larger instream flow benefit made available if the standard for impairment is perfectly in-time. Under current state law, meeting the domestic Guiding Principle with water made available slightly out-of-time would impair existing rights.

The IWG could seek and the Legislature could grant an OCPI waiver of impacts to the instream flow rule from junior domestic uses given the greater instream flow benefit aggregated under Alternative 3. If Legislative approval to waive impairment was not forthcoming, Alternative 3 could not move forward because Ecology's OCPI authority is too limited to address long-term impacts.

# 4.3.5 Alternative 4

The overall expected surface water impact associated with Alternative 4 is a benefit to instream flows of up to 131 cfs and 34,585 acre-feet in Icicle Creek, with smaller benefits in tributaries to Icicle Creek depending on project location. Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1, with the exception that the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement, Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement, and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would be included, and the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would not be included. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the

storage enhancement projects. The impacts of all other projects are discussed under Alternative 1.

### 4.3.5.1 Short-term Impacts

### Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

The Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would require demolition and reconstruction of the dam, installing a new low-level outlet pipeline, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures. The lake would need to be drawn down for construction activities, which would provide flow benefit in Eightmile Creek as well as Reaches 1 through 5 of Icicle Creek.

The use of cofferdams and dewatering may be required for some work.

### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would require developing a conveyance structure between Upper and Lower Klonaqua Lakes. This may require inwater work and the use of cofferdams, and dewatering may be required for some work near outlet tunnels. However, this project is conceptual at this stage, and exact impacts of construction activities on surface water is unknown.

### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

The Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would require demolition and reconstruction of the dam at Upper and Lower Snow Lakes, installing a new low-level outlet, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures. The lakes would need to be drawn down for construction activities, which would provide flow benefit in Snow Creek as well as Reaches 2 through 5 of Icicle Creek.

The use of cofferdams and dewatering may be required for some work near outlet tunnels.

### 4.3.5.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

Under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project, storage levels would be increased above historical levels. This additional water would be used for improving domestic reliability and instream flows.

Under this project, water storage in the Eightmile catchment would increase by 1,000 acre-feet over the storage volume listed in IPID's water right for the lake. Eightmile's lake level would rise 11 feet above the historic spillway level and draw down would increase by 22.4 feet below the current low level outlet. Impacts to Eightmile Lake levels are presented in Figure 2-44.

This project would provide for the release of up to an additional 17.9 cfs and 1,000 acrefeet, relatively to the storage allowed by IPID's water right, from Eightmile Lake into its tributary, Eightmile Creek, and Reach 1 of Icicle Creek. There would be additional flow

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

benefit in Reaches 2 through 5 of Icicle Creek. Flows would be adaptively managed to reduce low flow impacts in late summer. These flows would be within the naturally occurring flow range and would benefit the riverine system.

### Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

Building a conveyance system between Upper Klonaqua Lake and Lower Klonaqua Lake would allow for these lakes to be drawndown, making more water available in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. This would lead to increased stream flows in Icicle Creek Reaches 1 through 5. Streamflow would also increase in Klonaqua Creek and French Creek. This project is currently in the conceptual stage. Additional impacts on surface water would be identified after more detailed information is available on this project.

### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Under the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project, storage levels would be increased by 1,079 acre-feet. This additional water would be used for improving domestic reliability and instream flows. The primary impact of this project on surface water would occur in Upper Snow Lake, Snow Creek, and Reaches 2 through 5 of Icicle Creek.

Under this project, water storage in the Snow Lakes catchment would increase by 1,079 acre-feet. The maximum storage level in Upper Snow Lake's level would rise 5 feet and draw down would increase by 3 feet. Impacts to Upper and Lower Snow Lake levels are presented in Figure 2-46.

This project would provide for the release of an additional 18 cfs (maximum) and 1,079 acre-feet from Upper and Lower Snow Lake into Snow Creek and Reach 2 through 5 of Icicle Creek. Flows could be adaptively managed to reduce low flow impacts in late summer and would be beneficial to the riverine ecosystem.

# 4.3.6 Alternative 5

The overall expected surface water impact associated with Alternative 5 is an increase of up to 195 cfs and 55,458 acre-feet in instream flow in Icicle Creek. Alternative 5 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1, with the exception that the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project would be replaced by the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project. The impacts of all other Alternative 5 projects are discussed under Alternative 1.

## 4.3.6.1 Short-term Impacts

### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

The IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project includes the construction of three pump station to divert water to the IPID from the Wenatchee River and would involve instream work on the Wenatchee River. Impacts to surface water would likely include the use of cofferdams and dewatering at each pump station construction site.

### 4.3.6.2 Long-term Impacts

### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

The primary long-term impact of implementing the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project is increased streamflow in Icicle Creek and Peshastin Creek. In Icicle Creek, stream flow would be increased by as much as 117 cfs. These pump stations would allow for complete removal of IPID's diversion on Icicle Creek and Peshastin Creeks. However, IPID would still rely on releases from storage reservoirs in the ALWS to sustain water supply at the new pumped diversion locations on the Wenatchee River. The instream flow benefit from this project would occur during the irrigation season, which typically occurs from April through October. This period includes low flow months in late summer and early fall, as identified on the Icicle Creek hydrograph (Figure 3-2). These increased flows would benefit Icicle Creek downstream of IPID's point of diversion at RM 5.7 in Reaches 2 through 5. The benefit would continue into the Wenatchee River to the location of the new pump stations. Reach benefits can be seen in Figure 2-49.

There would also be additional benefit to Peshastin Creek, as water currently diverted by IPID from this creek would also be replaced with Wenatchee River water by this project.

## 4.3.7 Mitigation Measures

### 4.3.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Potential short-term impacts to surface waters are related to use of a cofferdam, rerouting water, and construction dewatering to support construction of the various project actions. These impacts are one time in nature for each project discussed above and are expected to occur only through the duration of active in-water construction work, likely for a few weeks or months. Dewatering to support construction would fall under the State Construction Stormwater General Permit, which contains BMP requirements for management and discharge of dewatering water. Additional BMPs or conditions for dewatering may be imposed under county grading permits, shoreline permits, or through NEPA review, depending on the project action and whether the project location is under state or federal jurisdiction.

### 4.3.7.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts to surface water resources are primarily related to increased stream flow in Icicle Creek and its tributaries. Additional surface water resource impacts include increased frequency of drawing down the Alpine Lakes. These potential impacts are not considered significant. The frequency of draw down is not anticipated to impact refill scenarios for the Alpine Lakes and is not expected to create new impacts on surface water resources. Permitting of trust water related to increased stream flow would be subject to Ecology water right permitting. The Ecology water right permitting process would include review of the potential for impairment to existing water rights, including the Instream

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Flow Rule, and would include the opportunity for mitigation should the potential for impairment be identified.

# 4.4 Groundwater

This section describes potential short- and long-term impacts to groundwater expected under each alternative, with a focus on potential changes in the timing and quantity of groundwater resources. Potential impacts to groundwater quality are discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality.

## 4.4.1 No-action Alternative

### 4.4.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various entities and agencies would undertake individual actions that could result in short-term impacts on water quality in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area. This is anticipated to entail construction of water diversion modifications, general habitat enhancement projects, LNFH improvements, required fish screening upgrades, modernization of infrastructure at the Alpine Lakes including the restoration of the Eightmile Lake Dam, and improvements to existing irrigation systems to support agricultural reliability.

Potential impacts would primarily be associated with projects that require construction in or near water bodies that would require dewatering of groundwater. Additionally, groundwater development activities associated with LNFH projects would involve pumping of groundwater to test the capacity of new wells or a groundwater collector gallery.

These impacts would be short-term in nature and are expected to have no significant impact on groundwater.

### 4.4.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts under the No-Action Alternative include reduced seepage and increased groundwater pumping that would result from domestic and irrigation conservation projects and groundwater development at LNFH.

Potential long-term impacts to groundwater that could result from implementing domestic conservation and irrigation efficiency project would be reduced recharge from leakage along the City of Leavenworth, IPID, and COIC conveyance systems and from reduced return flows near the mouth of Icicle Creek and along the Wenatchee River.

Given the high transmissivity of the sand and gravel alluvial aquifer along the Wenatchee River and the high degree of hydraulic continuity between the river and groundwater (refer to Section 3.4, Groundwater Resources), reduction in recharge resulting from conservation is not expected to significantly affect groundwater elevations in these areas. Groundwater discharge to surface water of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River could be reduced in proportion to the water efficiency savings; however, this reduction in groundwater discharge would be offset by the reduction in surface water diversion from Icicle Creek, approximately 32 cfs under the No-action Alternative. Potential impacts to groundwater resources under these projects are not considered significant.

Under the No-action Alternative, projects at LNFH will likely proceed. The effluent pump-back system and wellfield improvements to enhance groundwater supply under the LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements Project each have the potential to impact groundwater resources near the LNFH facility through increased groundwater recharge and withdrawals. However, the impacts of wellfield improvements at LNFH would not be greater than historically when wells were operating at full capacity. Water conservation efforts under this project (e.g., onsite water re-use) also have the potential to impact groundwater resources through reduced groundwater pumping or surface water diversions needed to meet LNFH water demands.

Previous investigations of the LNFH groundwater supply and pilot testing and evaluation of the pump-back system have confirmed the strong hydraulic connection between groundwater at the facility and surface water in Hatchery Channel when hydrated. Hydrating the Hatchery Channel via the effluent pump-back system would increase groundwater recharge and water levels in the adjacent aquifer. This in turn would support higher pumping rates from LNFH wells completed in this aquifer than could be sustained without the pump-back. Additional groundwater withdrawal capacity could be achieved by installing additional wells or a shallow groundwater collector on Hatchery Island. If implemented, impacts to groundwater from the well field improvements and effluent pump-back are expected to largely cancel out, with increased groundwater withdrawals offset by increased recharge from the pump-back system. Further, by reducing total LNFH water use through increased efficiency (water re-use), total surface water diversions and groundwater withdrawals would be reduced relative to current conditions, maintaining more water instream and in the adjacent alluvial aquifer to support instream flows and groundwater levels.

Based on these considerations, no significant impacts to groundwater resources were identified for this project.

## 4.4.2 Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, expected short-term impacts include construction dewatering and pumping groundwater to test the capacity of new wells or a groundwater collector. Long-term impacts include increased groundwater recharge near Icicle Creek, decreased groundwater recharge near areas of canal lining and piping, and increased groundwater use.

## 4.4.2.1 Short-term Impacts

### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Construction activities associated with this project would be limited to upland areas around the lakes and would likely not require dewatering during construction. No potential short-term impacts to groundwater resources were identified for this project.

### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Potential construction activities associated with the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project include the conversion of irrigation canals to pipelines and the lining of irrigation canals with concrete. Assuming the canals and pipelines are located above the local water table, construction dewatering is not expected to be required and no potential short-term impacts to groundwater resources were identified for this project.

### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Potential construction activities associated with this project include the conversion of irrigation system to pipelines and construction of a new COIC surface water intake and pump station. Potential groundwater impacts from implementing these actions include construction dewatering as needed during pump station construction. Duration of these impacts would be limited to the period of active dewatering during construction.

### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Potential construction activities associated with the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project include detection and replacement of leaking conveyance pipes and installation of water meters. Potential groundwater impacts from implementing these actions include construction dewatering as needed during pipe replacement. Duration of these impacts would be limited to the period of active dewatering during construction. No potential short-term impacts to groundwater resources were identified for installation of water service meters or other conservation efforts.

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would involve demolishing the existing dam and low-level outlet pipeline, installing a new low-level outlet pipeline, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures. Construction activities would occur along the banks and within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lake has been drawn down. Limited construction dewatering of groundwater could be required during installation of the new outlet pipeline. Duration of these impacts would be limited to the period of active dewatering during construction.

### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The focus of Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project is to ensure that there would be no adverse effect on tribal fishing as a result of implementing other projects as part of the overall Icicle Strategy. This project includes monitoring of fishery effectiveness and potential implementation of actions to improve the resource. Specific project actions for implementation have not been finalized but could include small-scale construction actions
to promote favorable fishing conditions in the pool at the bottom of the LNFH spillway. Construction dewatering is not expected to be required and no potential short-term impacts to groundwater resources were identified for this project.

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project includes stream restoration and protection projects to improve habitat in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Construction activities associated with these projects would include grading, vegetation planting and removal, and placement of logs and rocks in riparian areas. Some dewatering of groundwater during construction could be needed. Duration of these impacts would be limited to the period of active dewatering during construction.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

Under the Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project approximately 0.4 cfs of water reserved under the rule for future out-of-stream uses in the Wenatchee River would be reallocated to the Icicle Creek Subbasin, allowing for continued groundwater development. This would likely lead to more well construction than would occur under the current rule. Short-term impacts to groundwater associated with this project would be limited to withdrawals during well construction and testing.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

This project includes reducing LNFH's surface water use and improving the reliability and capacity of groundwater supply. Specific project actions could include onsite re-use, an effluent pump-back system to hydrate the Hatchery Channel and augment groundwater levels at nearby groundwater production wells, and wellfield enhancements. Potential short-term impacts to groundwater could include temporary dewatering during construction activities and pumping of groundwater to test the capacity of new wells or a groundwater collector gallery. Duration of these impacts would be limited to the period of active dewatering during construction or active pumping to test new wells.

Because this is a federal facility, an additional evaluation of the potential short-term impacts to groundwater under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined.

#### **Fish Passage**

The Fish Passage Improvements Project would potentially involve modification of existing LNFH instream structures in Icicle Creek as well as instream modifications to the Boulder Field near RM 5.6. Construction dewatering is not expected to be required at the Boulder Field but would likely be needed to improve the instream structures. Duration of dewatering impacts would be limited to the period of active dewatering during construction.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project involves replacing fish screens at three different diversions on Lower Icicle Creek. Construction activities could include building a temporary cofferdam and dewatering on the downstream side to accommodate screen replacement. Duration of dewatering impacts would be limited to the period of active dewatering during construction.

#### Water Markets

There are no construction activities proposed under the Water Markets Project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on groundwater are expected.

#### 4.4.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Under this project, management and releases of stored water at the Alpine Lakes would be automated and optimized to improve instream flows. This would result in some changes in how lake levels are managed. Lake levels would be drawn down every year instead of rotating 1-in-5-year basis. The high and low lake levels and the general pattern of releases would be adapted to fish needs in the particular water year.

Modifying the storage and release operations could have minor effects on groundwater levels in soils adjacent to the lakes. For example, if Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation allows lake levels to be maintained higher later in the season, then groundwater levels near the lakes would also be higher during the late season than under current operations. This in turn would lead to an increase in groundwater discharge to the lakes and outlet creeks during the later summer and early fall months. Conversely, if the lakes were drawn down earlier in the season than under current operations, then groundwater levels and associated late season discharge to surface water near the lakes would be reduced. In either event, these effects are expected to be very minor relative to the overall groundwater and surface water budgets for the Icicle Creek Subbasin.

Although the cycling of storage and releases may be increased to each lake every year instead of rotating, the impacts to groundwater, including groundwater discharge to surface water, would be within the variation already occurring within the system as currently managed. Based on this observation, potential impacts to groundwater resources under this project are not considered significant.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Under the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project, IPID's water management plan would be updated with a goal of identifying opportunities for irrigation efficiency upgrades and infrastructure improvements to reduce water diversions from Icicle Creek. Activities could include canal piping or lining and on-farm efficiency upgrades.

The primary effect of this project would be to reduce surface water diversions from Icicle Creek, resulting in increased instream flows downstream from the diversion. Potential

long-term impacts to groundwater could result from reduced recharge from leakage along the IPID conveyance system and from reduced irrigation return flows in the IPID service area near the mouth of Icicle Creek and along the Wenatchee River.

Given the high transmissivity of the sand and gravel alluvial aquifer along the Wenatchee River and the high degree of hydraulic continuity between the river and groundwater (refer to Section 3.4, Groundwater Resources), reduction in recharge resulting from IPID irrigation efficiencies is not expected to significantly affect groundwater elevations in these areas. Groundwater discharge to surface water of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River could be reduced in proportion to the water efficiency savings; however, this reduction in groundwater discharge would be more than offset by the reduction in surface water diversion from Icicle Creek that would be realized through this project. As such, potential impacts to groundwater resources under this project are not considered significant.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Potential project actions related to the COIC irrigation system include irrigation efficiency upgrades and infrastructure improvements like those considered for IPID (e.g., system piping and on-farm efficiency upgrades) as well as a source exchange option to move COIC's diversion from Icicle Creek downstream to a location near the confluence of the Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River.

COIC's service area is along Icicle Creek, extending to the Wenatchee River. Effects of improved irrigation system efficiencies would be similar to those expected for IPID improvements—a reduction in groundwater recharge along the conveyance system and within the service area, an associated reduction in groundwater discharge to surface waters, and an overall increase in instream flows as reduced diversions offset reduced groundwater discharge.

Assuming no other on-farm irrigation efficiencies, the potential source exchange project would not alter the amount of groundwater recharge from irrigation return flows within the COIC service area. The source exchange would reduce diversions from Icicle Creek, allowing higher flows to remain instream and slightly increasing creek stage. The higher creek stage would support slightly higher groundwater elevations in the adjacent alluvial aquifer, although groundwater elevations would be expected to remain within historical ranges, and these impacts are not considered significant.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

The Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project would improve domestic water use efficiency by the City of Leavenworth through pipe replacements, water meter installation, a voluntary lawn buyback program, and other water use conservation efforts. It would also improve domestic efficiency in rural Chelan County by providing conservation incentives and education. The overall effects of increased domestic water use efficiency are targeted to other domestic uses as the City of Leavenworth and Chelan County grow, so in general, increased efficiency is expected to reduce groundwater recharge as leaking pipes are replaced and irrigation and septic return flows decline with

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

declining water use. Potential impacts to groundwater resources from increased domestic conservation efforts are expected not to be significant.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Under this project, the Eightmile Lake Dam would be restored to the historical and permitted levels, increasing the useable storage capacity. Full storage elevations would be increased to match the historical spillway elevation (4,671 feet). That is about 4 feet higher than the current full operating water surface in the lake, which has been limited by erosion of the embankment portion of the dam to 4,667 feet. Other changes to the dam and lake operations would allow about 22.4 more feet of draw down to release water relative to current operations.

Groundwater elevations in soils adjacent to the lake are expected to rise and fall with changes in lake elevation. Given the increase in full elevation and the greater planned draw down, the range of groundwater elevations adjacent to the lake would likely exceed the range of elevations (high and low) experienced under recent lake operations, although elevations would be within the historical maximum range when the dam was at full capacity.

Potential impacts to groundwater adjacent to the lake are important to the Icicle Creek Subbasin to the extent that the groundwater discharges to and supports surface water levels and flows in Eightmile Lake and Eightmile Creek downstream to Icicle Creek. Filling the lake to higher levels would increase groundwater storage near the lake early in the season. As the lake is drawndown through the summer, groundwater would be released from storage and would discharge to the lake and headwaters of Eightmile Creek and support surface water flows. Overall, changes to groundwater near Eightmile Lake under this project are expected to have minor but beneficial impacts to the Icicle Creek Subbasin.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The preservation and enhancement of tribal fisheries is not expected to change groundwater levels. No long-term impacts to groundwater resources were identified for this project.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

Improving habitat in Icicle Creek by installing engineered logjams is expected to slow down stream, which could increase groundwater storage. These impacts are expected to be less than significant.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

Under the Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project, approximately 0.4 cfs of water reserved under the rule for future out-of-stream uses in the Wenatchee River would be reallocated to the Icicle Creek Subbasin. There would be no net change in the reserve available under the rule, but there would likely be more water well construction and groundwater pumping in the Icicle Creek Subbasin than would occur under the current rule, with a similar decrease in future groundwater development in the mainstem Wenatchee River Watershed. Long-term impacts to groundwater associated with this project action would include future groundwater withdrawals in the Icicle Creek Subbasin.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

The effluent pump-back system and wellfield improvements to enhance groundwater supply under the LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements Project each have the potential to impact groundwater resources near the LNFH facility through increased groundwater recharge and withdrawals. However, the impacts of wellfield improvements at LNFH would not be greater than historically when wells were operating at full capacity. Water conservation efforts under this project (e.g., onsite water re-use) also have the potential to impact groundwater resources through reduced groundwater pumping or surface water diversions needed to meet LNFH water demands.

Previous investigations of the LNFH groundwater supply and pilot testing and evaluation of the pump-back system have confirmed the strong hydraulic connection between groundwater at the facility and surface water in Hatchery Channel when hydrated. Hydrating the Hatchery Channel via the effluent pump-back system would increase groundwater recharge and water levels in the adjacent aquifer. This in turn would support higher pumping rates from LNFH wells completed in this aquifer than could be sustained without the pump-back. Additional groundwater withdrawal capacity could be achieved by installing additional wells or a shallow groundwater collector on Hatchery Island. If implemented, impacts to groundwater from the well field improvements and effluent pump-back are expected to largely cancel out, with increased groundwater withdrawals offset by increased recharge from the pump-back system. Further, by reducing total LNFH water use through increased efficiency (water re-use), total surface water diversions and groundwater withdrawals would be reduced relative to current conditions, maintaining more water instream and in the adjacent alluvial aquifer to support instream flows and groundwater levels.

Based on these considerations, no significant impacts to groundwater resources were identified for this project. However, because this is a federal facility, additional evaluation of the potential long-term impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined.

#### **Fish Passage**

No long-term impacts to groundwater resources were identified for this project.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

No long-term impacts to groundwater resources were identified for this project.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Water Markets

No significant long-term impacts to groundwater resources were identified for the Water Markets Project. If a water market is supplied by a groundwater right acquisition, historical groundwater diversions from that right would cease. If that right allowed currently interruptible rights to avoid curtailment, then some proportionate groundwater use would increase.

## 4.4.3 Alternative 2

This alternative includes the same projects as Alternative 1, with the exception that the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation project is not included and the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project is added. The discussion of short- and long-term impacts focuses on impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. The impacts of all other Alternative 2 projects are discussed under Alternative 1.

## 4.4.3.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

Under the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project, a new pump station would be constructed along the Wenatchee River near Dryden to augment water supply in the IPID canals. Potential groundwater impacts include construction dewatering as needed during pump station construction. Duration of these impacts would be limited to the period of active dewatering during construction.

## 4.4.3.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

Assuming no other on-farm irrigation efficiencies, the potential pump exchange project would not alter the amount of groundwater recharge from irrigation return flows within the IPID service area. However, the source exchange would reduce diversions from Icicle Creek, allowing higher flows to remain instream and slightly increasing creek stage. The higher creek stage would support slightly higher groundwater elevations in the adjacent alluvial aquifer, although groundwater elevations would be expected to remain within historical ranges. These impacts are not considered significant.

## 4.4.4 Alternative 3

This alternative includes the same projects as Alternative 2, with the exception that the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project is removed and the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project is added. The discussion of short- and long-term impacts focuses on impacts associated with Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project. The impacts of all other Alternative 3 projects are discussed under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

## 4.4.4.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

No short-term impacts to groundwater resources were identified for this project.

## 4.4.4.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

Under the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority Project, the small amount of outof-stream uses cannot be perfectly matched with the much larger instream flow benefit made available if the standard for impairment is perfectly in-time. The IWG could seek and the Legislature could grant an OCPI waiver for impacts to the instream flow rule. If granted, this would provide for decreased flows and corresponding decreases in groundwater to the creek. However, given the greater instream flow benefit aggregated under Alternative 3, these impacts are expected to be very minor.

## 4.4.5 Alternative 4

This alternative includes the same projects Alternative 1, but includes Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement, Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement, and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects. The discussion of short- and longterm impacts focuses on impacts associated with these projects. The impacts of all other Alternative 4 projects are discussed under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

## 4.4.5.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

Short-term impacts for the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement are similar to those described for Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project. Specifically, limited construction dewatering may be required during installation of the new outlet pipeline. The duration of these impacts would be limited to the period of active dewatering during construction.

#### Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

The Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project includes installing infrastructure to increase draw down in the lake and expand achievable storage releases. Short-term impacts for this project are similar to those expected for the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration project. Specifically, limited construction dewatering may be required during installation of the new outlet pipeline. The duration of these impacts would be limited to the period of active dewatering during construction.

#### Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement

The Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project includes raising the dam height on Upper Snow Lake to increase storage capacity and changing reservoir operations to allow more draw down during releases. Limited construction dewatering may be required during installation of the new outlet pipeline. The duration of these impacts would be limited to the period of active dewatering during construction.

## 4.4.5.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

Long-term impacts to groundwater resources under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project are expected to be the similar to those identified for the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project discussed in Section 4.4.2. Filling the lake to higher levels would increase groundwater storage near the lake early in the summer. As the lake is drawn down through the summer, groundwater would be released from storage and would discharge to the lake and headwaters of Eightmile Creek and support surface water flows. Overall, changes to groundwater near Eightmile Lake under this project are expected to have be very minor but beneficial impacts to the Icicle Creek Subbasin.

#### Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

Long-term impacts to groundwater resources under the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would be similar to impacts expected under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project. Increasing draw down in the lake to allow greater storage release would result in more late summer groundwater discharge to Upper Klonaqua Lake and its outlet creek. As the lake is allowed to fill over the winter and spring, groundwater adjacent to the lake would be recharged from surface water and groundwater levels would recover. Overall, changes to groundwater near Upper Klonaqua Lake under this project are expected to have minor but beneficial impacts to the Icicle Creek Subbasin.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Long-term impacts to groundwater resources under the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would be similar to impacts expected under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project. Increasing the dam height and full pool elevation of the lake would increase groundwater storage near the lake early in the summer. As the lake is drawn down through the summer, groundwater would be released from storage and would discharge to the lake and headwaters of Snow Creek and support surface water flows. Overall, changes to groundwater near Upper Snow Lake under this project are expected to have minor but beneficial impacts to the Icicle Creek Subbasin.

## 4.4.6 Alternative 5

This alternative includes the same projects as Alternative 1, with the exception that the IPID Irrigation Efficiency Project has been replaced by the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange. The discussion of short- and long-term impacts focuses on impacts associated with the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project. The impacts of all other Alternative 5 projects are discussed under Alternative 1.

## 4.4.6.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

Under the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project, three new pump stations would be constructed along the Wenatchee River near Leavenworth, Dryden, and Monitor to replace the IPID diversion on Icicle and Peshastin Creek. Potential groundwater impacts include construction dewatering as needed during pump station and piping construction. Duration of these impacts would be limited to the period of active dewatering during construction.

## 4.4.6.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

Piping IPID would likely result in a reduction in groundwater recharge along the conveyance system and within the service area, an associated reduction in groundwater discharge to surface waters, and an overall increase in instream flows as reduced diversions offset reduced groundwater discharge.

Assuming no other on-farm irrigation efficiencies, the potential source exchange project would not alter the amount of groundwater recharge from irrigation return flows within the IPID service area. The source exchange would reduce diversions from Icicle Creek, allowing higher flows to remain instream and slightly increasing creek stage. The higher creek stage would support slightly higher groundwater elevations in the adjacent alluvial aquifer, although groundwater elevations would be expected to remain within historical ranges, and these impacts are not considered significant.

## 4.4.7 Mitigation Measures

## 4.4.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Short-term impacts to groundwater are expected to be related to temporary construction dewatering to support implementation of the various project actions and construction and testing of groundwater supply wells. These impacts are expected to be localized and to occur only through the duration of active construction work or well testing. Dewatering to support construction would fall under the State Construction Stormwater General Permit, which contains BMP requirements for management and discharge of dewatering water. Additional BMPs or conditions for dewatering could be imposed under Chelan County grading permits, shoreline permits, or through NEPA review, depending on the project and whether the project location is under state or federal jurisdiction.

Water well construction is governed by Chapter 173-160 WAC *Minimum Standards for Construction and Maintenance of Wells* and would require filing a Notice of Intent to construct a well with Ecology. Well testing for non-permit exempt wells would likely

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

require a preliminary permit from Ecology, which would specify testing durations, rates, and monitoring requirements.

### 4.4.7.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts to groundwater resources include indirect effects from actions intended to improve flows and reliability of water in Icicle Creek and direct effects from actions related to groundwater withdrawals and supply improvements. Actions with indirect effects on groundwater quantity include changes in storage and operations of the Alpine Lakes, irrigation district improvements and pump exchanges to reduce diversions from Icicle Creek, water conservation measures by LNFH, and domestic water conservation efforts. These actions are expected to affect groundwater by increasing surface water quantities and levels, thereby increasing groundwater storage in adjacent soils, and conversely by reducing return flows from domestic and irrigation conveyance and uses, groundwater quantities would be reduced.

The Instream Flow Rule amendment and the LNFH groundwater augmentation actions are expected to have direct effects on groundwater quantity. The Instream Flow Rule amendment to reallocate water reserves from the mainstem Wenatchee River to the Icicle Creek Subbasin would directly reduce groundwater quantity in the Icicle Creek Subbasin via increased withdrawals while increasing groundwater in the Wenatchee River mainstem relative to the current rule. Groundwater augmentation at LNFH would maintain or increase groundwater elevations near the hatchery and support hatchery groundwater production.

The potential long-term impacts are not considered significant and are expected to partially offset each other (e.g., reduced groundwater recharge from domestic water conservation efforts may be offset by reduced pumping in the Wenatchee River Watershed following a rule amendment). Additionally, long-term impacts are not expected to alter groundwater elevations or quantities to the degree that they fall outside historical ranges in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area. Ecology water right permitting would be required for non-permit-exempt groundwater wells and would include an evaluation of the potential for withdrawals to impair other groundwater or surface water rights, including instream flows. Water right decisions would include the opportunity for mitigation should the potential for impairment be identified.

## 4.5 Water Quality

This section describes the potential short- and long-term impacts that could affect the resources identified in Section 3.5, Water Quality, from construction and operation related to the No-action Alternative and Program Alternatives.

## 4.5.1 No-action Alternative

## 4.5.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Potential impacts would primarily be associated with projects that require construction in or near water bodies and could include short-term increases in sedimentation and turbidity, changes in water temperature, and increased risk of contamination from such activities as concrete placement, use of construction equipment, and dewatering of groundwater. These impacts would be localized to specific areas of disturbance at the seven Alpine Lakes, Icicle and Peshastin Creeks, and the Wenatchee River. could include the modification of existing features, construction of new water diversion and flow control structures, various types of fish passage improvement work, and improvements to irrigation canal and pipe systems. Work would likely require the placement of temporary cofferdams in water bodies to isolate work areas and could also involve the temporary diversion of stream flow. Such activities could cause local, temporary increases in turbidity in the affected water bodies and could increase erosion potential from adjacent areas. Increases in turbidity and sedimentation could in turn lead to short-term increases in water temperature and decreases in available dissolved oxygen.

Placement of cast-in-place concrete either instream or in adjacent areas could increase the potential for water to meet uncured concrete, which could affect the pH of the water. The use of mechanized equipment for construction would also increase the potential for water contamination through the inadvertent release of fuel or other vehicle fluids (e.g., oil, grease, antifreeze, hydraulic fluids).

Activities involving ground disturbance near waterways are also likely to encounter groundwater. Exposed groundwater and groundwater dewatering can lead to increased risk of contamination similar to that described above from increased turbidity and potential spills.

Applicable permits would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce impacts on water quality, such as restricting in-water access to periods of low flows and species-specific in-water work windows and implementing construction BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion and inadvertent contamination from vehicle fluids (Section 4.5.7, Mitigation Measures). Therefore, the No-action Alternative would not be expected to result in short-term violations of the water quality standards that would adversely affect designated uses in the Icicle project area as described in Section 3.5, Water Quality. Short-term impacts on water quality would be less than significant and are unlikely to result in violation of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses within the Icicle project area.

## 4.5.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts under the No-action Alternative are anticipated to be largely beneficial for water quality, especially water temperature, because many projects would seek to improve instream flows during the late summer. Implementation of projects at the

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Alpine Lakes would also result in some changes in lake levels. Compared to existing conditions, the frequency in fluctuations in lake levels would increase. Lake levels at Eightmile Lake would also be able to reach higher or lower levels compared to existing conditions; however, this variation would remain within the levels historically achieved at the lake. Long-term water quality impacts include less than significant increases in erosion potential and turbidity in the lakes and associated creeks as a result of the changes in lake level management.

In the long term, projects implemented under the No-action Alternative that contribute to increased instream flows along Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River would also contribute to some increase in shallow groundwater recharge that would also be generally beneficial. However, because instream flow enhancement projects would not generally be coordinated with other activities in the Icicle project area and few projects would be implemented, these benefits are not anticipated to be as great as they would be under the other Program Alternatives. Potential long-term water quality benefits from such projects are also expected to be more localized, providing only minor overall benefits within the larger Icicle Creek Subbasin.

## 4.5.2 Alternative 1

Implementation of Alternative 1 has the potential to result in both increased adverse and beneficial impacts on water quality compared with the No-action Alternative because there would be greater likelihood that multiple projects would be implemented, and the scale of certain efforts would likely be greater. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses water quality in general by improving instream flows, sustainability at the LNFH, and Icicle Creek aquatic and riparian habitat. The following subsections describe the short- and long-term impacts that would likely occur under Alternative 1.

## 4.5.2.1 Short-term Impacts

### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

In the short term, this project has relatively limited potential to affect water quality at the Alpine Lakes. Construction activities would involve replacing existing flow control structures and installing automation equipment and would mostly affect upland areas. These activities would not require dewatering of groundwater and are therefore not expected to have the potential to adversely affect groundwater quality.

Some limited work would occur within the lake shorelines but within dry areas of the lake margins once lakes are drawn down at the end of the summer. This would include the replacement of existing water control gates at each of the five lakes, reconstruction of impoundment structures and upgrades of spillways where needed, and the demolition and reconstruction of the gate tower at Colchuck Lake. The latter of these would involve either the installation of a pre-cast concrete, rock masonry, or plastic pipe riser structure. The inlet pipe at Colchuck Lake may also need to be slip lined or repaired, which could require limited excavation and fill placement in the lake bottom. Work along the

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

shoreline could include some limited vegetation removal and soil disturbance for construction access, and installation of equipment (e.g., solar panels, antennas) and water control equipment enclosures.

Minor water quality impacts associated with these types of activities could include temporary increases in turbidity and sedimentation both in the lakes and their receiving waters. As compared to existing conditions, there would also be an increased risk of water contamination from fuels and other fluids used in gasoline or diesel-powered equipment (e.g., generators), the placement of uncured concrete (if used), and from human waste generated by workers.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures could include requiring all in-water work to be performed in the dry and implementing construction BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion and inadvertent water contamination (Section 4.5.7, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on water quality would be less than significant and would be unlikely to result in violation of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses assigned to the Wenatchee River and its tributaries.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

The IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project could cause short-term impacts on water quality if efficiency projects are implemented that require work in or adjacent to existing irrigation canals with potential to release flow back into the Wenatchee River or its tributaries through spillways. However, it is anticipated that any ground-disturbing work required to complete these projects would be completed during the off season, when the irrigation canals and spillways are completely dewatered.

Potential construction work under this plan that could affect surface water quality includes converting irrigation canals to pipelines, replacing or abandoning pipelines, and lining of irrigation canals with concrete. Water quality impacts that could occur from such work could include temporary increases in turbidity, increased erosion potential from disturbed areas along canal banks, re-suspension of contaminated sediments from canal substrates by excavation activities, and an increased risk of contamination from activities such as raw concrete placement and construction equipment usage. Because most of this work would occur when the canals are dry, the opportunity for these types of water quality impacts to occur would be minimized. As noted in Section 4.4, Groundwater, the irrigation canals are expected to be located above the water table, meaning there is also limited potential to adversely affect groundwater quality in the short term.

Work within irrigation canals or spillways that reconnect to waters of the United States or State of Washington could require a CWA Section 404 Permit and associated Section 401

## 

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Water Quality Certification. Work in other portions of the irrigation system could require local review and authorization.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures could include restricting work to periods when the irrigation canals are dewatered, restricting in-water access to periods of low flows, and implementing BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion and inadvertent water contamination from construction equipment and other sources (Section 4.5.7, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on water quality would be less than significant and would be unlikely to result in violation of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses assigned to the Wenatchee River and its tributaries.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Under the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project, canal and lateral to pipeline conversion would occur in or adjacent to existing irrigation systems that return flow back into the Wenatchee River or its tributaries through spillways and could cause some short-term impacts on water quality in those water bodies. However, similar to the IPID Efficiencies Project, it is anticipated that any ground-disturbing work required to complete efficiency projects would be completed during the off season when the irrigation canals and spillways are completely dewatered, and encountering groundwater is not likely.

Impacts could include temporary increases in turbidity, increases in erosion potential from disturbed areas along canal banks, re-suspension of contaminated sediments from canal substrates during excavation activities, and increases in the risk of contamination from the placement of raw concrete and the use of construction equipment in or near waterways. These potential impacts are expected to be minimized by local, state, and federal permit requirements and through the required implementation of standard construction BMPs.

Construction of a new pump station under this project would require both in-water and riverbank work on the Wenatchee River or Icicle Creek. Such activities could result in many of the same construction-related short-term impacts on water quality described above and would also include the potential for short-term impacts on groundwater. Because Ecology's current Water Quality Assessment (Ecology, 2016) records multiple Category 5 water quality impairment listings for the Wenatchee River, including five for polychlorinated biphenyls, five for 4,4'-DDE, and one for endosulfan, any excavation work in the river to construct the intake for the COIC pump station would need to address the potential presence of these and other contaminants in the substrate. As long as construction activities comply with required permit terms and conditions, including those in the Water Quality Certification that would be required by Ecology, it is unlikely that

this project would result in violations of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses of the affected water bodies. Short-term impacts on water quality would not be significant.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

The Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project does not involve any instream or stream bank construction work. Therefore, it is not expected to result in any short-term impacts on water quality.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would involve construction activities that could result in short-term impacts on water quality at Eightmile Lake and its receiving waters (Eightmile Creek and Icicle Creek). Construction activities could affect water quality of the lake primarily by increasing the potential for erosion or sediment disturbance that could lead to increased turbidity. Increased turbidity can occur as the result of either direct disturbance, for example the result of in-water work, or from runoff of sediment-laden stormwater into receiving waterways. Construction activities would also involve the use of chemicals, such as fuel, cement, and solvents, that could adversely affect water quality if accidentally spilled and subsequently entered water bodies.

While most construction equipment (potentially including a small tracked excavator) and materials would likely be flown into the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project site via helicopter, IPID is considering the option of walking in a larger tracked excavator or a spider excavator. The trail to access the project site requires several stream crossings and parallels several potential wetlands (Figure 3-10). Potential water quality impacts would include increased turbidity in any streams that would be crossed by machinery, increased erosion potential in areas where soils or vegetation would be disturbed, and an increased risk of water contamination from inadvertent fuel and vehicle fluid leaks and spills.

Construction activity would occur along the banks and within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lake has been drawn down and immediately downstream of the dam within Eightmile Creek. Demolition of the existing dam, installation of new piping, and construction of the new impoundment and water control structures would result in ground disturbance and could potentially cause a temporary increase in turbidity in both Eightmile Lake and Eightmile Creek. Some groundwater dewatering may be required for construction of the pipe inlet. Construction work would also increase the potential for erosion at the project site and the potential for surface and groundwater contamination from vehicle fluids and from the placement of concrete and grout. The extended presence of workers on the site would present similar risks of water contamination from human waste as occurs as the result of recreationalists that visit the area.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures could include requiring that the lake be drawn down to the lowest level feasible prior to

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

work near or below the ordinary high water mark of the lake, requiring that the lake be dewatered using temporary cofferdams or other measures so that the work area is separated and protected from the lake and stream, and implementing construction BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion and inadvertent contamination from vehicle fluids, uncured concrete, human waste, and other sources (Section 4.5.7, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on water quality would be less than significant and would be unlikely to result in violation of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses assigned to the Wenatchee River and its tributaries.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The focus of the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project is to ensure that there would be no adverse effect on tribal, as well as non-tribal, fishing as a result of implementing other projects as part of the overall Icicle Strategy. The specifics of this project are not yet determined but would involve elements of restoration along the lower Icicle Creek that could result in localized construction-related noise. At this stage, the primary options under consideration include the construction of facilities such as a bubble curtain, sprayer, or other modifications near the spillway in front of the LNFH to promote favorable fishing conditions. These activities are not expected to require groundwater dewatering.

Potential short-term water quality impacts from this project could occur if any instream or streambank work is needed to install the various project elements (e.g., spillway diversion piping, effluent discharge piping, bubble curtain, sprinklers) designed to mimic beneficial flow conditions near LNFH to support the tribal fishery in Icicle Creek. Such work could include the installation and removal of temporary cofferdams, excavation of the streambed or banks, placement of fill material and in-water structures, and the placement of cast-in-place concrete. Likely impacts would include a temporary increase in turbidity in the LNFH spillway and Icicle Creek during construction, increased potential for erosion, increased potential for the re-suspension of contaminated sediments, and the increased risk of accidental water contamination from vehicle fluids and water contact with uncured concrete. These types of impacts would most commonly occur near the construction sites and would decrease over time and distance.

Potential short-term water quality impacts associated with construction of Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project elements would be mitigated through compliance with the terms and conditions of required local, state, and federal permits as described in Section 4.5.6, Mitigation Measures. Potential impacts would also be reduced through the implementation of standard BMPs for construction work in and around streams and rivers. Overall, potential impacts on water quality from construction activities associated with this project would be less than significant and would not result in any violations of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses assigned to Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

Construction of in-water or streambank habitat protection and enhancement structures under the Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project could result in short-term increases in turbidity and erosion potential. No groundwater dewatering is expected. For activities located in the Wenatchee River and lower portions of Icicle Creek, resuspension of contaminated sediments could also occur. Because all in-water work and most work along the river and stream banks would require local, state, and federal authorizations, these potential effects would be minimized by permit terms and conditions and through the required implementation of standard construction BMPs for the reduction of soil erosion and water quality degradation, as described in Section 4.5.7, Mitigation Measures. Overall, potential impacts on water quality from construction activities under this project would be less than significant and would not result in any violations of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses assigned to Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

Short-term water quality impacts are not anticipated to occur under the Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project because it would not involve any construction work within or adjacent to any water bodies in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

Proposed improvements at LNFH would require some in-water and streambank construction activities that could cause a temporary increase in turbidity and erosion potential in Icicle Creek. Modification or replacement of the existing intake screens and surface water transmission piping may require the placement (and subsequent removal) of cofferdams in the stream channel and the use of dewatering methods (e.g., pumping) to isolate work areas. Potential short-term impacts affecting groundwater could include temporary dewatering during construction activities and pumping of groundwater to test the capacity of new wells or a groundwater collector gallery. The use of construction equipment to complete these improvements would also increase the risk of water contamination from inadvertent spills or leaks of vehicle fluids.

Short-term impacts on water quality from construction of the LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements Project would be minimized through compliance with the terms and conditions of required local, state, and federal permits as described in Section 4.5.7, Mitigation Measures, which would include specific requirements for the timing and duration of in-water work, erosion control, and handling of potentially contaminated sediments. Potential impacts would also be reduced through the implementation of standard BMPs for construction work in and around streams and rivers. Overall, potential impacts on water quality from construction activities are anticipated to be less than significant and not result in any violations of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses assigned to Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The Fish Passage Improvements Project would potentially involve modification of existing LNFH instream structures in Icicle Creek as well as instream modifications to the Boulder Field near RM 5.6. All of these activities would require the installation and removal of cofferdams, construction of temporary stream bypass structures, excavation of the streambed and banks, and the placement of cast-in-place concrete; however, these activities are not expected to require any contact with groundwater resources. Such activities would result in short-term increases in sedimentation and turbidity, an increased potential for erosion, and an increased risk of accidental spills of fuel, oil, grease, antifreeze, and other fluids associated with the use of heavy equipment. Surface water contamination is also possible from placement of concrete and grout during structure modification or replacement. Water quality parameters that could be affected by these impacts include temperature, dissolved oxygen, and pH.

All of the proposed fish passage improvements under this project would require local, state, and federal authorizations that would contain project-specific terms and conditions designed to reduce adverse impacts on water quality and other natural resources as described in Section 4.5.7, Mitigation Measures. As such, potential impacts on water quality from construction activities are anticipated to be less than significant and not result in any violations of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses assigned to Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project would require both in-water and shoreline work to upgrade and replace non-compliant fish screens on existing water diversion and intake structures used by LNFH and COIC, the City of Leavenworth, and IPID. Such work may require the isolation and dewatering of instream work areas using cofferdams and pumps, disturbance of streambank vegetation and soils for equipment access, and excavation of the streambed and bank for piping replacement. Construction activities would occur at ground surface and no dewatering is expected to be required. All of these actions could cause short-term increases in turbidity in Icicle Creek and an increased potential for streambank erosion. The use of construction equipment near the creek and the potential need to use cast-in-place concrete would also increase the potential for water contamination from these sources.

Potential short-term water quality impacts associated with the Fish Screen Compliance Project elements would be minimized through compliance with the terms and conditions of required local, state, and federal permits as described in Section 4.5.7, Mitigation Measures. Potential impacts would also be reduced through the implementation of standard BMPs for construction work in and around streams and rivers. Overall, potential impacts on water quality from construction activities are anticipated to be less than significant and not result in any violations of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses assigned to Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River.

#### Water Markets

Short-term water quality impacts are not anticipated to occur under the Water Markets Project because it would not involve any construction work within the Wenatchee River or any of its tributaries, including Icicle Creek.

## 4.5.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Long-term water quality impacts resulting from the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would primarily be associated with the way in which the lakes would be managed for downstream releases and are anticipated to be beneficial overall. With remote actuators in place, releases from the five managed lakes could be better timed based on flow levels in Icicle Creek, local and regional climatic conditions, and water demands of users in the basin. Rather than opening a gate in midsummer and closing it in late fall, this project would allow for improved control of water releases throughout the year to better mimic more natural flow conditions in the system.

Currently, water is typically released from one lake each year on a rotating basis, meaning that water is released for any given lake about once every 5 years. Under the proposed project, flows could be released from up to all five lakes on an as-needed basis each year. This would provide more flexibility for how flows from the lakes could be managed and greater security that there would be more water in Lower Icicle Creek available to users, including fish, in the later summer months when instream flows are typically lower.

While all the lakes would experience some level of draw down each year (versus less frequently under existing conditions), the overall impact on water quality in the lakes is expected to be beneficial. This is because the proposed project would likely reduce the annual extent of drawdown in individual lakes, which would help reduce temperature fluctuations. In addition, the high and low lake levels would not change, and water levels would continue to be drawn down at each lake over the course of several months similar to existing conditions. Groundwater around the lakes is limited because they are mostly surrounded by rock. Therefore, this project is not anticipated to result in substantial changes to water quality related to increased turbidity in the lakes or impacts on groundwater quality.

Annual usage of all five lakes could also reduce the amount of sediment accumulation around the outlet structures when gates are closed for extended periods of time. This would result in a reduction in sediment released into receiving waters when the gates are again opened for streamflow augmentation.

Likewise, the resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. In most years, the main change would be a beneficial increase in flows during the summer months. During high-flow

years, there could also be a potential for this project to result in a reduced contribution by the lakes to peak flows that might otherwise contribute to increased erosion and flooding.

Overall, increased instream flows, particularly in the summer and fall when flows are lower, would help to lower water temperatures, increase dissolved oxygen, and improve other water quality parameters. The potential impacts are not expected to exceed the water quality standards that are important to the beneficial uses designated for Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

In the long term, water conservation achieved through the implementation of irrigation efficiency measures by IPID would reduce the volume of water carried by spillways that return unused water and agricultural runoff from irrigated areas to the Wenatchee River and its tributaries. This condition could have both adverse and beneficial effects on water quality in these receiving waters and further downstream in the Columbia River. The reduction in flow moving through these features would reduce the opportunity for dilution, potentially increasing the nutrient concentration of the water being discharged. Over time, however, nutrient loading in spillways might decrease as on-farm conservation strategies reduce the amount of nutrient-laden runoff that is returned to these spillways. The transport of pesticide residues and other contaminants into these features may also decrease over time for the same reason. Decreased flows in these systems could also reduce the potential for bank erosion and the transport of sediments and other contaminants into receiving waters. Aside from some changes in the quantity of groundwater recharge, no long-term changes affecting groundwater quality would occur. Overall, long-term impacts are not expected to exceed the water quality standards that are important to the beneficial uses designated for Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River.

### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Effects of the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project would be similar to those expected for the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project. In addition, relocating the COIC diversion would conserve water and potentially increase instream flow downstream of RM 4.5 to the Wenatchee River. This would also contribute to lowering stream temperatures and increasing dissolved oxygen in that portion of Icicle Creek.

### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Long-term water quality impacts from the implementation of domestic conservation activities are expected to be minimal. Water conserved through this project would be made available to improve domestic supply, and domestic conservation is expected to have negligible effects on streamflow in Icicle Creek. Over the long term, implementation of domestic conservation would not cause water quality degradation such that the designated use water quality criteria for Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River would be violated.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from Eightmile Lake. Because the facilities would be remotely operated by IPID, the greatest potential for impacts to water quality over the long term would occur as the result of maintenance trips to and from the lake, which are anticipated to be less than would occur under the No-action Alternative, and any changes in operations with respect to how lake levels are managed.

The frequency in fluctuations in lake levels would increase compared to existing conditions but could be similar to the No-action Alternative should this project move forward. Lake levels would also be able to reach higher or lower levels compared to existing conditions; however, this variation would remain within the levels historically achieved at the lake. Long-term water quality impacts include less than significant increases in erosion potential and turbidity in the lake and Eightmile Creek as a result of the changes in lake level management.

Groundwater immediately surrounding the lake in many cases is limited by the presence of large rocks and boulders. Lake fluctuation could potentially alter the pattern of groundwater recharge as discussed in Section 4.4, Groundwater Resources, but would generally be similar to existing natural processes and would not result in substantial changes such that groundwater quality would be significantly affected.

Downstream of the lake, water quality impacts are expected to be largely beneficial as the ability to release flow into Icicle Creek in the late summer or in drought years would increase in frequency and duration. Overall, expected water quality impacts would not result in the exceedance of the water quality criteria associated with any of the designated uses for Eightmile Lake or its receiving waters.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

Because the overall goal of this project is to protect and enhance the tribal fishery, it is expected that most of the impacts on water quality would be beneficial and would improve fish habitat in Icicle Creek. Long-term impacts to water quality from the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project could alter sedimentation and scour patterns and increase turbidity in sections of Icicle Creek as a result of changes in water flow management practices at LNFH Structures 2 and 5. Although maintenance of flows over the LNFH Hatchery Channel spillway would induce turbulence and scour, potentially increasing turbidity downstream from the spillway, the increased air entrainment resulting from this turbulence would increase dissolved oxygen levels in the stream, which would be beneficial. Overall, the proposed Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project would not result in the exceedance of the water quality criteria associated with any of the designated uses for Icicle Creek or its receiving waters.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

Riparian and instream habitat protection and enhancement projects are expected to improve water quality in Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River over the long term, and no changes are proposed that would affect groundwater. Potential improvements include reduction in water temperatures from increased riparian shading and instream structures, decreased sedimentation and erosion potential from improved riparian runoff filtration and bank stabilization, and increased nutrient and dissolved oxygen concentrations from improved instream structure and fish habitat. Minor increases in turbidity may occur in certain locations (e.g., downstream of scour holes) but are expected to be within the range of natural variation. Depending on past and current land use, reconnection of floodplains in the lower reach could allow the introduction of contaminated sediment into the system during flood events and the transportation of this sediment to downstream water bodies.

Overall, the proposed habitat protection and enhancement projects would contribute to enhanced stream health, increased watershed functions, and improved water quality in the basin. This project is not anticipated to adversely affect any of the water quality criteria for designated uses in Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River. Corresponding effects on groundwater quality are anticipated to be minimal.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

Under the Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project, the Icicle Creek Reserve established under Chapter 173-545 WAC would be increased by 0.4 cfs. Over the long term, this amendment would ultimately result in the removal of additional water from Icicle Creek but only after habitat restoration elements are implemented. Additional water withdrawals could result in reduced instream flows, which could adversely affect water quality in portions of Icicle Creek. Reduced instream flow could lead to higher water temperatures, reduced dissolved oxygen concentrations, and increased pollutant concentrations in the stream. Corresponding effects on groundwater are anticipated to be minimal and similar to existing recharge processes. No instream flow reduction would occur in the Wenatchee River because this project would move 0.4 cfs out of the Wenatchee River Reserve specifically for Icicle Creek withdrawals.

Potential water quality impacts associated with the Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project are anticipated to be offset by the implementation of required instream flow and habitat restoration actions under this Program Alternative as well as several other projects associated with Alternative 1. The water quality benefits from habitat project implementation will exceed any water quality impacts from flow reduction of this element.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

Over the long term, the water conservation and water quality improvement elements proposed at LNFH under this project are expected to benefit water quality in Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River and improve groundwater recharge near LNFH. Water quality improvements at LNFH are expected through the implementation of facility upgrades and operational improvements. These actions would lead to compliance with relevant TMDLs for the Wenatchee River Watershed and would ultimately be designed to avoid additional water quality impacts in the basin.

In addition, most of the work included under this project is designed to improve water use efficiency at LNFH and to develop additional groundwater supplies such that less water would need to be diverted from Icicle Creek for hatchery operations. Such actions would potentially support higher flows in the system, which would benefit multiple water quality parameters, including temperature and dissolved oxygen content. However, the effluent pump back could impact shallow groundwater quality, particularly temperature and phosphorus. This shallow groundwater is expected to release to surface water in a relatively short timeframe. The temperature and phosphorus discharge to surface water is an already existing condition. This impact is expected to be less than significant but will be examined more during NEPA review.

Overall, improvements to the LNFH are expected to provide water quality benefits and would not adversely affect designated uses in Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

Over time, the Fish Passage Improvement Project could result in increased fish populations in portions of Icicle Creek where access was previously restricted; however, no long-term changes in water quality would be expected and no changes are proposed that would affect groundwater quality.

These types of water quality impacts would most likely occur during periods of low flow and would likely be mitigated by the other projects proposed under Alternative 1 that are designed to increase instream flows. Overall, this project is not anticipated to adversely affect any of the water quality criteria for designated uses in Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

Once the Fish Screen Compliance Project is completed, there is a potential for minor impacts to water quality related to increased fish in Icicle Creek similar to the long-term impacts related to the Fish Passage Improvements Project described above.

#### Water Markets

Implementation of the Water Markets Project could alter water use in Icicle Creek and thereby affect water quantity and quality in the system. This project would provide mitigation water to interruptible agricultural water users during years when the instream flow rule is not met and provide instream flow benefit in years that mitigation would not be needed. During years when mitigation is not needed, the increase in instream flows from the unexercised water rights could be beneficial for multiple water quality parameters, including temperature and dissolved oxygen, while potentially causing minor increases in turbidity. Effects would depend on the location, volume, and sources of the flow increases. The Water Markets Project is not expected to have an adverse impact on designated uses in Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River. Corresponding effects on groundwater are anticipated to be minimal and similar to existing recharge processes.

# 4.5.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would not. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses water quality in general by improving instream flows, sustainability at the LNFH, and Icicle Creek aquatic and riparian habitat. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. Other project impacts are discussed under Alternative 1 and impacts of not implementing projects under the Noaction Alternative.

## 4.5.3.1 Short-term Impacts

## IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

Construction of a new IPID Dryden Pump Exchange would require both in-water and riverbank work on the Wenatchee River, including the placement and removal of instream cofferdams, removal of streamside vegetation, excavation of the streambed and bank, and dewatering groundwater in the construction zone. These activities could result in short-term impacts on water quality including temporary increases in turbidity, sedimentation, and the potential re-suspension of contaminated sediments. Increased risk of contamination from the placement of raw concrete and the use of construction equipment in or near waterways, including potential short-term impacts on groundwater, would also occur. Construction of the proposed delivery facilities could also result in similar water quality impacts in the PID Canal. However, it is anticipated that delivery facilities would reduce or eliminate potential impacts to waters conveyed in the PID Canal to spillways that discharge water back to the Wenatchee River or its tributaries.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures may include restricting work to periods when the irrigation canals are dewatered, restricting in-water access to periods of low flows, and implementing BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion and inadvertent water contamination from construction equipment and other sources (Section 4.5.7, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on water quality would be less than significant and are unlikely to result in violation of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses assigned to the Wenatchee River and its tributaries.

## 4.5.3.2 Long-term Impacts

### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

Potential long-term impacts on water quality from the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project are expected to be largely beneficial. By installing the pump station downstream from IPID's current diversion, IPID could reduce the volume of water withdrawn from their existing diversions on Icicle Creek, augmenting late summer streamflow in the creek below RM 5.7 by 25 cfs. There would also be stream flow benefit in the Wenatchee River from its confluence with Icicle Creek. Increasing streamflow during this period would have positive effects on instream water temperatures and dissolved oxygen content. The project would also augment streamflow in Peshastin Creek below the IPID diversion at RM 2.4. In addition, other elements of this project would enable the more efficient delivery of irrigation water, which could reduce withdrawals from the system. Overall, long-term impacts are not expected to exceed the water quality standards that are important to the beneficial uses designated for Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River. Corresponding effects on groundwater are anticipated to be minimal and similar to existing recharge processes.

## 4.5.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 2 with the exception that the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project needed to allow for permitting additional domestic supplies would be included while the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would not. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the legislative change. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses water quality in general by improving instream flows, sustainability at the LNFH, and Icicle Creek aquatic and riparian habitat. The short- and long-term impacts of all other projects proposed under Alternative 3 are discussed under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Water quality impacts from not implementing the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project are discussed under the No-action Alternative.

## 4.5.4.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

The proposed legislative change to OCPI to address domestic use and instream flow impacts is a legislative change that would not involve any construction work. As such, it would not cause any short-term impacts on water quality.

## 4.5.4.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

If the proposed Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority Project were enacted, there could be potential conflicts with instream flow allocations. Under the proposed changes, junior domestic water rights could be exercised even when the instream flow rule is not

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

met, resulting in potential adverse impacts on water quality as a result of low flow conditions. Water quality parameters that could be affected include temperature, dissolved oxygen, and concentrations of nutrients and contaminants. Potential changes affecting groundwater quality are not expected. Depending on the instream conditions at the time domestic rights are exercised, water quality standards for some of the other uses designated for Icicle Creek (e.g., aquatic life uses, recreation) may not be able to be met and could violate the antidegradation regulations. However, Alternative 3 provides up to 70 cfs of instream flow benefit, but given the timing of the project benefits, perfect intime flow mitigation would not be available.

## 4.5.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the Eightmile Lake, Upper Klonaqua, and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would be included. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses water quality in general by improving instream flows, sustainability at the LNFH, and Icicle Creek aquatic and riparian habitat. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with these projects compared to Alternative 1 and the No-action Alternative.

## 4.5.5.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

Short-term impacts on water quality from the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would primarily be associated with construction and are similar in type and mechanism to the short-term water quality impacts identified for the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project (Section 4.5.2.1, Alternative 1, Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration), but longer in duration and greater in extent.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures may include requiring all in-water work to be performed in the dry and implementing construction BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion and inadvertent contamination from vehicle fluids, uncured concrete, human waste, and other sources (Section 4.5.6, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on water quality would be less than significant and are unlikely to result in violation of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses assigned to the Wenatchee River and its tributaries.

### Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

Short-term impacts on water quality from the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement project would be primarily related to construction activities and are similar in type and mechanism to those discussed for the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project.

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Specific construction activities that could result in water quality impacts include the transportation of construction equipment and materials to the project site; draw down of the lakes to isolate in-water work areas; groundwater dewatering during installation of the new outlet and pipeline; demolition of the existing dams and water control structures; removal of vegetation, excavation, and fill placement to install new low-level outlet piping; and the placement of concrete and other materials to construct new dam. Water quality impacts that could result from these activities include short-term increases in turbidity, water temperature, erosion potential, and the risk of contamination from vehicle fluids and uncured concrete.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures may include requiring all in-water work to be performed in the dry and implementing construction BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion and inadvertent contamination from vehicle fluids, uncured concrete, human waste, and other sources (Section 4.5.7, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the shortterm impacts on water quality would be less than significant and are unlikely to result in violation of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses assigned to the Wenatchee River and its tributaries.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Short-term impacts on water quality from the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would be primarily related to construction activities and are similar in type and mechanism to those discussed for the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project except no groundwater dewatering would be needed.

Specific construction activities that could result in water quality impacts include the transportation of construction equipment and materials to the project site; draw down of the lakes to isolate in-water work areas; demolition of the existing dams and water control structures; removal of vegetation, excavation, and fill placement to install new low-level outlet piping; and the placement of concrete and other materials to construct new dams. Water quality impacts that could result from these activities include short-term increases in turbidity, water temperature, erosion potential, and the risk of contamination from vehicle fluids and uncured concrete.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures may include requiring all in-water work to be performed in the dry and implementing construction BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion and inadvertent contamination from vehicle fluids, uncured concrete, human waste, and other sources (Section 4.5.7, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the shortterm impacts on water quality would be less than significant and are unlikely to result in

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

violation of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses assigned to the Wenatchee River and its tributaries.

## 4.5.5.2 Long-term Impacts

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

Operation of the proposed facilities for this project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from Eightmile Lake. The greatest potential for impacts on water quality over the long term would occur as the result of disturbance during maintenance and changes in operations with respect to how lake levels are managed that might influence increased erosion and turbidity.

Because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. However, this project would result in the ability to maintain the lake at higher than historical levels compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Under existing conditions, the maximum fill height of the lake is approximately 4,667 feet because the embankment portion of the dam has deteriorated. If the dam height is increased to enhance storage, the lake would be able to fill to a new high-water surface of 4,682 feet. Under this project, lake levels would be managed to rise beginning in the late fall and would continue to approximately 4,677 feet to the height of a notch in the proposed dam. The lake would remain at this height until stop logs are placed in the notch in the early summer. Placement of the stop logs would allow the lake level to continue to rise to the spillway elevation of 4,682 feet. The lake would stay at this level for less than a month in the early summer, after which time IPID would begin drawing down the lake by releasing water.

Compared with existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, this means that an additional area of shoreline would be under water. Shoreline areas up to 4,671 feet have been historically inundated, but areas above 4,671 feet to 4,682 feet have not been inundated. The additional area would be under water for a little less than a month each summer. The project would also allow for the lake to be drawn down below existing lake levels to an elevation of 4,619 feet, which is approximately 24.4 feet lower than the existing low. This change would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed, mainly in the later summer months and early fall up to the point when the water would no longer be drawn down, generally around the end of September. The additional draw down is not expected to result in increased erosion by comparison, because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity.

Groundwater immediately surrounding the lakes in many cases is limited by the presence of large rocks and boulders. Lake fluctuation could potentially alter the pattern of groundwater recharge as discussed in Section 4.4, Groundwater Resources, but would generally be similar to existing natural processes and would not result in substantial changes such that groundwater quality would be significantly affected.

Likewise, the resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. In most years, the main change would be a beneficial increase in flows during the summer months. There could also be a potential for this project to result in a reduced contribution by the lakes to peak flows that might otherwise contribute to increased erosion and flooding. Even though flows in Icicle Creek would be increased compared to existing conditions, as discussed in Section 4.3, Surface Water Resources, instream flow targets under this project would remain within existing high and low flow rates. Potential effects on fish, wildlife, aesthetics, and recreation are discussed in Sections 4.7, Fish; 4.9, Wildlife; 4.11, Aesthetics; and 4.15, Recreation. Overall, potential long-term impacts on water quality are not expected to conflict with the designated uses assigned to Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

Potential long-term impacts to shorelines of Klonaqua Lake would be similar to those described under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (Section 4.5.5.2, Long-term Impacts, Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement). Potential benefits would mainly occur in Icicle Creek and would include an increased ability to augment stream flow in the late summer or during drought years, with flow augmentation primarily benefitting Reach 1.

The frequency in fluctuations in lake levels in Upper Klonaqua Lake would increase compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. Lake levels would also be drawn down further compared to existing conditions.

The high lake level in Upper Klonaqua Lake would not change. The lake would still refill and outlet naturally through an existing channel to Lower Klonaqua Lake during most of the year. However, the new facilities would allow for the lake to be drawn down an additional 20 to 50 feet and allow for access to an additional 1,146 to 2,448 acre-feet of storage. The draw down would likely occur over a couple of months in the late summer. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect water quality by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity.

Groundwater immediately surrounding the lakes in many cases is limited by the presence of large rocks and boulders. Lake fluctuation could potentially alter the pattern of groundwater recharge as discussed in Section 4.4, Groundwater Resources, but would generally be similar to existing natural processes and would not result in substantial changes such that groundwater quality would be significantly affected.

Likewise, the resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. In most years, the main change would be a beneficial increase in flows during the summer months. During high-flow

years, there could also be a potential for this project to result in a reduced contribution by the lakes to peak flows that might otherwise contribute to increased erosion and flooding.

Even though flows in Icicle Creek would be increased compared to existing conditions, as discussed in Section 4.3, Surface Water Resources, instream flow targets under this project would remain within existing high- and low-flow rates. Potential effects on fish, wildlife, aesthetics, and recreation are discussed in Sections 4.7, Fish; 4.9, Wildlife; 4.11, Aesthetics; and 4.15, Recreation. Overall, potential long-term impacts to water quality are not expected to conflict with the designated uses assigned to Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River.

### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Potential long-term impacts to shorelines would be similar to those described under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (Section 4.5.5.2, Long-term Impacts, Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement). Potential benefits would mainly occur in Icicle Creek and would include an increased ability to augment stream flow in the late summer or during drought years, with flow augmentation primarily benefitting the section of Icicle Creek in Reaches 2 through 5.

The proposed enhancement project would increase the high-water storage levels in both Upper and Lower Snow Lakes by 5 feet compared with existing high levels. This change would result in the inundation of some upland vegetation that has grown along the shoreline areas between the current and proposed high lake levels, most likely occurring in the fall through the early summer when releases would be likely to begin. The project would also allow for the Lower Snow Lake to be drawn down 3 feet below the current lake level, which would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect water quality by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity.

Groundwater immediately surrounding the lakes in many cases is limited by the presence of large rocks and boulders. Lake fluctuation could potentially alter the pattern of groundwater recharge as discussed in Section 4.4, Groundwater Resources, but would generally be similar to existing natural processes and would not result in substantial changes such that groundwater quality would be significantly affected.

Likewise, the resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. In most years, the main change would be a beneficial increase in flows during the summer months. During high-flow years, there could also be a potential for this project to result in a reduced contribution by the lakes to peak flows that might otherwise contribute to increased erosion and flooding.

Even though flows in Icicle Creek would be increased compared to existing conditions, as discussed in Section 4.3, Surface Water Resources, instream flow targets under this project would remain within existing high and low flow rates. Potential effects on fish, wildlife, aesthetics, and recreation are discussed in Sections 4.7, Fish; 4.9, Wildlife; 4.11,

Aesthetics; and 4.15, Recreation. Overall, potential long-term impacts on water quality are not expected to conflict with the designated uses assigned to Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River.

## 4.5.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of the same projects as Alternative 1 except instead of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies, the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project would be included.

## 4.5.6.1 Short-term Impacts

#### IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project

Construction of the new IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project includes removal of existing diversion facilities and construction of new pump stations and intake facilities. The work would require both in-water and riverbank work on the Wenatchee River, including the placement and removal of instream cofferdams, removal of streamside vegetation, excavation of the streambed and bank, and dewatering groundwater in the construction zone. The project also involves fully replacing the existing IPID canal systems with a pressurized pipe delivery system, which would require ground disturbance throughout the system. The existing intakes on Icicle and Peshastin Creeks would also be removed or abandoned. These activities could result in short-term impacts on water quality including temporary increases in turbidity, sedimentation, and the potential resuspension of contaminated sediments. Increased risk of contamination from the placement of raw concrete and the use of construction equipment in or near waterways, including potential short-term impacts on groundwater, would also occur.

Conversion of the IPID conveyance system to pipelines could also result in similar water quality impacts in the IPID canal system. However, it is anticipated that any work to these features would be done in the off-season when the canals are dewatered, which would reduce or eliminate potential impacts to waters conveyed in the IPID system that discharge water back to the Wenatchee River or its tributaries.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures may include restricting work to periods when the irrigation canals are dewatered, restricting in-water access to periods of low flows, and implementing BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion and inadvertent water contamination from construction equipment and other sources (Section 4.5.7, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on water quality would be less than significant and are unlikely to result in violation of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses assigned to the Wenatchee River and its tributaries.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Because Ecology's current Water Quality Assessment (Ecology, 2016) records multiple Category 5 water quality impairment listings for the Wenatchee River, including five for polychlorinated biphenyls, five for 4,4'-DDE, and one for endosulfan, any excavation work in the river to construct the pump stations would need to address the potential presence of these and other contaminants in the substrate. As long as construction activities comply with required permit terms and conditions, including those in the Water Quality Certification that would be required by Ecology, it is unlikely that this project would result in violations of the water quality standards associated with the designated uses of the affected water bodies. Short-term impacts on water quality would not be significant.

## 4.5.6.2 Long-term Impacts

### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project**

Potential long-term impacts on water quality from the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project are expected to be largely beneficial. By installing the pump station downstream from IPID's current diversion, IPID could reduce the volume of water withdrawn from their existing diversions on Icicle Creek and Peshastin Creek, with more water instead being drawn from the Wenatchee River. This project would increase stream flow in both Icicle and Peshastin Creeks. Increasing streamflow during this period would have positive effects on instream water temperatures and dissolved oxygen content. In addition, other elements of this project would enable the more efficient delivery of irrigation water, which could reduce withdrawals from the system. Overall, long-term impacts are not expected to exceed the water quality standards that are important to the beneficial uses designated for Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River. Corresponding effects on groundwater are anticipated to be minimal and similar to existing recharge processes.

## 4.5.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

## 4.5.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Short-term impacts on water quality would be mitigated by complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal water quality regulations and project-specific permits, including local building, grading, and stormwater construction permits; state stormwater permits; SMA shoreline permits; HPAs; and CWA Section 404 permits and their associated Section 401 Water Quality Certifications, among others.

Local approvals could include building and grading permits and other constructionrelated authorizations for construction work within the limits of a municipality or county. Construction projects could also require a Construction Stormwater General Permit from Ecology. Projects involving work along shorelines or banks of lakes and streams would potentially require some type of shoreline permit under the state's SMA, which is administered by either local entities (e.g., City of Leavenworth, Chelan County) or Ecology. Projects that would use, divert, obstruct, or otherwise change the natural flow or bed of any water of the state require an HPA authorization from WDFW under the Washington State Hydraulic Code.

In addition to these state and local permits, any work that would involve the placement of dredged or fill material below the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) of a water of the United States (e.g., streams, rivers, lakes, wetlands) would require authorization from the USACE, Seattle District, under Section 404 of the CWA. Projects requiring a Section 404 Permit would also need a Water Quality Certification from Ecology under Section 401 of the CWA, which certifies that a project will comply with state water quality standards and other aquatic resources protection requirements under Ecology's authority.

Common permit conditions are likely to include specific in-water work restrictions, worksite isolation procedures, and post-construction restoration requirements designed to avoid and minimize impacts on multiple types of natural resources, including water quality. In addition, contractors would be required to prepare and implement a spill prevention, control, and countermeasure plan and develop and implement a temporary erosion and sediment control plan prior to the commencement of construction activities.

During construction, BMPs to control, isolate, and contain stormwater runoff, erosion, fluids from construction equipment, and uncured concrete would also be used to further minimize potential impacts on water quality. Turbid or contaminated dewatering water would be treated prior to discharge as necessary to comply with the requirements of the Washington Administrative Code, HPA, construction NPDES permit, and/or the local grading permit. Contracts for construction projects would also include site-specific restoration requirements to ensure that all disturbed areas are appropriately stabilized and routinely monitored following the completion of construction.

## 4.5.7.2 Long-term Impacts

Local long-term effects on water quality are possible for some of the projects, but they would be mitigated with both local measures and net benefits from changes in the operations of the system. Water quality impacts could further be mitigated through evaluations that consider site-specific characteristics to aid in design and selection of individual projects.

In most cases, the potential for long-term water quality impacts would be mitigated by applicable permit requirements for the construction and operation of the project. Project design and permitting would occur within the existing TMDL implementation framework. Water quality monitoring throughout the system would be used to document the effectiveness of the various flow augmentation, water conservation, and habitat enhancement projects. Long-term adaptive management plans and monitoring would also be beneficial for maintaining and enhancing water quality. Lake operational practices

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

related to the timing and volume of storage releases can be structured to mitigate water quality impacts.

All long-term operational activities that relate to individual projects would require monitoring and approval to meet local, state, or federal regulatory requirements for water quality. Ecology is the lead agency in charge of administering and enforcing the various rules and regulations governing water use and water quality in the State of Washington. Ecology's Water Quality Program is responsible for reviewing plans before construction to ensure all state and local water quality standards and requirements are met.

## 4.6 Water Use

## 4.6.1 No-action Alternative

### 4.6.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various agencies and other entities would continue to undertake individual actions to restore and enhance fish and aquatic resources in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area, but those actions would not be part of a coordinated program implemented with the support of the IWG. Actions implemented by individual agencies and entities could include construction of diversion improvements, irrigation system upgrades, LNFH improvements, and fish passage work.

Project construction could temporarily impact water supply, especially for construction work on or near a point of diversion. These projects could be timed and coordinated to minimize these impacts. Generally, short-term, construction related impacts to water use would be less than significant.

### 4.6.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, some water quantity issues may be eased, while some would likely persist.

Several projects aimed at out-of-stream uses may persist under the No-action Alternative. These would likely include improvements to irrigation reliability by implementing piping and lining efforts, and maintenance and improvements at IPID's alpine lakes infrastructure. However, the timing and magnitude of these projects will likely be different under the No-action Alterative.

Some domestic conservation is likely to occur under the No-action Alternative, and the instream flow rule might be amended if sufficient habitat improvements occur. This would allow for improved domestic supply. However, this increased supply would not meet projected demand through 2050 particularly for rural residents.

While it is expected that COIC and LNFH would continue to pursue water conservation to improve instream flow, there would only be modest progress made towards meeting the flows prescribed in the rule. Additionally, stream flow goals set for Reach 4 would consistently fail to reach to goals set by the IWG.

## 4.6.2 Alternative 1

Implementation of Alternative 1 has the potential to result in greater short-term impacts on use compared with the No-action Alternative because there would be higher likelihood that projects would be constructed, which could temporarily impact water use at construction projects near diversions. Alternative 1 would also improve water use conditions over the No-action Alternative. Long-term benefits would include increased water available for instream and out-of-stream uses, including water to meet growth projections. The following sections describe the short- and long-term impacts that would occur under Alternative 1.

## 4.6.2.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Construction activities associated with the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would involve replacing existing gates and installing solar panels, actuators, flow monitoring equipment, and other new equipment. This work would occur when the lakes are drawn down in late summer. Construction related impacts to water use could occur for construction projects near points of diversion, which would impact the ability to divert water. Construction associated with this project is not near an out-of-stream diversion. No short-term impacts to water use are expected to result from this project.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Construction activities associated with the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project include the conversion of irrigation canals to pipelines, on-farm efficiency upgrades, and other traditional irrigation efficiency projects. Construction on the irrigation infrastructure could result in impacts to IPID water use. However, construction activities on water distribution infrastructure would likely occur outside the irrigation season to minimize effects on water use.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Construction activities associated with the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project include a new surface water intake and pump station as well as piping existing canals and laterals. These construction activities could result in impacts to COIC water use. However, these construction actives would likely occur in a manner so as to not affect COIC's water deliveries.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Construction activities associated with the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project would include pipe replacement and meter installations. Additionally, some landscape modification could occur. These construction activities would be staged to minimize any impacts on water delivery to domestic customers.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would involve demolishing the existing dam, installing a new low-level outlet pipeline, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures. Construction activities would occur along the banks and within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lake has been drawn down. Construction related impacts to water use could occur for construction projects near points of diversion, which would impact the ability to divert water. Construction associated with this project is not near an out-of-stream diversion. No short-term impacts to water use are expected to result from this project.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The focus of this project is to ensure that there would be no adverse effect on tribal fishing as a result of implementing other projects as part of the overall Icicle Strategy. While to details of this project are not fully known, it is unlikely any construction activities would prevent a water use from diverting water from Icicle Creek. No short-term effects on what use have been identified.

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

Habitat protection and enhancement proposed under this project could involve grading, planting and thinning vegetation, and hauling and placing logs, rock, soil, and other materials. While to details of this project are not fully known, it is unlikely any construction activities would prevent a water use from diverting water from Icicle Creek. No short-term effects on what use have been identified.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on water use.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

This project includes various elements geared toward improving water quality and hatchery rearing conditions at the LNFH. Reconstruction of the facilities intake structure could impact the facilities water use. Alterative water sources or temporary points of diversion would need to be identified prior to construction.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The Fish Passage Improvements Project would potentially involve modification of existing LNFH instream structures in Icicle Creek, as well as instream modifications to the Boulder Field near RM 5.6. Work at the Boulder Field may have short-term impacts
to IPID and the City of Leavenworth's diversion points. Construction activities would need to be coordinated with IPID and the City of Leavenworth to ensure service would not be interrupted.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

This project would involve replacing fish screens at three different diversions on Lower Icicle Creek: LNFH/COIC, the City of Leavenworth, and IPID. Under this project, screens and associated infrastructure would be improved to bring all three intakes up to compliance with state and federal laws. This construction work would occur at active water diversions and could result in short-term disruptions to water use. Construction schedules would need to be coordinated with diverters to minimize any potential impacts.

#### Water Markets

There are no construction activities proposed under the Water Markets Project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on water use.

## 4.6.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from the lakes. This project would provide an additional 30 cfs and 5,465 acre-feet per year to the Icicle Creek System. This water would be managed exclusively for instream flow benefit during non-drought years. This would affect summer instream flows and likely increase the frequency when the flows prescribed in the Wenatchee Instream Flow Rule for Icicle Creek are met.

In drought years, IPID would continue operating these lakes for irrigation of lands within their service area. This project would improve operation so the district could more accurately and responsively release water from the lakes for their operational needs. The Snow Lake systems would continue to be operated by USFWS for streamflow benefit and for the operation of their diversion on Icicle Creek.

This project is not anticipated to have any negative long-term impacts on Icicle Creek diversionary rights. The resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. In most years, the main change would be a beneficial increase in flows during the summer months. To protect this water instream, a change authorization or a new secondary use permit authorizing instream flows as a beneficial use for these storage rights would need to be issued for each lake. Issuance of these water rights would require analysis of beneficial use, impairment of senior users, potential detriment to the public interest, and water availability.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Many elements of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project include pipelines or canal improvements. The anticipated effect of this project is a decrease in IPID's water demand, and, consequently, a reduction in the amount of water diverted by the district from Icicle Creek. The reduction in demand is anticipated to increase stream flows in Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River by 10 cfs and 3,000 acre-feet per year, from the historical point of diversion at Icicle Creek RM 7.5 to the historical point of return flows on the Wenatchee River.

This project is not anticipated to have any negative long-term impacts on Icicle Creek diversionary rights. The resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

A new COIC pump station and intake facilities would be constructed on the Wenatchee River or Lower Icicle Creek. Moving the point of diversion would require a water right change authorization.

This project would increase flows by up to 11.9 cfs and 3,500 acre-feet per year on Icicle Creek.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Implementing the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project would include improved leak detection, metering, a voluntary lawn buyback program, conservation incentives, and conservation-oriented rate structure. Conserved water would be used to provide service to more ERUs within the City of Leavenworth service area and for rural domestic users.

Domestic conservation is not anticipated to affect instream flows or other water uses in the Icicle Creek Subbasin or in the Wenatchee River Watershed, where the City well field is located. Conserved water within the City of Leavenworth will help meet future municipal demand.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project involves restoring the Eightmile Lake Dam to its historical high water mark. This would provide an additional 900 acre-feet per year of storage in the Icicle Creek Subbasin over current conditions. This water would be utilized for instream flows and domestic use. The effects of this project on water use are related to these two uses.

The additional storage water would provide increased stream flow from Eightmile Lake Dam downstream to either RM 7.5 or RM 0, depending on where domestic and municipal water would be diverted. Providing additional water for instream flow would increase water use security for out-of-stream users who are junior to the instream flow rule. The resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. In most years, the main change would be a beneficial increase in flows during the summer months. To protect this water instream, a new secondary use permit would need to be issued for instream flows as a beneficial use for the storage right. Issuance of this water right would require analysis of beneficial use, impairment of senior users, potential determent to the public interest, and water availability.

This water would also be used to provide for rural domestic and City of Leavenworth demand through 2050, which would also require a secondary use permit. This would increase the City of Leavenworth water right and water potentially available to other domestic uses without having impact on instream flows or affecting other water users in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. City of Leavenworth has expressed interest in taking available water resulting from this project from its Wenatchee River well fields, which would require a water right permitting action.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The purpose of this project is to protect and enhance the tribal, as well as non-tribal, fishery. There are no anticipated long-term negative effects to water use associated with this project.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

The purpose of this project is to protect and enhance habitat within the Lower Icicle Creek corridor, which is not anticipated to have long-term effects to water use.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

Under the Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project, the City of Leavenworth's water reserve from Icicle Creek would be increased to support future domestic water supply demands projected through 2050. Over the long term, this amendment would ultimately result in the removal of additional water (up to 0.4 cfs) from Icicle Creek for domestic use, which would reduce stream flow in Icicle Creek. This is offset by the addition of water from other projects as part of this alternative. Additionally, this shifts a portion of the existing reserve from the Wenatchee River to Icicle Creek as contemplated by the original watershed planning effort, with no net increase for the basin. Additionally, streamflow and habitat restoration efforts, as required by WAC 173-545-090(1)(d)(iv), are expected to offset these long-term effects.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

This project consists of several proposals to improve instream water conservation and water quality at LNFH. The water conservation component is the most likely to have long-term effects on water use. Through implementing operational changes to reduce LNFH demand, more water would be left instream from RM 4.5 to RM 2.7. This would increase stream flow in Reaches 3 and 4 by up to 20 cfs and 14,454 acre-feet year-round. Because of the non-consumptive nature of the LNFH water right, the instream flow benefit would not extend past the hatchery outfall at RM 2.7. Additionally, restored

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

groundwater use to historical permitted levels would create increased balance in hatchery water use between its surface and groundwater sources.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

This project involves modifying passage barriers in Icicle Creek to improve fish passage. While potential short-term impacts have been identified for construction at the Boulder Field, no long-term effects to water use are anticipated as a result of this project.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project is not anticipated to have long-term effects on water use.

#### Water Markets

The Water Markets Project would create a water market on Icicle Creek and downstream on the Wenatchee River. This would result in fallowing senior agricultural lands, placing the water right into the TWRP, and issuing mitigated permits to downstream interruptible agricultural users that is offset by the retired use. The effects on water use would include increased stream flow and water resources for fish from the historical point(s) of diversion to the new points of diversion. This would likely include several reaches in Icicle Creek examined by the IWG, as well as in the Wenatchee River. Additionally, it would convert irrigators whose use was not permitted during water-short years into uninterruptible water users. Senior water rights that might be purchased and retired for a water bank have not been identified, so specific reach benefits to instream flow are unknown at this time.

# 4.6.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would be included and the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would not be included. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. Other project impacts are discussed under Alternative 1 and impacts of not implementing projects are discussed under the No-action Alternative.

## 4.6.3.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

Construction of a new pump station under this project would likely not affect water use.

## 4.6.3.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would result in new pump exchange and intake facilities on the Wenatchee River. These intake facilities would decrease diversion on both Icicle Creek and Peshastin Creek by using Wenatchee River water to supply

irrigation demand instead. This would result in a 25 cfs and 1,484 acre-feet per year increase in flows in Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River from Icicle Creek RM 7.5 to Wenatchee RM 16.5. This would provide additional water resources for fish benefit and increased flow in Reaches 1 through 5 on Icicle Creek. Additionally, this project would likely increase the frequency when the flows prescribed in the Wenatchee Instream Flow Rule for Icicle Creek are met during summer months.

This project is not anticipated to have any negative long-term impacts on Icicle Creek, Peshastin Creek, or Wenatchee River diversionary rights. The resulting downstream changes in flows in these systems would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system.

## 4.6.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 2 with the exception that the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Projects would also be included while the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Projects would not. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Projects. Other project impacts are discussed under Alternative 1 and 2 and impacts of not implementing projects are discussed under the No-action Alternative.

## 4.6.4.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts with the potential to affect water use.

## 4.6.4.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

If the proposed Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority Project were enacted, there could be potential conflicts with instream flow allocations. Under the proposed changes, junior domestic water rights could be exercised even when the Instream Flow Rule is not met. This is particularly true for the winter months when flows often fall short of those prescribed in the Wenatchee Instream Flow Rule for Icicle Creek and no in-kind mitigation is available; although, these changes would be generally adverse for instream flow water rights established by WAC 173-545-060. Because these impacts are primarily anticipated for winter months, it is not anticipated to increase interruption of other water rights junior to the Instream Flow Rule.

This project would increase the amount of water available to the City of Leavenworth and provide for future residential and commercial growth within the City of Leavenworth's service area.

# 4.6.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1. The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would be replaced with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project, and the Upper Klonaqua and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would also be included. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with these projects compared to Alternative 1 and the No-action Alternative.

## 4.6.5.1 Short-term Impacts

## Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

The Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would involve demolishing the existing dam, installing a new low-level outlet pipeline, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures that would allow for an increase in the accessible storage at Eightmile Lake to 3,500 acre-feet. Construction activities would not likely affect water use.

## Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

This project's construction activities would require the construction of a low-level outlet from Upper Klonaqua Lake to Lower Klonaqua Lake using one of the three conceptual connection options discussed in Chapter 2. Construction activities are not anticipated to affect water use.

## **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Construction activities related to this project are not anticipated to affect water use.

## 4.6.5.2 Long-term Impacts

## Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

Under existing conditions, the maximum fill height of the lake is approximately 4,667 feet because the embankment portion of the dam has deteriorated. After the dam is enhanced, the lake would be able to fill to a new high water surface of 4,682 feet. These changes would increase the accessible storage to 3,500 acre-feet, which is 1,000 acre-feet more than currently permitted by IPID's water right. This additional storage water would be used for instream flows and domestic use.

The additional storage water would provide increased stream flow from Eightmile Lake Dam downstream to either RM 7.5 or RM 0, depending on where domestic and municipal water would be diverted. The resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. In most years, the main change would be a beneficial increase in flows during the summer months. To protect this water instream, a new secondary use permit would need to be issued for instream flows as a beneficial use for the storage right. Issuance of this water right would require analysis of beneficial use, impairment of senior users, potential detriment to the public interest, and water availability. This water would also be used to provide for rural domestic and City of Leavenworth demand through 2050, which would also require a secondary use permit. This would increase the City of Leavenworth water right and water potentially available to other domestic uses without having impact on instream flows or affecting other water users in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. City of Leavenworth has expressed interest in taking available water resulting from this project from its Wenatchee River well fields, which would require a water right permitting action.

It is not anticipated that this project would have any other long-term effects on water use in the basin.

This activity would require a new storage permit and additional secondary use permits, as discussed in Section 4.6.6, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

Potential long-term impacts to water use would be similar to those described under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project. This project could provide up to 2,448 acre-feet of additional discharge from the Klonaqua Lake system. This additional storage water would be used for instream flows and domestic use.

The additional storage water would provide increased stream flow from Eightmile Lake Dam downstream to either RM 7.5 or RM 0, depending on where domestic and municipal water would be diverted. The resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. In most years, the main change would be a beneficial increase in flows during the summer months. To protect this water instream, a new secondary use permit would need to be issued for instream flows as a beneficial use for the storage right. Issuance of this water right would require analysis of beneficial use, impairment of senior users, potential detriment to the public interest, and water availability.

This water would also be used to provide for rural domestic and City of Leavenworth demand through 2050, which would also require a secondary use permit. This would increase the City of Leavenworth water right and water potentially available to other domestic uses without having impact on instream flows or affecting other water users in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. City of Leavenworth has expressed interest in taking available water resulting from this project from its Wenatchee River well fields, which would require a water right permitting action.

It is not anticipated that this project would have any other long-term effects on water use in the basin.

This activity would require a new storage permit and additional secondary use permits, as discussed in Section 4.6.6, Mitigation Measures.

## Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement

Potential long-term impacts to water use would be similar to those described under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (4.6.5.2, Long-term Impacts). Increased storage capacity in the Snow Lakes system would be 1,079 acre-feet. This additional storage water would be used for instream flows and domestic use.

The additional storage water would provide increased stream flow from Upper Snow Lake Dam downstream to either RM 7.5 or RM 0, depending on where domestic and municipal water would be diverted. The resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. In most years, the main change would be a beneficial increase in flows during the summer months. To protect this water instream, a new secondary use permit would need to be issued for instream flows as a beneficial use for the storage right. Issuance of this water right would require analysis of beneficial use, impairment of senior users, potential detriment to the public interest, and water availability.

This water would also be used to provide for rural domestic and City of Leavenworth demand through 2050, which would also require a secondary use permit. This would increase the City of Leavenworth water right and water potentially available to other domestic uses without having impact on instream flows or affecting other water users in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. City of Leavenworth has expressed interest in taking available water resulting from this project from its Wenatchee River well fields, which would require a water right permitting action

It is not anticipated that this project would have any other long-term effects on water use in the basin.

This activity would require a new storage permit and additional secondary use permits, as discussed in Section 4.6.6, Mitigation Measures.

# 4.6.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would replace IPID Irrigation Efficiencies project. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project. Other project impacts are discussed under Alternative 1.

# 4.6.6.1 Short-term Impacts

## IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange

Construction of new pump stations under this project would likely not affect water use in the short-term. Construction of piping would occur outside the window of the irrigation season and would not impact water use.

## 4.6.6.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

The IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would result in new pump stations and intake facilities on the Wenatchee River. These intake facilities would remove IPID's diversions on both Icicle Creek and Peshastin Creek by using Wenatchee River water to supply irrigation demand instead. This would result in a 117 cfs and 30,000 acre-feet per year increase in flows in Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River from Icicle Creek RM 5.7 to the pump stations located in Leavenworth, Dryden, and Cashmere. This would provide additional water resources for fish benefit and increased flow in Reaches 1 through 5 on Icicle Creek. Additionally, this project would likely increase the frequency when the flows prescribed in the Wenatchee Instream Flow Rule for Icicle Creek are met during summer months.

This project is not anticipated to have any negative long-term impacts on Icicle Creek, Peshastin Creek, or Wenatchee River diversionary rights. The resulting downstream changes in flows in these systems would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. This project would require water right change authorization to move the points of diversion from their historical locations to the proposed pump stations.

# 4.6.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

## 4.6.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Short-term impacts on water use is expected to be relatively limited. Specific mitigation measures would include coordination with water users whose infrastructure could be limited by construction activities.

## 4.6.7.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts on water use primarily relate to instream flows, reduced return flows, increased domestic use, and water right change authorizations. Nearly all of the projects require either a new or changed water right authority under Chapters 90.03 and 90.44 RCW. These statutes require no impairment to senior water rights, no detriment to the public interest, beneficial use, and availability. Meeting these criteria would mitigate potential effects on water use.

# 4.7 Fish

This section describes the potential short- and long-term impacts that could affect the resources identified in Section 3.7, Fish, from construction and operation related to the No-action Alternative and Program Alternatives. Impacts on special-status species are addressed in Section 4.10, Threatened and Endangered Species.

# 4.7.1 No-action Alternative

## 4.7.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Projects likely to occur under the No-Action Alternative would likely result in short-term impacts that could affect aquatic habitat such as would occur from activities within the Alpine Lakes at the existing dam or from work within or adjacent to Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River, such as might occur from dewatering of instream habitat, potential disturbance and displacement of juvenile salmonids and resident species, disturbance of shoreline habitat, increased water temperatures, sedimentation, fish passage obstruction, and potential for accidental spills of hazardous materials (i.e., uncured cement, fuel, hydraulic fluid). Short-term impacts affecting water quality are addressed in Section 4.5, Water Quality.

The agencies or entities implementing projects under the No-action Alternative would be required to comply with applicable local, state, and federal environmental review requirements as described in Section 5.2, Table 5-2. In the event of any potential adverse impacts, project applicants would be required to implement appropriate mitigation measures to reduce impacts on aquatic species, such as minimizing potential disturbance of aquatic habitat, including possibly excluding species from work areas or implementing any necessary timing restrictions for construction work (Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on fish would not be significant.

## 4.7.1.2 Long-term Impacts

The long-term impacts under the No-action Alternative are generally anticipated to be beneficial due largely to obligations that the USFWS has at LNFH to improve fish passage through hatchery structures, improve water diversion intake screening, maintain instream flow in the historical channel, and support the tribal and sport fisheries in Icicle Creek. In addition, conservation projects, irrigation improvements, and restoration projects implemented individually by other agencies and entities would provide a longterm benefit to fish and aquatic habitat through increased flow.

Currently, LNFH operators have observed an increase in fish mortality at LNFH (Irving, pers. comm.), which has been attributed in part to improved fish passage and decreased water supply into the hatchery. To address these issues, LNFH has reduced fish densities

at the hatchery and increased flushing and chemical treatment. Improving water quality and quantity as part of the planned LNFH improvements would further help to reduce these impacts. While these measures are also expected to be implemented under the No-Action Alternative, the potential for this impact would likely remain.

In addition, because instream flow and fish habitat enhancement projects would not generally be coordinated with other activities in the Icicle project area, the benefits are not anticipated to be as great as they would under the other Program Alternatives. For example, proposed modifications at the Alpine Lakes would not result in management of the lakes for the benefit of fish. Depending on the specific location and extent of long-term changes affecting aquatic habitat, there is a potential for some projects to result in localized adverse impacts.

# 4.7.2 Alternative 1

## 4.7.2.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

As discussed in Section 3.7, Fish, the Alpine Lakes do not appear to have naturally occurring fish populations. The lakes typically have low temperatures (8°C to 15°C in summer) (Dion et al., 1976) and low nutrient inputs that naturally limit fish metabolism, growth, and the development of food resources for fish. Because of the high altitude and cold temperatures, these lakes have low productivity levels and lack fish passage that would naturally support fish populations.

Several of the lakes have been artificially stocked with trout species that contribute to the recreational high lakes fishery, although none of the project lakes have been stocked or managed for these fish in recent years. Fish present in these lakes are likely descendants of stocked fish and most likely include cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkii*), rainbow trout (*O. mykiss*), and lake trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*).

Most of the work would occur in upland areas. Some limited work would occur within the lake shorelines but within the dry areas on the lake margins when the lakes are drawn down at the end of the summer. As discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, construction is not anticipated to result in significant water quality impacts and would, therefore, not be expected to adversely affect fish or aquatic invertebrates. However, construction activities would result in increased noise that could affect these species, depending on the type of activity and whether these species were located in close proximity.

As noted in Section 4.14, Noise, the majority of construction activities would result in relatively minor noise increases associated primarily with hand-held tools. Normal fish behavior, such as foraging or use of refuge areas within the lakes, would not likely be adversely affected because fish would be able to move to other areas of the lake during construction. These activities are generally consistent with routine operation and

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

maintenance activities that have occurred and would otherwise continue under the Noaction Alternative.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures may include limiting in-water work, excluding aquatic species from in-water work areas, and implementing construction timing restrictions (Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Construction activities associated with the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project include the conversion of irrigation canals to pipelines, replacing or abandoning pipelines, lining of irrigation canals with concrete, and on-farm application efficiency upgrades. These activities are unlikely to adversely affect fish because the work would be done in the off-season when the irrigation canals are dry, and away from where these species may be found. As noted in Section 4.5, Water Quality, there would also be relatively limited potential for water quality impacts that could adversely affect aquatic habitat related to these activities.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

The COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project includes conversion of irrigation canals and laterals to pipelines and construction of the new pump station along Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River. Short-term impacts that could adversely affect fish and aquatic invertebrates include direct disturbance associated with work near or in water and any associated temporary impacts on aquatic habitat.

Canal work is unlikely to adversely affect fish because the work would be done in the dry during the off-season when the irrigation system is dry, and away from where these species may be found. As noted in Section 4.5, Water Quality, there would also be relatively limited potential for water quality impacts that could adversely affect aquatic habitat related to these activities.

Construction of the COIC pump station would require in-water work along lower Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River and has a higher potential to adversely affect fish and aquatic invertebrates. Potential impacts include increased risk of disturbance or harm from construction activities such as from installation of a cofferdam, increased potential for harm from noise and vibration, increased risks of water quality impacts adversely affecting aquatic habitat, and temporary loss of aquatic habitat during dewatering for in-water construction. Depending on the location and extent of these activities and the number and type of fish or aquatic invertebrates likely to be affected, short-term impacts could be significant.

Work within waters of the United States or State of Washington or within irrigation canals or spillways that reconnect to these waters would require a CWA Section 404 Permit and associated Section 401 Water Quality Certification; work in other portions of the irrigation system could require local review and authorization.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures may include limiting in-water work, excluding aquatic species from in-water work areas, and implementing construction timing restrictions (Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Construction activities proposed under the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project include pipeline replacement and meter installation. These activities are unlikely to adversely affect fish because the work would be done in the dry and away from where these species may be found. As noted in Section 4.5, Water Quality, there would also be relatively limited potential for water quality impacts that could adversely affect aquatic habitat related to these activities.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

As noted previously, the Alpine Lakes typically have low temperatures (8°C to 15°C in summer) (Dion et al., 1976) and low nutrient inputs that limit fish metabolism and growth, and the development of food resources for fish. Because of high altitude and cold temperatures, Eightmile Lake has low productivity levels and lacks fish passage that would naturally support fish populations; however, as noted in Section 3.7, Fish, Eightmile Lake was stocked most recently in 2005 and descendants of these stocked fish may exist in this lake, most likely cutthroat trout, rainbow trout, and lake trout.

Construction activities would occur primarily in the dry lake margins in the later summer when the lake is drawn down and in Eightmile Creek immediately downstream of the dam. As discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, these activities are not anticipated to result in significant water quality impacts and would therefore not be expected to adversely affect fish or aquatic invertebrates. However, construction activities would result in increased noise that could affect these species, depending on the type of activity and whether these species were located in close proximity.

As noted in Section 4.14, Noise, most construction activities would result in relatively minor noise increases and normal fish behavior such as foraging or use of refuge areas within the lakes would not likely be adversely affected because fish would be able to move to other areas of the lake =. However, construction could involve some blasting. Blasting can directly harm fish and aquatic invertebrates from increases in noise and vibration. Depending on the species that may be within close proximity when blasting occurs, there is a potential for those species to be affected.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

could include limiting in-water work, excluding aquatic species from in-water work areas, and implementing construction timing restrictions (Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The focus of this project is to ensure that there would be no adverse effect on tribal fishing as a result of implementing other projects as part of the overall Icicle Strategy. The specifics of this project are not yet determined, but would involve elements of restoration along lower Icicle Creek that could result in streambank and in-water construction. At this stage, the primary options under consideration include the construction of facilities, such as plumbing to create a bubble curtain, sprayer, or other minor modifications to the LNFH, to promote favorable fishing conditions in the pool at the bottom of the spillway.

Potential short-term impacts on fish and aquatic invertebrates would occur mainly as a result of work in or within close proximity to water. Potential impacts include increased risk of disturbance or harm from construction activities such as from installation of a cofferdam, increased potential for harm from noise and vibration, increased risks of water quality impacts adversely affecting aquatic habitat, and temporary loss of aquatic habitat during dewatering for in-water construction. Depending on the location and extent of these activities and the number and type of fish or aquatic invertebrates likely to be affected, short-term impacts could be significant.

These types of activities would require authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to address these impacts (Section 4.7.6, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

Habitat protection and enhancement proposed under this project could involve grading, planting and thinning vegetation, and hauling and placing logs, rock, soil, and other materials along lower Icicle Creek. Potential short-term impacts on fish and aquatic invertebrates would occur mainly as a result of work in or within close proximity to water.

Potential impacts include increased risk of disturbance or harm from construction activities such as installation of a cofferdam, increased potential for harm from noise and vibration, increased risks of water quality impacts adversely affecting aquatic habitat, temporary loss of aquatic habitat during dewatering for in-water construction, and potential loss of riparian habitat. Depending on the location and extent of these activities and the number and type of fish or aquatic invertebrates likely to be affected, short-term impacts could be significant. These types of activities would require authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to address these impacts (Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on fish or aquatic invertebrates.

# Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

This project includes various elements geared towards improving water quality and hatchery rearing conditions at the LNFH. Many of these activities would occur within the existing hatchery, although some in-water work would also be required. In general, construction of these elements has the potential to affect fish, depending on the specific location and type of disturbance.

Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential short-term impacts under the NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined. Similar to the construction activities described above, various authorizations are likely to be required that would ensure that potential impacts would be avoided, minimized, or compensated as noted in Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The Fish Passage Improvements Project would potentially involve modification of existing LNFH instream structures in Icicle Creek, as well as instream modifications to the Boulder Field near RM 5.6. This work would result in disturbances along the streambank and within Icicle Creek that could potentially affect fish and aquatic invertebrates.

Potential impacts include increased risk of disturbance or harm from construction activities such as installation of a cofferdam, increased potential for harm from noise and vibration, increased risks of water quality impacts adversely affecting aquatic habitat, and temporary loss of aquatic habitat during dewatering for in-water construction. Depending on the location and extent of these activities and the number and type of fish or aquatic invertebrates likely to be affected, short-term impacts could be significant.

These types of activities would require authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to address these impacts (Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures).

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

This project involves replacing fish screens at three different diversions on lower Icicle Creek: LNFH/COIC, the City of Leavenworth, and IPID. Under this project, screens and associated infrastructure would be improved to bring all three intakes up to compliance with state and federal laws. This work would result in disturbances along the streambank and within Icicle Creek.

Potential impacts include increased risk of disturbance or harm from construction activities such as installation of a cofferdam, increased potential for harm from noise and vibration, increased risks of water quality impacts adversely affecting aquatic habitat, and temporary loss of aquatic habitat during dewatering for in-water construction. Depending on the location and extent of these activities and the number and type of fish or aquatic invertebrates likely to be affected, short-term impacts could be significant.

These types of activities would require authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to address these impacts (Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### Water Markets

There are no construction activities proposed under the Water Markets Project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on fish or aquatic invertebrates.

## 4.7.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Operation of the proposed facilities for this project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from the affected lakes. Over the long-term the greatest potential for affecting fish and aquatic invertebrates would be related to changes in how the lakes are managed and the resulting changes in flows in lower Icicle Creek.

Under this project, the frequency in fluctuations in lake levels would increase compared to existing conditions because some portion of each lake would likely be drawn down every year instead of relying on draw down of only one or two lakes per year; however, the high and low lake water levels at the lakes would not change. Operation of the proposed project would also potentially result in less draw down at any one lake because releases would be spread across all lakes and releases would be optimized to meet instream and water supply needs in lower Icicle Creek. Lake level variation would largely remain within the same parameters as existing conditions.

Accumulation of organic inputs and nutrient cycles in the lakes that support the aquatic food web are not expected to substantially change as a result of re-operation of the lakes. Although lakes could be affected each year compared to every few years, the changes in

lake levels (e.g., highs and lows) would be consistent with existing operations and the current seasonal pattern of change.

Additional flows released from these lakes would also be more evenly spread out across receiving streams that flow into Icicle Creek and eventually the Wenatchee River. With more efficient operation of the lakes, flow releases to lower Icicle Creek could be better targeted to the periods when they are needed. In general, this would mean that there would be lower contributions to flows early in the season and there would be higher contributions, estimated at up to 30 cfs over 92 days, when flows are low later in the summer (Skalicky et. al. 2013).

The potential impacts associated with increased flows would generally be beneficial with respect to fish and aquatic invertebrates because flows would be returned to more natural conditions. The benefits are mainly associated with increasing aquatic habitat in lower Icicle Creek in the later summer months and improving fish passage to the upper reaches (above the Boulder Field at RM 5.6) of Icicle Creek and its tributaries. These benefits are generally anticipated to extend to any listed critical habitat and essential fish habitat within Icicle Creek and its tributaries and the Wenatchee River.

Rearing juvenile steelhead trout (*O. mykiss*) have been chosen to generally represent how flow changes are expected to affect aquatic habitat mainly because this species is present year-round when others are not and juvenile rainbow trout or steelhead have been observed in all reaches of Icicle Creek. Assuming that the full 30 cfs was achieved in late summer, the WUA per 1,000 linear feet of stream, a measure of aquatic habitat area, could increase by as much as 24 percent for juvenile steelhead in the historical channel (RM 3.9 to 2.7) compared to existing conditions (Skalicky et al., 2013). The historical channel currently experiences the lowest flows in Icicle Creek compared to other reaches downstream of RM 9 because of diversion of water from this reach for LNFH and irrigators, with an average of 63 cfs in September (IFC, 2016). Flow-habitat relationships have not been evaluated upstream of RM 9. Specific changes in the amount of available habitat resulting from this project would vary depending on the species, the month of the year, general flow conditions, and the affected stream reach; however, in general, increased flow in the late summer would correspond to increased aquatic habitat.

Because flow releases from the lakes would be better regulated in the spring and early summer months, it is not anticipated that additions from the lakes would exacerbate natural extreme high-flow conditions in spring and early summer. Instead of water from one or two lakes being released for the duration of the irrigation season and contributing to peak flows, releases would be controlled remotely and would occur only as needed to support continued irrigation withdrawals that might otherwise conflict with minimum instream flow targets intended to protect aquatic habitat.

Elevated flows in Icicle Creek are also expected to improve fish passage through obstructions in Icicle Creek during late summer and fall, particularly benefiting anadromous and migratory salmon, steelhead, and bull trout (*S. confluentus*) by allowing

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

access to high quality habitat in the upper reaches of Icicle Creek. Potential impacts associated with improved fish passage can result in increased genetic mixing and increased competition between different species or distinct populations of the same species. These impacts are described in greater detail under Section 4.7.2.2, Long-term Impacts, Fish Passage Improvements; however, improving fish passage is generally considered to be beneficial overall.

There remains uncertainty around how the proposed patterns of release would affect resident fish in receiving tributaries immediately downstream of the lakes but upstream of Icicle Creek. Compared to existing conditions, all of these streams would receive water released from the lakes each year instead of every few years; however, the releases would likely be more intermittent compared to a steady release.

Increasing instream flows in downstream tributaries, including Icicle Creek, over the summer and fall could also alter the hydrology in areas in which upstream-migrating salmon currently tend to gather, which may alter the distribution pattern of fish and affect fishing opportunities on a localized basis. There is uncertainty at this time whether increasing instream flow would cause fish to distribute themselves more broadly or in different areas than they currently do. Potential impacts would be addressed in part by efforts to be completed under the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project as described in greater detail in Chapter 2.

As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, the Guiding Principles require flows to be managed to benefit aquatic species and minimize adverse impacts. An example of a strategy under consideration is prioritizing the timing of releases relative to potential impacts on downstream aquatic habitat. Continued coordination on the development of the Icicle Strategy along with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would help to address potential impacts on special-status species as noted in Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

In the long-term, the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project would contribute an estimated 10 cfs to instream flows in Reaches 2 through 5 and in the Wenatchee River to the point of historical return flows (approximately RM 5). Improving irrigation system efficiency is intended to benefit all fish in Icicle Creek, including ESA-listed spring-run Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*), steelhead, and bull trout, by allowing more water to remain in the creek downstream of the IPID and COIC irrigation diversions from May through September.

Rearing juvenile steelhead have been chosen to generally represent how flow changes are expected to affect aquatic habitat mainly because this species is present year-round when others are not and juvenile rainbow trout or steelhead have been observed in all reaches of Icicle Creek. With respect to the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies, the WUA for juvenile steelhead could increase by as much as 9 percent in the historical channel. Implementation could increase habitat area in September and expand the benefit earlier in

the season in mid- to late July. Specific changes in availability of habitat resulting from this project would vary depending on the species, the month of the year, general flow conditions, and the affected stream reach; however, in general, increased flow in the later summer would correspond to increased habitat.

Elevated flows in Icicle Creek are also expected to improve fish passage through obstructions in Icicle Creek during summer, particularly benefiting anadromous and migratory salmon, steelhead, and bull trout by allowing access to high-quality habitat in the upper reaches of Icicle Creek. Potential impacts associated with improved fish passage can result in increased genetic mixing and increased competition between different species or distinct populations of the same species. These potential impacts are described in greater detail under Section 4.7.2.2, Long-term Impacts, Fish Passage Improvements, but are generally considered to be beneficial overall.

As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, efforts to characterize the impacts of the managed flows on fish species are ongoing. Continued coordination on the development of the Icicle Strategy along with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would help to address potential impacts on special-status species as noted in Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Under the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project, installing pipelines would occur in areas that have already been developed with irrigation infrastructure and would not result in long-term adverse impacts on fish from operation and maintenance activities. However, the COIC pump station would create a permanent change in the near-field hydraulics and levels of vibration on lower Icicle Creek or on the Wenatchee River, depending on where it is located. In addition, the new facilities would result in limited loss of riparian vegetation.

As noted in Section 4.8, Vegetation, compliance with applicable regulations would minimize the potential impacts on habitat and ecosystem functions and values associated with siting and operating the proposed facilities and would help reduce potential adverse impacts on fish and aquatic invertebrates. Overall, the new facilities are anticipated to represent a net benefit over the current facilities because they would be designed according to the current NMFS guidelines to ensure fish-friendly irrigation diversion operations, for example by providing intake screens that would be designed to prevent entrainment of juvenile fish.

Improving irrigation system efficiency and changing the location of the point of diversion is intended to benefit all fish in Icicle Creek, including ESA-listed spring-run Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*), steelhead, and bull trout, by allowing more water to remain in the creek downstream of the current COIC irrigation diversions. In the long term, this project would contribute to beneficial increases in instream flows in Icicle Creek from RM 4.5 to its confluence with the Wenatchee River. Instream flow increases are expected to be between 8.0 cfs and 11.9 cfs.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Rearing juvenile steelhead have been chosen to generally represent how flow changes are expected to affect aquatic habitat mainly because this species is present year-round when others are not and juvenile rainbow trout or steelhead have been observed in all reaches of Icicle Creek. With respect to the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project, the WUA for juvenile steelhead could increase by as much as 17 percent in the historical channel. Specific changes in availability of habitat resulting from this project would vary depending on the species, the month of the year, general flow conditions, and the affected stream reach; however, in general, increased flow in the later summer would correspond to increased habitat.

Under existing conditions, water is diverted from Icicle Creek at the existing COIC/LNFH diversion at RM 4.5. Under average and low-flow conditions, withdrawals by COIC most typically result in an adverse impact on fish habitat. Extreme high-flow conditions that occur in spring and early summer may reduce habitat value for resident fish that must seek refuge from high velocity flows. An increase to instream flow during the early part of the irrigation season could contribute to a minor reduction in WUA of approximately 1 percent (Granger, 2017); however, this would present a negligible impact to fish that are already adapted to naturally elevated flow during this time of year. Additionally, the timing of increased flows would improve outmigration conditions for salmonids.

Elevated flows in Icicle Creek are also expected to improve fish passage through obstructions in Icicle Creek during summer, particularly benefiting anadromous and migratory salmon, steelhead, and bull trout by allowing access to high-quality habitat in the upper reaches of Icicle Creek. Potential impacts associated with improved fish passage can result in increased genetic mixing and increased competition between different species or distinct populations of the same species. These impacts are described in greater detail under Section 4.7.2.2, Long-term Impacts, Fish Passage Improvements, but are generally considered to be beneficial overall.

As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, efforts to characterize the impacts of the managed flows on fish species are ongoing. Continued coordination on the development of the Icicle Strategy along with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would help to address potential impacts on special-status species as noted in Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures.

## **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

The implementation of the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project for the City of Leavenworth and rural users in the Icicle Creek Subbasin would not have a direct impact on fish populations or aquatic resources within Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River. Water made available through domestic conservation upgrades would go to new domestic uses. This increased efficiency could reduce return flows from the City of Leavenworth, which would decrease flows in the Wenatchee River downstream of the Leavenworth Wastewater Treatment Plant. However, this decreased flow is expected to be minimal.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

This project would result in the restoration of Eightmile Lake Dam to allow for storage of water in Eightmile Lake to the original spillway elevation (4,671 feet) and construction of an inflow pipeline that would facilitate draw down of the lake. These changes would provide the ability to store and release more water, consistent with historical operations at the lake and the volume allowed by the IPID water right (2,500 acre-feet). While the changes in the maximum lake level would be consistent with historical operations, this would represent a change compared to existing conditions as discussed further below. Over the long term, the greatest potential for impacts affecting fish and aquatic invertebrates would be related to the relative changes in lake levels and the resulting changes in flows in lower Icicle Creek.

With this project, the lake would be able to reach the restored height of 4,671 feet, allowing for 4 additional feet of storage compared to existing conditions. This means the surface area of the lake would be restored to cover approximately 3.6 additional acres, which would last for about 1 month in the early summer before IPID begins to draw down the lake. Under this project, the lake would also be able to be drawn down by an additional 22.4 feet compared to current operations, occurring in the late summer or early fall before natural precipitation and runoff begin to recharge the lake.

Compared with existing conditions, re-operation of the lake area would result in an increase in habitat for resident fish in the early summer and a decrease in late summer. The extent of the decrease in aquatic habitat would depend on how far the lake is drawn down each year.

During draw down, shallow water areas would become disconnected from shorelines that have more vegetation and wood accumulation. This would reduce the area available for cover and foraging, although deeper water refugia towards the center of the lake would remain. As noted previously, productivity of the Alpine Lakes is low and the ability to support existing fish populations is also likely to be low. Over time, reductions in habitat area could further reduce the capacity of the lakes to support existing trout populations.

Restoration of the dam would also result in the ability to release up to 9.5 additional cfs from the lake relative to existing conditions. Increased flows would be released from the dam into Eightmile Creek, which flows into Icicle Creek. Increased flows would occur from the point of release at Eightmile Lake Dam down to the IPID diversion at RM 5.7.

The potential impacts associated with increased flows would generally be beneficial with respect to fish and aquatic invertebrates. The benefits are mainly associated with increasing aquatic habitat in lower Icicle Creek in the later summer months and improving fish passage to the upper reaches (above the Boulder Field at RM 5.6) of Icicle Creek and its tributaries.

Rearing juvenile steelhead have been chosen to generally represent how flow changes are expected to affect aquatic habitat mainly because this species is present year-round when

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

others are not and juvenile rainbow trout or steelhead have been observed in all reaches of Icicle Creek. Assuming that a full 12.6 cfs is achieved in late summer, the WUA per 1,000 linear feet of stream could increase by as much as 9 percent for juvenile steelhead in the historical channel. Specific changes in availability of habitat resulting from this project would vary depending on the species, the month of the year, general flow conditions, and the affected stream reach; however, in general, increased flow in the later summer would correspond to increased habitat.

Elevated flows in Icicle Creek are also expected to improve fish passage through obstructions in Icicle Creek during late summer and fall, particularly benefiting anadromous and migratory salmon, steelhead, and bull trout by allowing access to high-quality habitat in the upper reaches of Icicle Creek. Potential impacts associated with improved fish passage can result in increased genetic mixing and increased competition between different species or distinct populations of the same species. These impacts are described in greater detail under Section 4.7.2.2, Long-term Impacts, Fish Passage Improvements; however, improving fish passage is generally considered to be beneficial overall.

There remains uncertainty around how the proposed patterns of release would affect resident fish in receiving tributaries immediately downstream of the lakes but upstream of Icicle Creek. Compared to existing conditions, all of these streams would receive water released from the lakes each year instead of every few years; however, the releases would likely be more intermittent compared to a steady release.

Increasing instream flows in downstream tributaries, including Icicle Creek, over the summer and fall could also alter the hydrology in areas in which upstream-migrating salmon currently tend to gather, which may alter the distribution pattern of fish and affect fishing opportunities on a localized basis. There is uncertainty at this time whether increasing instream flow would cause fish to distribute themselves more broadly or in different areas than they currently do. Potential impacts would be addressed in part by efforts to be completed under the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project as described in greater detail in Chapter 2.

As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, the Guiding Principles require flows to be managed to benefit aquatic species and minimize adverse impacts. An example of a strategy under consideration is prioritizing the timing of releases relative to potential impacts on downstream aquatic habitat. Continued coordination on the development of the Icicle Strategy along with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would help to address potential impacts on special-status species as noted in Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The intent of the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project is to ensure that other projects implemented as part of the Icicle Strategy do not have negative effects on tribal fisheries and tribal treaty and federally protected harvest rights. As noted in Section 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest, tribal harvest targets unlisted Carson-stock spring-run Chinook salmon and coho salmon (*O. kisutch*) returning to LNFH, with Usual and Accustomed fishing areas adjacent to and downstream of LNFH. Currently, the plunge pool immediately downstream of the LNFH Hatchery Channel spillway is a popular harvest area where fish returning to LNFH tend to collect. Hatchery-reared salmon find refuge in the deep scour pool and turbulent conditions created by large volumes of water spilling out of the Hatchery Channel.

Over the long term, this project would result in long-term benefits to fish and fish habitat that are primarily related to restoration actions to ensure that overall fish populations or fishing conditions are not adversely affected by the Icicle Strategy. These improvements are likely to increase the useable area for all fishes in the affected areas, improving conditions for LNFH-reared salmon that are targeted in fisheries, as well as leading to increases in the numbers of other native fish.

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

As noted previously, this project is intended to result in long-term improvements in habitat and ecosystem functions and values that would be beneficial to fish and aquatic invertebrates. As noted above, any work within sensitive areas would require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts, such as compensating for the permanent loss of any sensitive areas (Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures). These requirements would be developed once project-specific details are available.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

Under the Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project, the Icicle Creek Reserve established under Chapter 173-545 WAC would be increased by 0.4 cfs. Over the long term, this amendment would ultimately result in the removal of 0.4 cfs from Icicle Creek annually, which could adversely affect water quantity and quality in portions of Icicle Creek and thus could adversely affect dependent fish and aquatic invertebrates. No instream flow reduction would occur in the Wenatchee River because this project would move 0.4 cfs out of the Wenatchee River Reserve.

Potential impacts associated with the Instream Flow Rule Amendment are anticipated to be offset by the implementation of required instream flow and habitat restoration actions under this Program Alternative, as well as several other projects associated with Alternative 1.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

Over the long term, LNFH Conservation and Water Quality improvements are intended to benefit fish reared at LNFH and resident fish that use Icicle Creek. A BiOp was issued by NMFS in 2015 and included recommendations that would improve the sustainability of LNFH to support production of spring-run Chinook salmon and protect wild salmon

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

and trout listed under the ESA, including Wenatchee stock spring-run Chinook salmon, Wenatchee stock summer-run steelhead, and bull trout. This project would bring LNFH in compliance with guidelines established in the 2015 BiOp to protect wild and hatchery fish in Icicle Creek. These improvements would likely occur under the No-action Alternative; however, inclusion of this project within the Icicle Strategy would allow for coordination of LNFH projects with other IWG projects, maximizing and potentially expediting the benefits for fish in Icicle Creek.

Salmon reared in the LNFH would benefit from more reliable operations and upgraded facilities. Resident and migratory fish that use Icicle Creek would experience habitat benefits related to improvements in water quality from effluent treatment actions and inwater quantity from water use efficiency actions.

It is estimated that water use efficiency improvements could conserve up to 20 cfs depending on the specific measures put in place. The amount conserved would remain in Icicle Creek and would contribute to increased instream flows between the LNFH diversion at RM 4.5 and the hatchery water return at RM 2.5.

Fish and aquatic invertebrates would generally benefit from these increases. Major focal fish that would be affected include adult steelhead spawning, adult and juvenile steelhead migration, bull trout migration, and lamprey migration. The historical channel may provide some incubation and rearing to steelhead; however, these activities are less common under the current condition. Other fish uses that could be affected after flow is increased in the historical channel are bull trout rearing; rainbow trout rearing; coho spawning; and spring-run Chinook salmon, summer-run Chinook salmon, mountain whitefish (*Prosopium williamsoni*), largescale sucker (*Catostomus macrocheilus*), and bridgelip sucker (*C. columbianus*) spawning and rearing. Specific changes in habitat resulting from this project would vary depending on the species, the month of the year, general flow conditions, and the affected stream reach; however, in general, increased flow in the later summer would correspond to increased habitat.

Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by the USFWS, an evaluation of the potential impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined. Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would further address any potentially significant impacts on fish and aquatic invertebrates. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, which could include measures such as implementing construction timing restrictions and no net loss of ecological functions and values (Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

Although the details of the Fish Passage Improvements Project are not yet determined, in general, the intent is to improve fish passage to the upper reaches of Icicle Creek. As noted in Section 3.7, Fish, while fish passage above LNFH does occur under some flow conditions, it is generally considered to be limited, particularly above the Boulder Field at RM 5.6. Currently, low numbers of anadromous steelhead and Chinook salmon can pass

through the Boulder Field; biologists recently observed two redds, and one juvenile anadromous Chinook salmon was observed upstream of the Boulder Field (WDFW, 2016). It is unlikely that coho salmon (*O. kisutch*) can ascend the Boulder Field.

Opening a large area (over 20 miles) of relatively high quality habitat upstream of these barriers is expected to result in overall benefits to native stocks of anadromous fish, including ESA-listed upper Columbia spring-run Chinook, upper Columbia summer-run steelhead, as well as unlisted summer-run Chinook and reintroduced coho salmon. The upper Icicle Creek is relatively productive. For example, the habitat supports approximately 480 resident rainbow trout per kilometer that are between 4 to 12 inches in size that grow well as juveniles (Gayeski, 2015). These observations and modeled habitat potential suggest that improving passage in upper and lower Icicle Creek would greatly increase the capacity of habitat to sustain greater numbers of anadromous fish and generally contribute to an increase in these populations.

In addition, anadromous adults returning farther upstream from the ocean would spawn, die, and decay in the upper watershed where they were previously not able to reach in large numbers. They would bring large amounts of marine-derived nutrients to this area, generally providing benefits that have been absent from this system. The delivery of marine-derived nutrients by salmon carcasses is a natural process that supports food-webs and enhances riparian forest growth in Pacific Northwest streams. However, this process would also increase the potential for water-borne pathogens to be brought upstream by spawning salmon and steelhead. Diseases transmitted by these fish could negatively affect other resident salmonids, including rainbow trout, westslope cuthroat trout (*O. clarki lewisi*), and bull trout, as well as fish at the LNFH.

If productivity in these upper reaches is limited by suitable spawning and rearing habitats, nutrients, and food availability, competition between anadromous and resident fish for resources may reduce productivity for resident populations, including rainbow trout and bull trout, while increasing productivity of anadromous stocks. In addition, large subadult and adult bull trout are known to be effective predators on juvenile fish. More abundant anadromous juvenile salmon and steelhead may benefit the bull trout that prey on them, but anadromous stocks attempting to recolonize the upper watershed may be limited by the resident bull trout population.

Mixing of resident fish with anadromous fish may also contribute to some hybridization. It is possible that previously isolated rainbow trout could spawn with migratory steelhead, changing the genetic makeup of *O. mykiss* groups in the upper watershed. Whether a change in genetic diversity would ultimately benefit *O. mykiss* or reduce their ability to adapt to diverse conditions in the upper watershed is unknown.

Depending on how Structures 2 and 5 near LNFH are operated, there is a potential for fish passage improvements at LNFH to adversely affect fish distribution that supports fishing, particularly tribal fishing that occurs at the LNFH plunge pool. This could occur because, depending on the timing of how fish passage near LNFH is managed, some additional fish

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

could be allowed or encouraged to move into the historical channel away from the plunge pool. There are also concerns that changing flows as the result of changes in operation of Structure 2 may result in conditions where fish are no longer attracted to or congregate in the plunge pool.

Currently, passage through Structure 5 is limited in spring and early summer during periods of broodstock collection (mid-May through June) to capture and prevent passage of hatchery fish to areas farther upstream. If Structure 5 is opened after broodstock collection goals are met to improve overall fish passage, some later-arriving LNFH spring-run Chinook salmon may stray into the historical channel and into the upstream reaches, away from typical tribal harvest areas. USFWS coordinates with WDFW, NMFS, the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation on the timing of the adjustments for broodstock collection to minimize potential impacts on tribal fishing. This would continue as part of the development of this project.

In addition, if adjustments are made at Structure 2 to redirect flows into the historical channel to restore habitat for fish, the resulting reduction in flow to the Hatchery Channel may reduce attraction flow to the plunge pool near the hatchery ladder compared to the existing operations. However, recently, when no adjustments were made to divert water to the Hatchery Channel at Structure 2, no significant straying of hatchery origin spring-run Chinook salmon into the historical channel was observed and no noticeable loss of fishing opportunities was observed (Anglin, 2013). Implementation of activities as part of the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project would further help to ensure there are no significant impacts on tribal fishing.

As noted previously, this project would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations, including CWA and ESA compliance. If needed, additional mitigation measures would be developed during project-level permitting to minimize potentially significant adverse impacts as discussed in Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project involves replacing fish screens at three different diversions on lower Icicle Creek: LNFH/COIC, the City of Leavenworth, and IPID. Under this project, screens and associated infrastructure would be improved to bring all three intakes up to compliance with state and federal laws.

Improvements to fish screens are intended to provide a long-term benefit to fish. Under existing conditions, juvenile steelhead, rainbow trout, and bull trout have been entrained at these locations. For example, from 2009 and 2013, the number of *O. mykiss* removed from the LNFH water intake system ranged from 30 to 63 per year (excluding winter and spring months because of ice and debris buildup) (Hall et al., 2014). From 2005 to 2013, a total of 31 subadult bull trout or bull trout/brook trout hybrids were entrained and sampled for genetic analysis. With this project, these impacts would be reduced and would likely benefit other native aquatic species that could become entrained.

#### Water Markets

The implementation of Water Markets would not have a direct impact on fish populations or aquatic resources within Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River. Fish may benefit indirectly over time from more efficient allocation and better reliability of the water supply for agricultural uses and allowing for the protection of instream flows for fish.

# 4.7.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would also be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation project would not. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. Other projects proposed under this Alternative are discussed under Alternative 1. In addition, consistent with the Guiding Principles, the selection of projects under this Program Alternative would seek to meet minimum instream flow targets and generally improve aquatic habitat.

## 4.7.3.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

Construction activities associated with this project include construction of new IPID Dryden Pump Exchange facilities. Short-term impacts that could adversely affect fish and aquatic invertebrates include direct disturbance associated with work near or in water and any associated temporary impacts on aquatic habitat.

Construction of these facilities would require in-water work along the Wenatchee River, which has the potential to adversely affect fish and aquatic invertebrates. Potential short-term impacts would occur mainly as a result of work in or within close proximity to water. Potential impacts include increased risk of disturbance or harm from construction activities, including exclusion of these species from in-water work areas, increased potential for harm from noise and vibration, increased risks of water quality impacts adversely affecting aquatic habitat, and temporary loss of aquatic habitat during dewatering for in-water construction. Depending on the location and extent of these activities and the number and type of fish or aquatic invertebrates likely to be affected, short-term impacts could be significant.

Work within waters of the United States or State, which includes the Wenatchee River, would require a CWA Section 404 Permit and associated Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures could include limiting in-water work, excluding aquatic species from in-water work areas, and implementing construction timing restrictions (Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures.

## 4.7.3.2 Long-term Impacts

## **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would create a permanent change in the nearfield hydraulics and levels of noise and vibration on the Wenatchee River, depending on where the pump station is located. In addition, the new facilities would result in the loss of some riparian vegetation. However, as noted above, compliance with applicable regulations would minimize the potential impacts on habitat and ecosystem functions and values associated with siting and operating the proposed facilities. This would help to reduce potential adverse impacts on fish and aquatic invertebrates in the long term.

Generally speaking, the overall impacts associated with this project are expected to be beneficial because instream flows would increase between the current IPID diversion (RM 5.7) and the new pump station location on the Wenatchee River. The benefit could be as much as 25 cfs in the late summer compared to the existing condition.

This project is intended to benefit all fish in Icicle Creek, including ESA-listed spring-run Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout, by replacing diversions from Icicle Creek with water pumped to irrigation canals from the Wenatchee River. Increased flows in Icicle Creek would likely improve fish passage through obstructions in Icicle Creek during summer, particularly benefiting anadromous and migratory salmon, steelhead, and bull trout by allowing access to high-quality habitat in the upper reaches of Icicle Creek.

Rearing juvenile steelhead have been chosen to generally represent how flow changes are expected to affect aquatic habitat mainly because this species is present year-round when others are not. Assuming that a full 25 cfs is achieved in late summer, the WUA per 1,000 linear feet of stream could increase by approximately 29 percent in the historical channel. Specific changes in habitat resulting from this project would vary depending on the species, the month of the year, general flow conditions, and the affected stream reach; however, in general, increased flow in the later summer would correspond to increased habitat.

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would also allow more water to remain in Peshastin Creek, which is a smaller tributary to the Wenatchee River where late summer low flows impact fish passage and habitat below the PID Diversion below RM 2.4. The project would benefit native fish in Peshastin Creek with relatively small additional adverse impact to fish in the Wenatchee River.

Elevated flows in Icicle Creek are also expected to improve fish passage through obstructions in Icicle Creek during summer, particularly benefiting anadromous and migratory salmon, steelhead, and bull trout by allowing access to high-quality habitat in the upper reaches of Icicle Creek. Potential impacts associated with improved fish passage could result in increased genetic mixing and increased competition between different species or distinct populations of the same species. These impacts are described in greater detail under Section 4.7.2.2, Long-term Impacts, Fish Passage Improvements, but are generally considered to be beneficial overall.

As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, efforts to characterize the impacts of the managed flows on fish species are ongoing. Continued coordination on the development of the Icicle Strategy along with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would help to address potential impacts on special-status species as noted in Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures.

# 4.7.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 2 with the exception that the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project would also be included while the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would not. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the legislative change project. Other proposed projects under Alternative 3 can be reviewed in Alternative 1 and Alternative 2. Consistent with the Guiding Principles, the selection of projects under this Program Alternative would seek to meet minimum instream flow targets and generally improve aquatic habitat.

## 4.7.4.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on fish or aquatic invertebrates.

## 4.7.4.2 Long-term Impacts

## Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

If the proposed Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority Project were enacted to allow impacts on the Instream Flow Rule when out-of-time mitigation where not available, there could be potential conflicts with instream flow allocations that could adversely affect fish and aquatic invertebrates. Under the proposed changes, junior domestic water rights could be exercised even when the Instream Flow Rule is not met, resulting in potential adverse impacts on riparian vegetation and any associated wetlands because of low-flow conditions.

# 4.7.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1. The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would be replaced with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project. The Upper Klonaqua and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would also be included. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with these projects compared to Alternative 1 and the No-action Alternative. In addition, consistent with the

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Guiding Principles, the selection of projects under this Program Alternative would seek to meet minimum instream flow targets and generally improve aquatic habitat.

## 4.7.5.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

As noted previously, there are no native populations of fish in the Alpine Lakes; however, some remnant fish associated with past recreational stocking activities remain, most likely cutthroat trout, rainbow trout, and lake trout. Construction activities have the potential to adversely affect these species, depending on the extent of the activity.

Construction activities would occur primarily in the dry lake margins in the later summer when the lake is drawn down. As discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, construction is not anticipated to result in significant water quality impacts and would therefore not be expected to adversely affect fish or aquatic invertebrates. However, construction activities would result in increased noise that could affect these species, depending on the type of activity and whether these species were located in close proximity.

As noted in Section 4.14, Noise, the majority of construction activities would result in relatively minor noise increases and normal fish behavior such as foraging or use of refuge areas within the lakes is not likely to be adversely affected because fish would be able to move to other areas of the lake during construction. However, construction could involve some blasting. Blasting can directly harm fish and aquatic invertebrates from increased noise and vibration. Depending on the species that may be within close proximity when blasting occurs, there is a potential for those species to be affected.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures may include limiting in-water work, excluding aquatic species from in-water work areas, and implementing construction timing restrictions (Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

The potential impacts on fish and aquatic invertebrates during construction would be similar to those that would occur related to the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (Section 4.7.5.1, Short-term Impacts). As noted previously, there are no native populations of fish in the Alpine Lakes; however, some remnant fish associated with past recreational stocking activities remain, most likely cutthroat trout, rainbow trout, and lake trout. Construction activities have the potential to adversely affect these species, depending on the extent of the activity.

Construction activities would occur primarily in the dry lake margins in the later summer when the lake is drawn down. As discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, construction is not anticipated to result in significant water quality impacts and would therefore not be expected to adversely affect fish or aquatic invertebrates. However, construction activities would result in increased noise that could affect these species, depending on the type of activity and whether these species were located in close proximity.

As noted in Section 4.14, Noise, the majority of construction activities would result in relatively minor noise increases and normal fish behavior such as foraging or use of refuge areas within the lakes is not likely to be adversely affected because fish would be able to move to other areas of the lake. However, construction could involve some blasting. Blasting can directly harm fish and aquatic invertebrates from increased noise and vibration. Depending on the species that may be within close proximity when blasting occurs, there is a potential for those species to be affected.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures may include limiting in-water work, excluding aquatic species from in-water work areas, and implementing construction timing restrictions (Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

The potential impacts on fish and aquatic invertebrates during construction would be similar to those that would occur related to the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (Section 4.7.5.1, Short-term Impacts). There would be limited in-water work and no permanent loss of aquatic habitat.

Construction activities would occur primarily in the dry lake margins in the later summer when the lake is drawn down. As discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, potential shortterm impacts on water quality would not be significant and are not expected to adversely affect fish or aquatic invertebrates in the short term. However, construction activities would also result in increased noise that could adversely affect fish and other aquatic species.

As noted in Section 4.14, Noise, the majority of construction activities would result in relatively minor noise increases and normal fish behavior such as foraging or use of refuge areas within the lakes is not likely to be adversely affected because fish would be able to move to other areas of the lake during construction. Construction could involve some blasting. Blasting can directly harm fish and aquatic invertebrates from increased noise and vibration. Depending on the species that may be within close proximity when blasting occurs, there is a potential for those species to be affected.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures could include limiting in-water work, excluding aquatic species from in-water work areas, and implementing construction timing restrictions (Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures).

## 4.7.5.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would involve demolition of the existing structure and construction of a taller dam at Eightmile Lake (spillway elevation of 4,682 feet), and construction of an inflow pipeline that would facilitate draw down of the lake. These changes would provide the ability to store and release more water (up to 3,500 acre-feet), which would represent an increase over the historical operation and the volume currently allowed by the IPID water right (up to 2,500 acre-feet). It would also represent a change compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative as discussed further below. Over the long term, the greatest potential for impacts affecting fish and aquatic invertebrates would be related to the relative changes in lake levels and the resulting changes in flows in lower Icicle Creek.

Under this project, the lake would be able to reach a new maximum height of 4,682 feet for 11 additional feet of storage compared to existing conditions. This means the surface area of the lake would be restored to cover approximately 13.6 additional acres, which would last for about 1 month in the early summer before IPID begins to draw down the lake. Under this project the lake would also be able to be drawn down by an additional 24.4 feet, occurring in the late summer or early fall before natural precipitation began to recharge the lake.

Compared with existing conditions, re-operation of the lake area would result in an increase in habitat for resident fish in the early summer and a decrease in late summer. The extent of the decrease in aquatic habitat would depend on how far the lake is drawn down each year.

During draw down, shallow water areas would become disconnected from shorelines that have more vegetation and wood accumulation. This would reduce the area available for cover and foraging, although deeper water refugia toward the center of the lake would remain. As noted previously, productivity of the Alpine Lakes is low and the ability to support existing fish populations is also likely to be low. Over time, reductions in habitat area could further reduce the capacity of lakes to support existing trout populations.

Restoration of the dam would also result in the ability to release up to an additional 17.9 cfs from the lake relative to existing conditions. Increased flows would be released from the dam into Eightmile Creek, which flows into Icicle Creek. Increased flows would occur from the point of release at Eightmile Lake Dam down to the IPID diversion at RM 5.7.

The potential impacts associated with increased flows would generally be beneficial with respect to fish and aquatic invertebrates. The benefits are mainly associated with increasing aquatic habitat in lower Icicle Creek in the later summer months and improving fish passage to the upper reaches (above the Boulder Field at RM 5.6) of Icicle Creek and its tributaries.

Specific changes in habitat resulting from this project would vary depending on the species, the month of the year, general flow conditions, and the affected stream reach; however, in general, increased flow in the later summer would correspond to increased aquatic habitat.

Elevated flows in Icicle Creek are also expected to improve fish passage through obstructions in Icicle Creek during late summer and fall, particularly benefiting anadromous and migratory salmon, steelhead, and bull trout by allowing access to high-quality habitat in the upper reaches of Icicle Creek. Potential impacts associated with improved fish passage can result in increased genetic mixing and increased competition between different species or distinct populations of the same species. These impacts are described in greater detail under Section 4.7.2.2, Long-term Impacts, Fish Passage Improvements; however, improving fish passage is generally considered to be beneficial overall.

There remains uncertainty around how the proposed patterns of release would affect resident fish in receiving tributaries immediately downstream of the lakes but upstream of Icicle Creek. Compared to existing conditions, all of these streams would receive water released from the lakes each year instead of every few years; however, the releases would likely be more intermittent compared to a steady release.

Increasing instream flows in downstream tributaries, including Icicle Creek, over the summer and fall could also alter the hydrology in areas in which upstream-migrating salmon currently tend to gather, which could alter the distribution pattern of fish and affect fishing opportunities on a localized basis. There is uncertainty at this time whether increasing instream flow would cause fish to distribute themselves more broadly or in different areas than they currently do. Potential impacts would be addressed in part by efforts to be completed under the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project as described in greater detail in Chapter 2.

As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, the Guiding Principles require flows to be managed to benefit aquatic species and minimize adverse impacts. An example of a strategy under consideration is prioritizing the timing of releases relative to potential impacts on downstream aquatic habitat. Continued coordination on the development of the Icicle Strategy along with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would help to address potential impacts on special-status species as noted in Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would result in similar longterm impacts on fish and aquatic invertebrate as the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (4.7.5.2, Long-term Impacts). This would provide the ability to store and release additional flows from Upper Klonaqua Lake, which would represent a change compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative as discussed further below. Over the long term, the greatest potential for impacts affecting fish and

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

aquatic invertebrates would be related to the relative changes in lake levels and the resulting changes in flows in lower Icicle Creek.

The new high lake level in Upper Klonaqua Lake would not change. The lake would still refill and outlet naturally through an existing channel to Lower Klonaqua Lake during most of the year. However, the new facilities would allow for the lake to be drawn down an additional 20 feet to allow for access to an additional 1,146 acre-feet of storage. The draw down would likely occur over a couple of months in the late summer.

Compared with existing conditions, this project would result in an increase in habitat for any resident fish in the Upper Lake in the early summer and a decrease in late summer. The extent of the decrease in aquatic habitat would depend on how far the lake is drawn down each year.

During draw down, shallow water areas would become disconnected from shorelines that have more vegetation and wood accumulation. This would reduce the area available for cover and foraging, although deeper water refugia towards the center of the lake would remain. As noted previously, productivity of the Alpine Lakes is low and the ability to support existing fish populations is also likely to be low. Over time, reductions in habitat area could further reduce the capacity of the lakes to support existing trout populations.

Modifications at Upper Klonaqua Lake would also result in the ability to release up to an additional 5 to 20 cfs from the lake. Increased flows would be released from the dam into downstream tributaries, which flow into Icicle Creek. Increased flows would occur from the point of release at Klonaqua Dam down to the IPID diversion at RM 5.7.

The potential impacts associated with increased flows would generally be beneficial with respect to fish and aquatic invertebrates. The benefits are mainly associated with increasing aquatic habitat in lower Icicle Creek in the later summer months and improving fish passage to the upper reaches (above the Boulder Field at RM 5.6) of Icicle Creek and its tributaries.

Specific changes in habitat resulting from this project would vary depending on the species, the month of the year, general flow conditions, and the affected stream reach; however, in general, increased flow in the later summer would correspond to increased aquatic habitat.

Elevated flows in Icicle Creek are also expected to improve fish passage through obstructions in Icicle Creek during late summer and fall, particularly benefiting anadromous and migratory salmon, steelhead, and bull trout by allowing access to high-quality habitat in the upper reaches of Icicle Creek. Potential impacts associated with improved fish passage can result in increased genetic mixing and increased competition between different species or distinct populations of the same species. These impacts are described in greater detail under Section 4.7.2.2, Long-term Impacts, Fish Passage Improvements; however, improving fish passage is generally considered to be beneficial overall.

There remains uncertainty around how the proposed patterns of release would affect resident fish in receiving tributaries immediately downstream of the lakes but upstream of Icicle Creek. Compared to existing conditions, all of these streams would receive water released from the lakes each year instead of every few years; however, the releases would likely be more intermittent compared to a steady release.

Increasing instream flows in downstream tributaries, including Icicle Creek, over the summer and fall could also alter the hydrology in areas in which upstream-migrating salmon currently tend to gather, which could alter the distribution pattern of fish and affect fishing opportunities on a localized basis. There is uncertainty at this time whether increasing instream flow would cause fish to distribute themselves more broadly or in different areas than they currently do. Potential impacts would be addressed in part by efforts to be completed under the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project as described in greater detail in Chapter 2.

As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, the Guiding Principles require flows to be managed to benefit aquatic species and minimize adverse impacts. An example of a strategy under consideration is prioritizing the timing of releases relative to potential impacts on downstream aquatic habitat. Continued coordination on the development of the Icicle Strategy along with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would help to address potential impacts on special-status species as noted in Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

The Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would result in similar long-term impacts on fish and aquatic invertebrates as the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (4.7.5.2, Long-term Impacts). This project would provide the ability to store and release additional flows at the lake, which would represent a change compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative as discussed further below. Over the long term, the greatest potential for impacts affecting fish and aquatic invertebrates would be related to the relative changes in lake levels and the resulting changes in flows in lower Icicle Creek.

The proposed enhancement project would increase the high-water storage levels in both Upper and Lower Snow Lakes by 5 feet compared with existing high levels. This change would result in the inundation of some upland vegetation that has grown along the shoreline areas between the current and proposed high lake levels, and would most likely occur in the fall through the early summer when releases would be likely to begin. The project would also allow for the Lower Snow Lake to be drawn down 3 feet below the current lake level, which would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed.

Compared with existing conditions, this project would result in an increase in habitat for resident fish in the early summer and a decrease in late summer. The extent of the decrease in aquatic habitat would depend on how far the lake is drawn down each year.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

During draw down, shallow water areas would become disconnected from shorelines that have more vegetation and wood accumulation. This would reduce the area available for cover and foraging, although deeper water refugia towards the center of the lake would remain. As noted previously, productivity of the Alpine Lakes is low and the ability to support existing fish populations is also likely to be low. Over time, reductions in habitat area could further reduce the capacity of lakes to support existing trout populations.

Restoration of the dams at Upper and Lower Snow Lakes would result in the ability to release up to an additional 9 to 18 cfs from the lake. Increased flows would be released from the Lower Snow Lake Dam or from the Upper Snow Lake release valve through Nada Lake to Snow Creek, which flows into Icicle Creek. Increased flows would occur from the point of release down to the IPID diversion at RM 5.7.

The potential impacts associated with increased flows would generally be beneficial with respect to fish and aquatic invertebrates. The benefits are mainly associated with increasing aquatic habitat in lower Icicle Creek in the later summer months and improving fish passage to the upper reaches (above the Boulder Field at RM 5.6) of Icicle Creek and its tributaries.

Specific changes in habitat resulting from this project would vary depending on the species, the month of the year, general flow conditions, and the affected stream reach; however, in general, increased flow in the late summer would correspond to increased aquatic habitat.

Elevated flows in Icicle Creek are also expected to improve fish passage through obstructions in Icicle Creek during late summer and fall, particularly benefiting anadromous and migratory salmon, steelhead, and bull trout by allowing access to high-quality habitat in the upper reaches of Icicle Creek. Potential impacts associated with improved fish passage can result in increased genetic mixing and increased competition between different species or distinct populations of the same species. These impacts are described in greater detail under Section 4.7.2.2, Long-term Impacts, Fish Passage Improvements; however, improving fish passage is generally considered to be beneficial overall.

There remains uncertainty around how the proposed patterns of release would affect resident fish in receiving tributaries immediately downstream of the lakes but upstream of Icicle Creek. Compared to existing conditions, all of these streams would receive water released from the lakes each year instead of every few years; however, the releases would likely be more intermittent compared to a steady release.

Increasing instream flows in downstream tributaries, including Icicle Creek, over the summer and fall could also alter the hydrology in areas in which upstream-migrating salmon currently tend to gather, which may alter the distribution pattern of fish and affect fishing opportunities on a localized basis. There is uncertainty at this time whether increasing instream flow would cause fish to distribute themselves more broadly or in different areas than they currently do. Potential impacts would be addressed in part by
efforts to be completed under the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project as described in greater detail in Chapter 2.

As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, the Guiding Principles require flows to be managed to benefit aquatic species and minimize adverse impacts. An example of a strategy under consideration is prioritizing the timing of releases relative to potential impacts on downstream aquatic habitat. Continued coordination on the development of the Icicle Strategy along with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would help to address potential impacts on special-status species as noted in Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures.

# 4.7.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of the same projects as Alternative 1 except instead of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies, the IPID Full Piping and Pump Station Project would be included.

# 4.7.6.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project**

This IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project would involve fully converting the IPID delivery systems to pressurized pipelines, removing or abandoning the existing intakes on Icicle and Peshastin Creeks, and constructing three new pump stations and screened intakes on the Wenatchee River. Short-term impacts that could adversely affect fish and aquatic invertebrates include direct disturbance associated with work near or in water and any associated temporary impacts on aquatic habitat.

Work affecting the delivery system is unlikely to adversely affect fish because it would be done in the dry during the off-season when the irrigation canals are dry, and away from where these species may be found. As noted in Section 4.5, Water Quality, there would also be relatively limited potential for water quality impacts that could adversely affect aquatic habitat related to these activities.

Removal of the existing intake structures and construction of the pump stations and new intakes would require in-water work along lower Icicle and Peshastin Creeks and the Wenatchee River. These activities have a higher potential to adversely affect fish and aquatic invertebrates. Potential impacts associated with intake removal could include increased risk of disturbance, depending on the type of equipment and extent of the work along the shoreline or within the creeks. Construction of the new pump stations and associated facilities could also result in increased risk of disturbance or harm from construction activities such as from installation of a cofferdam, increased potential for harm from noise and vibration, increased risks of water quality impacts adversely affecting aquatic habitat, and temporary loss of aquatic habitat during dewatering for in water construction. Depending on the location and extent of these activities and the

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

number and type of fish or aquatic invertebrates likely to be affected, short-term impacts could be significant.

Work within waters of the United States or State of Washington or within irrigation canals or spillways that reconnect to these waters would require a CWA Section 404 Permit and associated Section 401 Water Quality Certification; work in other portions of the irrigation system could require local review and authorization.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures may include limiting in-water work, excluding aquatic species from in-water work areas, and implementing construction timing restrictions (Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures).

# 4.7.6.2 Long-term Impacts

### IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project

Under this project, installing pipelines would occur in areas that have already been developed with irrigation infrastructure and would not result in long-term adverse impacts on fish from operation and maintenance activities. However, the new pump stations and associated facilities would create a permanent change in the near-field hydraulics and levels of vibration on the Wenatchee River at the three proposed locations. In addition, the new facilities would result in limited loss of riparian vegetation.

Generally speaking, the overall impacts associated with this project are expected to be beneficial because instream flows would increase between the current IPID diversion (RM 5.7) and the new pump station locations on the Wenatchee River. The benefit could be as much as 117 cfs in the late summer compared to the existing condition.

This project is intended to benefit all fish in Icicle Creek, including ESA-listed spring-run Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout, by replacing diversions from Icicle Creek with water pumped to irrigation canals from the Wenatchee River. Increased flows in Icicle Creek would likely improve fish passage through obstructions in Icicle Creek during summer, particularly benefiting anadromous and migratory salmon, steelhead, and bull trout by allowing access to high-quality habitat in the upper reaches of Icicle Creek.

Rearing juvenile steelhead have been chosen to generally represent how flow changes are expected to affect aquatic habitat mainly because this species is present year-round when others are not. Assuming that a full 117 cfs is achieved in late summer, the WUA per 1,000 linear feet of stream could increase by approximately 32-percentpercentfor juvenile steelhead rearing in the historical channel. Specific changes in habitat resulting from this project would vary depending on the species, the month of the year, general flow conditions, and the affected stream reach; however, in general, increased flow in the later summer would correspond to increased habitat.

The IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would also allow more water to remain in Peshastin Creek, which is a smaller tributary to the Wenatchee River where late summer low flows impact fish passage and habitat below the PID Diversion below RM 2.4. The project would benefit native fish in Peshastin Creek with relatively small additional adverse impact to fish in the Wenatchee River.

As noted in Section 4.8, Vegetation, compliance with applicable regulations would minimize the potential impacts on habitat and ecosystem functions and values associated with siting and operating the proposed facilities and would help reduce potential adverse impacts on fish and aquatic invertebrates. Overall, the new facilities are anticipated to represent a net benefit over the current facilities because they would be designed according to the current NMFS guidelines to ensure fish-friendly irrigation diversion operations, for example by providing intake screens that would be designed to prevent entrainment of juvenile fish.

As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, efforts to characterize the impacts of the managed flows on fish species are ongoing. Continued coordination on the development of the Icicle Strategy along with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would help to address potential impacts on special-status species as noted in Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures.

# 4.7.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

# 4.7.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Short-term impacts on fish and aquatic invertebrates would be mitigated by complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal regulations and obtaining required project-specific permits and approvals, such as any Shoreline Management Act shoreline permits, Critical Areas Review, HPAs, CWA compliance, and Endangered Species Act compliance.

Common mitigation measures are likely to include pre-construction surveys, when deemed appropriate; conducting construction work in a manner to minimize disturbance of wildlife, including excluding sensitive species from work areas; ensuring no net loss of any important habitat or ecosystem functions or values; and possibly restricting the timing of some construction activities to avoid affecting particular species.

Specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting. In addition to the measures identified in Section 4.8, Vegetation, implementation of the following measures would ensure short-term impacts would be less than significant.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

• Contracts for construction projects would include language directing workers to protect fish during construction such as excluding sensitive species from work areas, rescuing entrained fish in areas that are dewatered, and working within seasonal fish windows to avoid impacts on special-status species during periods of migration, spawning, and incubation.

#### 4.7.7.2 Long-term Impacts

As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, the Guiding Principles must be met. This requires ensuring that proposed projects benefit fish and fisheries, provide adequate stream flow for fish, enhance aquatic habitat, support a sustainable LNFH, protect treaty and nontreaty harvest rights, and comply with state and federal laws, such as the ESA. Efforts are ongoing to ensure that projects implemented as part of the Icicle Strategy meet these objectives. More specifically, the following measures would help to reduce potential adverse impacts that could occur over the long term.

• Develop a long-term management plan for releases from IPID at the Alpine Lakes. To support project-level permitting and optimization planning, continue to evaluate how flow changes might affect downstream habitat of Icicle Creek and its tributaries.

Examples of measures under consideration to help minimize impacts include the following.

- Ramp down lake releases gradually toward the end of the augmentation period to avoid stranding fish.
- Limit releases from these lakes in September to avoid negatively affecting spawning bull trout.
- Minimize ice and debris build-up on fish screens at existing diversion points by sustaining or increasing the frequency of maintenance compared to current activities. Sequence projects implemented as part of the Icicle Strategy to ensure irrigation diversion screens are updated prior to improving passage for anadromous fish above hatchery barriers and the Boulder Field barrier.
- Continue monitoring and adaptive management of tribal and non-tribal fisheries to prevent overfishing and unintended adverse impacts to non-target fish species, including endangered and threatened salmon and bull trout.
- Ensure compliance with permits issued by NMFS and USFWS for the protection of endangered and threatened native salmon, steelhead, and bull trout.
- Continue monitoring and adaptive management of fish passage efficiency through Structures 2 and 5 in association with different hydraulic conditions and structure configurations.

# 4.8 Vegetation

This section describes the potential short- and long-term impacts that could affect the resources identified in Section 3.8, Vegetation, from construction and operation related to the No-action Alternative and Program Alternatives.

# 4.8.1 No-action Alternative

# 4.8.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various entities and agencies would undertake individual actions that could result in short-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area. This is anticipated to entail construction of water diversion modifications, general habitat enhancement projects, LNFH improvements, required fish screening upgrades, modernization of infrastructure at the Alpine Lakes including the restoration of the Eightmile Lake Dam, and improvements to existing irrigation systems to support agricultural reliability. Potential impacts would primarily be associated with projects that require construction and improvements to the seven Alpine Lakes. Impacts that could adversely affect vegetation and wetlands include direct disturbance from construction activity and increased potential for exposure to contaminated stormwater runoff. These impacts would be localized to specific areas of disturbance along the Wenatchee River, Icicle and Peshastin Creeks, and the seven Alpine Lakes.

The agencies or entities implementing projects under the No-action Alternative would be required to comply with applicable local, state, and federal environmental review requirements and permits as described in Section 5.2, Table 5-2. Applicable permits would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce impacts on vegetation, such as revegetation of adversely affected areas and BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion and accidental spills of construction chemicals (Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures). For instance, Chelan County Code requires riparian buffer protection and mitigation with buffer widths determined based on Environment Designation and intensity of use as shown in Table 4-2.

Environment Classification	Buffer Width	
	High Intensity (feet)	Low Intensity (feet)
Natural	250	200
Conservancy	250	200
Rural	150	100
Urban	100	75

Table 4-2
<b>Chelan County Riparian Buffer Protection and Mitigation Requirements</b>

A habitat management and mitigation plan could be required to avoid degradation of the riparian habitat function, structure, and value. Therefore, short-term impacts under the No-action Alternative are not expected to be significant.

# 4.8.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts associated with the diversion and water efficiency projects are anticipated to be largely beneficial for vegetation around Icicle and Peshastin Creeks because project elements that would be implemented would seek to improve instream flows during the late summer, which would provide a benefit to riparian vegetation. However, implementation of the Eightmile Restoration Project means that some area of vegetation around that lake would be periodically inundated more frequently. In addition, because projects would not generally be coordinated with other activities in the Icicle project area, instream flow benefits are not anticipated to be as great as they would under the other Program Alternatives. Potential long-term benefits from such projects are also expected to be more localized, providing only minor overall benefits within the larger Icicle Creek Subbasin.

# 4.8.2 Alternative 1

Implementation of Alternative 1 has the potential to result in greater impacts on vegetation compared with the No-action Alternative because there would be higher likelihood that certain projects would be implemented and the scale of certain efforts would likely be greater. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses vegetation in general by enhancing Icicle Creek aquatic and riparian habitat. The following sections describe the short- and long-term impacts that would occur under Alternative 1.

# 4.8.2.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Construction activities associated with this project would involve replacing existing gates and installing solar panels, flow monitors, and other new equipment. Most of the work would occur in upland areas. Some limited work would occur within the lake shorelines but within the dry when the lakes are drawn down at the end of the summer. Activities would have limited potential to affect surrounding vegetated or potential wetland areas.

Accessing the project sites, staging equipment, and providing for worker accommodations could temporarily disturb vegetation or wetlands mainly as the result of inadvertent trampling. Construction equipment and supplies would most likely be flown in by helicopter with the exception of possibly carrying some equipment up by hand to Eightmile Lake. Hiking would occur within existing trails and roadways and would therefore have limited potential to adversely affect adjacent vegetation or wetlands along the route. Although some small vegetated areas may be disturbed during staging of equipment and supplies, vegetation and wetland impacts would largely be avoided by limiting vegetation removal and limiting work within sensitive areas.

As noted in Section 4.5, Water Quality, construction activities would also slightly increase the potential for contaminated stormwater runoff or spills of construction chemicals that could adversely affect vegetation and wetlands. However, as discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, this risk would be very low because there would be limited use of powered equipment near water.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures could include limiting the extent of work within sensitive areas, requiring revegetation of disturbed sites, and compensating for any loss of important ecosystem functions and values (Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands would be less than significant.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Construction activities associated with the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project include the conversion of irrigation canals to pipelines, replacing or abandoning pipelines, and the lining of irrigation canals with concrete. Impacts that could adversely affect vegetation and wetlands include inadvertent trampling or disturbance during construction. Short-term impacts on vegetation would be limited because most of the work would occur within areas that are already disturbed, such as within rights-of-way and existing irrigation canal easements, and would occur during the off-season when the irrigation canals are dry. As noted in Section 4.5, Water Quality, there would also be limited potential for water quality impacts that could adversely affect vegetation or wetlands.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures could include limiting the extent of work within sensitive areas, requiring revegetation of disturbed sites, and compensating for any loss of important ecosystem functions and values (Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands would be less than significant.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Potential impacts on vegetation and wetlands associated with work affecting COIC irrigation system would be similar to those described above. Construction of the COIC pump station would also require work along the streambank of lower Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River, and depending on the location would likely result in the loss of riparian vegetation. Depending on the location and extent of these activities, there would also be a

potential for wetlands to be adversely affected. Impacts that could adversely affect vegetation and wetlands include inadvertent trampling or disturbance during construction.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures may include limiting the extent of work within sensitive areas, requiring revegetation of disturbed sites, and compensating for any loss of important ecosystem functions and values (Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands would be less than significant.

### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Construction activities proposed under the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project include pipeline replacement and meter installation. These activities are unlikely to adversely affect vegetation because the work would be done in areas that are already developed.

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project involves demolishing the existing dam, installing new piping, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures. Construction activity would occur along the banks and within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lake has been drawn down, and in Eightmile Creek immediately downstream of the dam. While most construction equipment (potentially including a small tracked excavator) and materials would likely be flown into the project site via helicopter, IPID is considering the option of walking in a larger tracked excavator or a spider excavator. The trail to access the project site requires several stream crossings and parallels several potential wetlands (Figure 3-10).

Disturbance within these areas has the potential to adversely affect vegetation and wetlands through direct impact or through increased exposure to contaminated stormwater runoff. Direct impacts could occur as the result of general construction activity resulting in clearing or trampling of vegetation during earth movement and staging of equipment and materials. There would also be minor potential for contaminated runoff to adversely affect vegetation and wetlands by increased erosion or accidental spills of chemicals, such as fuels, cement, and solvents, used during construction.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures could include limiting the extent of work within sensitive areas, requiring revegetation of disturbed sites, and compensating for any loss of important ecosystem functions and values (Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands would be less than significant.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The focus of this project is to ensure that there would be no adverse effects on tribal fishing as a result of implementing other projects as part of the overall Icicle Strategy. The specifics of this project are not yet determined, but would involve elements of restoration along the Lower Icicle Creek that could result in localized construction disturbance and removal of vegetation. At this stage, the primary options under consideration include the construction of facilities such as a bubble curtain, sprayer, or other minor modifications to the Hatchery Channel spillway at LNFH to promote favorable fishing conditions in the pool at the bottom of the spillway.

Depending on the specific location of the activities, construction would affect vegetation and any wetlands as a result of direct disturbance or through exposure to contaminated stormwater as described previously. However, project activities with the potential to affect these resources would likely require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures could include limiting the extent of work within sensitive areas, requiring revegetation of disturbed sites, and compensating for any loss of important ecosystem functions and values (Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands would be less than significant.

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

Habitat protection and enhancement proposed under this project could involve grading; planting and thinning vegetation; hauling and placing logs, rock, soil, and other materials; and some in-water work on lower Icicle Creek. These activities could affect vegetation and wetlands. Depending on the specific location of the activities, construction would affect vegetation and any wetlands as the result of direct disturbance or through exposure to contaminated stormwater as described previously. However, project activities with the potential to affect these resources would likely require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures may include limiting the extent of work within sensitive areas, requiring revegetation of disturbed sites, and compensating for any loss of important ecosystem functions and

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

values (Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands would be less than significant.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and, therefore, no potential short-term impacts on vegetation or wetlands.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

This project includes various elements geared toward improving water quality and hatchery rearing conditions at the LNFH. In general, construction of these elements has the potential to affect vegetation and wetlands, depending on the specific location and type of disturbance. Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential short-term impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined.

Similar to the construction activities described above, various authorizations are likely to be required that would ensure that potential impacts would be avoided, minimized, or compensated as noted in Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures. Therefore, short-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands from construction work are expected to be less than significant.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The Fish Passage Improvements Project would potentially involve modification of existing LNFH instream structures in Icicle Creek as well as instream modifications to the Boulder Field near RM 5.6. This work would result in disturbances along the streambank and within Icicle Creek that would be addressed in subsequent environmental review and permitting once project specifics are determined. This work would also likely require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification, which would help to further address potential impacts on vegetation and wetlands. Therefore, short-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands from construction work are expected to be less than significant.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project involves replacing fish screens at three different diversions on lower Icicle Creek: LNFH/COIC, the City of Leavenworth, and IPID. Under this project, screens and associated infrastructure would be improved to bring all three intakes up to compliance with state and federal laws. This work would result in disturbances along the streambank and within Icicle Creek that would be addressed once project specifics are determined. This work would also likely require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification, which would help to further address potential impacts on vegetation and

wetlands. Therefore, short-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands from construction work are expected to be less than significant.

#### Water Markets

There are no construction activities proposed under the Water Markets Project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on vegetation or wetlands.

## 4.8.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Under this project, the greatest potential for impacts on vegetation and wetlands over the long term could occur as the result of any disturbance during maintenance activities and any changes in operations with respect to how lake levels are managed.

Because the facilities would be newer and largely operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes, or activities needed to maintain the facilities, are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. However, this project would result in increased frequency in fluctuations in lake levels compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. This is because lake levels would be drawn down every year instead of rotating one or two lakes per year.

Although the lakes would be drawn down more frequently, the high and low lake levels would not change. The variation in lake levels would be consistent with the general pattern that currently occurs. Therefore, there would be no impacts on shoreline vegetation or wetlands.

Likewise, as discussed in Section 3.5, Water Quality, changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. The main changes would be beneficial increases in flows during times when water levels would otherwise be low. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, flow changes on Icicle Creek would not occur at a level that would negatively affect the shoreline. For these reasons, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term impacts on vegetation or wetlands.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

The majority of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project elements include pipelines or canal improvements that would occur in areas that have already been disturbed and would not result in long-term impacts on vegetation or wetlands. Over the long term, efficiencies gained would result in an increase in instream flows that would also be beneficial to riparian vegetation and wetlands.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

In general, the potential impacts associated with the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project would be similar to those described for the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project with the exception of the COIC pump station and intake facilities.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

These facilities would result in the loss of a small area of riparian vegetation and, depending on the specific location, could potentially affect wetlands. Any adverse impacts would likely be minor because the amount of area converted from vegetation to the new facilities would be small and would be addressed as required by applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts, such as compensating for the permanent loss of any sensitive areas (Section 4.8.6, Mitigation Measures). Over the long term, this project would also contribute to beneficial increases in instream flows that would be beneficial to riparian vegetation and wetlands.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Increased conservation and re-use associated with this project is expected to lead to decreased return flows, which could decrease flows in the Wenatchee River downstream of the Leavenworth Wastewater Treatment Plant; however, the long-term effects on streamflow and any associated changes to riparian vegetation are expected to be negligible.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from Eightmile Lake. The greatest potential for impacts on vegetation and wetlands over the long term would occur as the result of permanent conversion of any sensitive areas, disturbance during maintenance, and any changes in operations with respect to how lake levels are managed.

Because the facilities would be newer and largely operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes, or activities needed to maintain the facilities, are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. However, restoration of the facilities and re-operation of the lake would result in the ability to maintain the lake at higher, historical levels compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Under existing conditions, the maximum fill height of the lake is approximately 4,667 feet because the embankment portion of the dam has deteriorated. After the dam is restored, the lake would be able to fill to the historical high level of 4,671 feet. Under this project, lake levels would be managed to rise beginning in the late fall and would continue to approximately 4,666 feet, which would be the crest elevation of a notch in the proposed dam. The lake would remain at this height until stop logs are placed in the notch early in the summer. Placement of the stop logs would allow the lake level to continue to rise to the spillway elevation of 4,671 feet, equal to the historical full water surface elevation. The lake would stay at this level for less than a month in the early summer, after which time IPID would begin drawing down the lake by releasing water.

Compared with existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, this means that an additional area of shoreline would be under water. These areas have been historically inundated, but have not been under water since deterioration of the embankment. This change in lake levels could result in some changes to the vegetative community along the fringes of the shoreline; however, this area is expected to be relatively small, on the order of 3.6 acres of shoreline area inundated.

The project would also allow for the lake to be drawn down below the existing low lake levels to an elevation of 4,621 feet, which is approximately 22.4 feet below the existing low. This change would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed, mainly in the later summer months and early fall up to the point when the water would no longer be drawn down, generally around the end of September. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect vegetation or wetlands by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity.

Likewise, as discussed in Section 3.5, Water Quality, changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. The main changes would be beneficial increases in flows during times when water levels would otherwise be low. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, flow changes on Icicle Creek would not occur at a level that would negatively affect the shoreline. For these reasons, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term impacts on vegetation or wetlands.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The purpose of this project is to protect and enhance the tribal fishery, which, depending on the specific actions, could result in the loss of some small areas of vegetation and wetlands; however, these project elements are meant to preserve and enhance stream and riparian habitat, leading to improved vegetation and wetland quality and habitat functions. Additionally, work within sensitive areas would require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts affecting sensitive areas (Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures). These requirements would be developed once project-specific details were available.

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The purpose of this project is to protect and enhance habitat within the lower Icicle Creek corridor, which could require work within riparian areas and wetlands. Although these activities could result in the loss of some small areas of these resources, overall, the purpose of this project is to preserve and enhance stream and riparian habitat, which would improve vegetation and wetland quality and habitat functions. Additionally, work within sensitive areas would require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal

regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts, such as compensating for the permanent loss of any sensitive areas (Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures). These requirements would be developed once project-specific details were available.

# Instream Flow Rule Amendment

Under the Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project, the Icicle Creek Reserve established under Chapter 173-545 WAC would be increased by 0.4 cfs. Over the long term, this amendment would ultimately result in the removal of 0.4 cfs from Icicle Creek annually, which could adversely affect riparian vegetation and any associated wetland areas because there could be less water to support these areas. However, potential impacts on vegetation and wetlands would be offset by the implementation of required instream flow and habitat restoration actions under this Program Alternative, as well as several other projects associated with Alternative 1.

No instream flow reduction would occur in the Wenatchee River because this project would move 0.4 cfs out of the Wenatchee River Reserve.

# Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

The potential long-term adverse impacts on vegetation and wetlands under the LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements Project would occur in areas where new facilities resulted in the conversion or loss of vegetation and possibly wetland areas. Potential adverse impacts would likely be minor because the potential permanent loss of vegetation is expected to affect a relatively small area. Additionally, work within sensitive areas would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations, including NEPA, which would address the need for mitigation to reduce potential long-term impacts affecting sensitive areas (Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures).

# Fish Passage Improvements

Proposed Fish Passage Improvements Project elements occur entirely within Icicle Creek, therefore no long-term negative impacts to vegetation and wetlands would be expected.

# Fish Screen Compliance

Long-term impacts associated with the Fish Screen Compliance Project would largely be beneficial; however, it is possible that some small areas of vegetation could be removed, depending on final design of the proposed project elements.

Any adverse impacts on vegetation would be likely minor because these impacts would be addressed as required by applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts, such as revegetating any disturbed areas and compensating for the permanent loss of any sensitive areas that could not otherwise be restored (Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures). These requirements would be developed once project-specific details were available.

#### Water Markets

Proposed Water Markets Project elements would result in changes in the water market with the intention of increasing flows in lower Icicle Creek. There would be no long-term negative impacts on vegetation and wetlands. Potential long-term impacts would be beneficial.

# 4.8.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would also be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would not. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses vegetation in general by enhancing Icicle Creek aquatic and riparian habitat. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. Impacts of other project elements are described under Alternative 1

# 4.8.3.1 Short-term Impacts

### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

Construction of a new pump station under this project would require both in-water and riverbank work on the Wenatchee River. Such activities could result in many of the same construction-related short-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands described for the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project, including clearing of vegetation along the bank of the Wenatchee River and along the delivery pipeline route. As long as construction activities comply with permit terms and conditions that would be required as discussed in Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures, potential short-term impacts would not be significant. Specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting.

# 4.8.3.2 Long-term Impacts

### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project facilities would likely result in the loss of a small area of riparian vegetation for the pump station and intake facilities constructed along the right bank of the Wenatchee River and, depending on the specific location, could potentially affect wetlands. The project could also require clearing of vegetation along the delivery pipeline alignment, which would likely pass through existing agricultural properties and could impact orchard trees.

Any adverse impacts would likely be minor because the amount of area converted from vegetation to the new facilities would be small and would be addressed as required by

applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts, such as compensating for the permanent loss of any sensitive areas (Section 4.8.6, Mitigation Measures).

Operational changes associated with relocating the pump exchange would result in increased flows within Icicle Creek from the point of the existing diversion (RM 5.7) to the new location. Increased flows within the creek would be beneficial.

# 4.8.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 2 with the exception that the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 would be included while the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would not. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses vegetation in general by enhancing Icicle Creek aquatic and riparian habitat. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the legislative change. The impacts of all other project elements are described under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

# 4.8.4.1 Short-term Impacts

### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts to vegetation or wetlands.

# 4.8.4.2 Long-term Impacts

### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

If the proposed Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority Project were enacted, there could be potential conflicts with instream flow allocations. Under the proposed changes, junior domestic water rights could be exercised even when the Instream Flow Rule is not met, resulting in potential adverse impacts on riparian vegetation and any associated wetlands as a result of low-flow conditions. Under Alternative 3, there would be flow improvement projects. However, the timing of flow improvement might not always provide for in-time mitigation for junior users.

# 4.8.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1. The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would be replaced with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project. The Upper Klonaqua and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would also be included. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses vegetation in general by enhancing Icicle Creek aquatic and riparian habitat. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with these projects compared to Alternative 1 and the No-action Alternative.

## 4.8.5.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would involve demolishing the existing dam, installing new piping, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures that would allow for an increase in the accessible storage at Eightmile Lake to 3,500 acre-feet. The spillway elevation would be raised to allow for storage at a higher level than current or historical water storage levels and the project would allow for additional draw down of the lake.

Construction activity would occur along the banks and within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lake was drawn down. While most construction equipment (potentially including a small tracked excavator) and materials would likely be flown into the project site via helicopter; however, IPID is considering the option of walking in a larger tracked excavator or a spider excavator. The trail to access the project site requires several stream crossings and parallels several potential wetlands (Figure 3-10).

Disturbance within these areas has the potential to adversely affect vegetation and wetlands through direct impact or through increased exposure to contaminated stormwater runoff. Direct impacts could occur as the result of general construction activity resulting in clearing or trampling of vegetation during earth movement and staging of equipment and materials. There would also be minor potential for contaminated runoff to adversely affect vegetation and wetlands by increased erosion or accidental spills of chemicals used during construction.

This project would require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts on vegetation and wetlands, such as requiring all in-water work to be performed in the dry with the lake level drawn down and implementing construction BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion and inadvertent contamination from vehicle fluids, uncured concrete, human waste, and other sources (Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures). As such, potential impacts on vegetation and wetlands would not be significant.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

Short-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands from the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would primarily be associated with construction activities required to provide a low-level outlet from Upper Klonaqua Lake to Lower Klonaqua Lake using one of the three conceptual connection options discussed in Section 2.8. Construction activity would occur between the lakes and along the banks within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lakes were drawn down.

Disturbance within these areas has the potential to adversely affect vegetation and wetlands through direct impact or through increased exposure to contaminated

# ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

stormwater runoff. Direct impacts could occur as the result of general construction activity resulting in clearing or trampling of vegetation during earth movement and storage of equipment. There would also be minor potential for contaminated runoff to adversely affect vegetation and wetlands by increased erosion or accidental spills of chemicals used during construction.

This project would require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts on vegetation and wetlands, such as requiring all in-water work to be performed in the dry and implementing construction BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion and inadvertent contamination from vehicle fluids, uncured concrete, human waste, and other sources (Section 4.8.6, Mitigation Measures). As such, potential impacts on vegetation and wetlands would not be significant.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Short-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands from this project would be primarily related to construction activities, and the impacts are similar in type and mechanism to those discussed in Sections 4.8.5.1, Short-term Impacts, Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement and Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement. Specific construction activities that could result in impacts include the transportation of construction equipment and materials to the project site; draw down of the lakes to isolate in-water work areas; demolition of the existing dams and water control structures; removal of vegetation, excavation, and fill placement to install new low-level outlet piping; and the placement of concrete and other materials to construct new dams. Impacts that could result from these activities include direct disturbance of vegetation or wetlands or increased potential for exposure of these resources to contaminated stormwater runoff.

The Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would require multiple local, state, and federal environmental reviews and permits as described in Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures. Permits issued by regulatory agencies would include requirements for the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures and construction BMPs to reduce impacts on water quality. As a result of these requirements, potential impacts on vegetation and wetlands would not be significant.

## 4.8.5.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from Eightmile Lake. The greatest potential for impacts on vegetation and wetlands over the long term would occur as the result of permanent conversion of any sensitive areas, disturbance during maintenance, and any changes in operations with respect to how lake levels are managed.

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

As noted previously, compliance with applicable regulations, as discussed in Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure there would be no net loss of important ecological functions that may be associated with impacts on any sensitive vegetative communities.

Because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. However, this project would result in the ability to maintain the lake at higher than historical levels compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Under existing conditions, the maximum fill height of the lake is approximately 4,667 feet because the embankment portion of the dam has deteriorated. After the dam is restored, the lake would be able to fill to a new high water surface of 4,682 feet. Under this project, lake levels would be managed to rise beginning in the late fall and would continue to approximately 4,677 feet to the height of a notch in the proposed dam. The lake would remain at this height until stop logs are placed in the notch in the early summer. Placement of the stop logs would allow the lake level to continue to rise to the spillway elevation of 4,682 feet. The lake would stay at this level for less than a month in the early summer, after which time IPID would begin drawing down the lake by releasing water.

Compared with existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, this means that an additional area of shoreline would be under water. Shoreline areas up to 4,671 feet have been historically inundated, but areas above 4,671 feet to 4,682 feet have not been inundated. The additional area would be under water for a little less than a month each summer. This change in lake levels could result in some changes to the vegetative community along the shoreline. The proposed project would inundate approximately 13.6 acres that are not currently inundated, which would not represent a substantial loss but rather a change in the mix of vegetation.

The project would also allow for the lake to be drawn down below existing lake levels to an elevation of 4,619 feet, which is approximately 24.4 feet lower than the existing low. This change would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed, mainly in the later summer months and early fall up to the point when the water would no longer be drawn down, generally around the end of September. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect vegetation or wetlands by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity

Likewise, as discussed in Section 3.5, Water Quality, changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. The main changes would be beneficial increases in flows during times when water levels would otherwise be low. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, flow changes on Icicle Creek

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

would not occur at a level that would negatively affect the shoreline. Additionally, work within sensitive areas would likely require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations, which would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts affecting sensitive areas (Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures). For these reasons, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term impacts on vegetation or wetlands.

## Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

Potential long-term impacts to vegetation and wetlands would be similar to those described under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (Section 4.8.5.2, Long-term Impacts). Potential benefits would mainly occur in Icicle Creek and would include an increased ability to augment stream flow in the late summer or during drought years, with flow augmentation primarily benefitting the section of Icicle Creek between Upper Klonaqua Lake and the IPID diversion.

As noted previously, compliance with applicable regulations, as discussed in Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure there would be no net loss of important ecological functions that may be associated with impacts on any sensitive vegetative communities.

The frequency in fluctuations in lake levels in Upper Klonaqua Lake would increase compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. Lake levels would also be drawn down further compared to existing conditions.

The high lake level in Upper Klonaqua Lake would not change. The lake would still refill and outlet naturally through an existing channel to Lower Klonaqua Lake during most of the year. However, the new facilities would allow for the lake to be drawn down an additional 20 feet to allow for access to an additional 1,146 acre-feet of storage. The draw down would likely occur over a couple of months in the late summer. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect vegetation or wetlands by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity.

Likewise, as discussed in Section 3.5, Water Quality, changes in flows in Icicle Creek resulting from this action would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. The main changes would be beneficial increases in flows during times when water levels would otherwise be low. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, flow changes on Icicle Creek would not occur at a level that would negatively affect the shoreline. Additionally, work within sensitive areas would likely require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations, which would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts affecting sensitive areas (Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures). For these reasons, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term impacts on vegetation or wetlands.

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Potential long-term impacts to vegetation and wetlands would be similar to those described under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (Section 4.8.5.2, Long-term Impacts). Potential benefits would mainly occur in Icicle Creek and would include an increased ability to augment stream flow in the late summer or during drought years, with flow augmentation primarily benefitting the section of Icicle Creek between Lower Snow Lake and the IPID diversion.

The proposed enhancement project would increase the high-water storage levels in both Upper and Lower Snow Lakes by 5 feet compared with existing high levels. This change would result in the inundation of some upland vegetation that has grown along the shoreline areas between the current and proposed high lake levels, most likely occurring in the fall through the early summer when releases would be likely to begin. This could result in some changes to the vegetative community along the shoreline.

The project would also allow for the Lower Snow Lake to be drawn down 3 feet below the current lake level, which would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect vegetation or wetlands by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity.

Overall, potential adverse impacts would likely be minor because the potential loss or conversion of vegetation is expected to affect a relatively small area. Additionally, work within sensitive areas would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations, including NEPA, which would address the need for mitigation to reduce potential long-term impacts affecting sensitive areas (Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures).

# 4.8.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of the same projects as Alternative 1 except instead of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies, the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would be included.

## 4.8.6.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project**

This project would involve converting the IPID delivery systems to pressurized pipelines throughout the entire system, removing or abandoning the existing intakes on Icicle and Peshastin Creeks, and constructing three new pump stations and intakes on the Wenatchee River. Construction of the new pump stations and removal of existing diversion facilities under this project would require both in-water and riverbank work on the Wenatchee River, Icicle Creek, and Peshastin Creek. Such activities could result in construction-related short-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands, including clearing of vegetation along the bank of the Wenatchee River and along the extensive delivery

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

pipeline route. As long as construction activities comply with permit terms and conditions that would be required as discussed in Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures, potential short-term impacts would not be significant. Specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting.

# 4.8.6.2 Long-term Impacts

# IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project

IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project facilities would likely result in the loss of a small area of riparian vegetation where the pump stations are located along the Wenatchee River and, depending on the specific location, there could be could potentially a loss of wetlands. The project could also require clearing of vegetation along the entire delivery pipeline alignment, which would likely pass through existing agricultural properties and could impact orchard trees.

Permanent loss of vegetation is expected to be relatively small and would be compensated for as required by applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts, such as compensating for the permanent loss of any sensitive areas (Section 4.8.6, Mitigation Measures).

Operational changes associated with relocating the intakes from Icicle and Peshastin Creeks to the Wenatchee River would result in increased flows within Icicle and Peshastin Creeks. Increased flows would be beneficial to riparian vegetation and wetlands.

# 4.8.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

# 4.8.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Short-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands would be mitigated by complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal regulations and project-specific permits and approvals, including local building, grading, and stormwater construction permits; state stormwater permits; Shoreline Management Act shoreline permits; HPAs; and CWA Section 404 permits and their associated Section 401 Water Quality Certifications, among others. Common permit conditions are likely to include conducting work in a manner to minimize potential disturbance of sensitive vegetation communities and possibly compensating for loss of any important habitat or ecosystem functions. For permits or approvals affecting any work near or within wetlands, refer to Section 4.5.7, [Water Quality] Mitigation Measures.

Specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting. Implementation of the following additional measures would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

- Mark clearing or disturbance limits and protect vegetation outside those limits.
- Design and locate any permanent facilities to avoid, to the extent possible, potential impacts on sensitive vegetative communities, including the removal of trees or wetlands.
- Locate construction staging areas and any new access roads to avoid disturbing sensitive areas to the extent possible.
- Revegetate disturbed areas with native plant species as agreed upon by the appropriate regulatory agencies.

### 4.8.7.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts on vegetation and wetlands would be mitigated by complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal regulations and project-specific permits and approvals, as described above.

Specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting. Implementation of the following additional measures would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

• Monitor and continue to remove invasive species from any revegetated areas to ensure re-establishment of the desired vegetation communities and ecological function as agreed upon by the appropriate regulatory agency.

# 4.9 Wildlife

This section describes the potential short- and long-term impacts that could affect the resources identified in Section 3.9, Wildlife, from construction and operation related to the No-action Alternative and Program Alternatives. Potential impacts on special-status species are addressed in Section 4.10, Threatened and Endangered Species.

# 4.9.1 No-action Alternative

## 4.9.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various entities and agencies would undertake individual actions that could result in short-term impacts on wildlife in the ALWA and in riparian areas along Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. This is anticipated to entail construction of water diversion modifications, general habitat enhancement projects, LNFH improvements, required fish screening upgrades, modernization of infrastructure at the Alpine Lakes including the restoration of the Eightmile Lake Dam, and improvements to existing irrigation systems to support agricultural reliability. Potential impacts would be associated with projects that require construction. In the short term, construction activity could adversely affect wildlife by causing noise disturbance and adversely affecting habitat as described in Section 4.8, Vegetation.

The agencies or entities implementing projects under the No-action Alternative would be required to comply with applicable local, state, and federal environmental review requirements and permits as described in Section 5.2, Table 5-2. Applicable permits would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce impacts on wildlife, such as including any necessary timing restrictions for construction work and ensuring no net loss of important habitat and ecological values and functions (Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures). Therefore, short-term impacts to wildlife under the No-action Alternative are not expected to be significant.

# 4.9.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts under the No-action Alternative are anticipated to be largely beneficial for wildlife, especially wildlife dependent on Icicle Creek, because many projects would seek to improve instream flows during the late summer and improve habitat overall although the benefit is not excepted to be as great without implementation of a coordinated strategy.

# 4.9.2 Alternative 1

Implementation of Alternative 1 has the potential to result in greater impacts on wildlife compared with the No-action Alternative because there would be higher likelihood that certain projects would be implemented and the scale of certain efforts would likely be greater. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses wildlife in general by enhancing Icicle Creek aquatic and riparian habitat. The following sections describe the short- and long-term impacts that would occur under Alternative 1.

# 4.9.2.1 Short-term Impacts

### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Most of the work would occur in upland areas. Some limited work would occur within the lake shorelines but within the dry when the lakes are drawn down at the end of the summer. Construction would last for a period of a few days to a couple of weeks at each lake. Some equipment may be walked in via the Eightmile Lake Trail but most equipment and workers would be transported to the project site by helicopter.

Construction activity could disrupt the use of riparian and forested habitat by native wildlife species to breed, forage, rest, and overwinter. As discussed in Section 3.9, Wildlife, the lakes are used by many species, including large and small mammals, reptiles, amphibians, cavity nesting birds, raptors, waterfowl, and a variety of songbirds.

Waterfowl species such as common loons nest along the lake shoreline. Aquatic species such as amphibians could also be present during construction.

Although some vegetated areas would be used to stage construction equipment and temporarily provide housing for workers, there would be no permanent loss of habitat and the activities would not block access to habitat areas. As discussed in Section 4.5, Surface Water Quality, risks of spills (e.g., fuel, chemicals, etc.) would be very low because there would be limited use of powered equipment near water.

Wildlife would be exposed to some increased noise during construction. Short-term increases in noise lasting a couple days to a couple of weeks are described in Section 4.14, Noise, and would include some helicopter trips. As noted, the majority of construction noise would be relatively minor. In general, in response to periodic increases in noise and activity, most wildlife species are expected to disperse to adjacent habitat areas to avoid impacts. However, particularly vulnerable species include special-status species, especially those that may be breeding during this time. These species are discussed in Section 4.10, Threatened and Endangered Species.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would further ensure that there were no significant impacts on wildlife. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, which may include measures such as implementing construction timing restrictions and no net loss of ecological functions and values (Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Construction activities associated with this project include the conversion of IPID canals to pipelines and lining of irrigation canals with concrete. Short-term impacts that could adversely affect wildlife include disturbance from increased construction activity and noise, and temporary disturbance of habitat. These impacts would be relatively limited because most of the work would occur within areas that are already disturbed, such as within rights-of-way and existing canal easements. As noted in Section 4.14, Noise, construction-related noise is anticipated to be relatively minimal. Species in the work area may temporarily relocate to other areas during periods of increased activity.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would further ensure that there were no significant impacts on wildlife. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, such as implementing construction timing restrictions and ensuring no net loss of ecological functions and values for wildlife habitat (Section 4.9.6, Mitigation Measures).

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Potential impacts on wildlife associated with work affecting COIC canals and laterals would be similar to those described for the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project (4.9.2.1, Short-term Impacts). Construction of the COIC pump station would also require work along the streambank of lower Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River. Depending on the

specific location, there could be a slightly greater potential for adverse constructionrelated impacts compared with canal-related work, particularly if construction disturbance occurred in an otherwise relatively undisturbed area.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures could include limiting the extent of work within sensitive areas, requiring revegetation of disturbed sites, and compensating for any loss of important ecosystem functions and values (Section 4.9.6, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on wildlife would be less than significant.

# **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Construction activities proposed under the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project include pipeline replacement and meter installation. These activities are unlikely to adversely affect wildlife because the work would be done in areas that are already developed.

# Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration

This project involves demolishing the existing dam, installing new piping, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures. Construction activity would occur along the banks and within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lake has been drawn down and in Eightmile Creek immediately downstream of the dam. While most construction equipment (potentially including a small tracked excavator) and materials would likely be flown into the project site via helicopter, IPID is considering the option of walking in a larger tracked excavator or a spider excavator. The trail to access the project site requires several stream crossings and parallels several potential wetlands (Figure 3-10.

Construction activity could disrupt the use of riparian and forested habitat by native wildlife species to breed, forage, rest, and overwinter. As discussed in Section 3.9, Wildlife, the lakes are used by many species, including large and small mammals, reptiles, amphibians, cavity nesting birds, raptors, waterfowl, and a variety of songbirds. Waterfowl species such as common loons nest along the lake shoreline. Aquatic species such as amphibians could also be present during construction.

Construction activity would be limited to the dry lake margins and the existing structure for a period of 2 to 3 months. Although some vegetated areas would be used to stage construction equipment and temporarily provide housing for workers, there would be no permanent loss of habitat and the activities would not block access to adjacent habitat. As discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, risks of spills (e.g., fuel, chemicals, etc.) would be very low because there would be limited use of powered equipment near water and work would occur in the dry after the lake was drawn down.

The greatest potential for short-term impacts on wildlife would occur as the result of increased noise during construction. Short-term increases in noise lasting 2 to 3 months are described in Section 4.14, Noise, and would include some helicopter trips and possibly blasting. As noted, the majority of construction noise would be relatively minor. In general, in response to periodic increases in noise and activity, most wildlife species are expected to disperse to adjacent habitat areas to avoid impacts. Potential noise disturbance would be most disruptive if it occurred during the spring months when many species are breeding However, the potential for overlap with construction is more limited because construction activities would occur in late summer or early fall when lake water levels can be drawn down to allow for construction. Particularly vulnerable species include special-status species discussed in Section 4.10, Threatened and Endangered Species.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would further ensure that there were no significant impacts on wildlife. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, which may include measures such as implementing construction timing restrictions and no net loss of ecological functions and values (Section 4.9.6, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The focus of this project is to ensure that there would be no adverse effects on tribal fishing as a result of implementing other projects as part of the overall Icicle Strategy. The specifics of this project are not yet determined, but would involve elements of restoration along the lower Icicle Creek that could result in localized construction-related noise and short-term disturbance to habitat. At this stage, the primary options under consideration include the construction of facilities such as a bubble curtain, sprayer, or other minor modifications to the LNFH to promote favorable fishing conditions in the pool at the bottom of the spillway.

Depending on the specific location of the activities, construction could result in shortterm impacts on wildlife, primarily related to construction disturbance. Project activities with the potential to affect sensitive wildlife species would require authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to address these impacts (Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

Habitat protection and enhancement proposed under this project could involve grading; planting and thinning vegetation; hauling and placing logs, rock, soil, and other materials; and some in-water work on lower Icicle Creek. Depending on the specific location of the activities, construction could result in short-term impacts on wildlife, primarily associated with construction disturbance similar to those described above.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Project activities with the potential to affect sensitive wildlife species would require authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts (Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures).

### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts to wildlife or wildlife habitat.

### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

This project includes various elements geared towards improving water quality and hatchery rearing conditions at the LNFH. In general, construction of these elements has the potential to affect wildlife, depending on the specific location and type of disturbance. Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential short-term impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined.

Similar to the construction activities described above, various authorizations are likely to be required that would ensure that potential impacts would be avoided, minimized, or compensated as noted in Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures.

### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The Fish Passage Improvements Project would potentially involve modification of existing LNFH instream structures in Icicle Creek, as well as instream modifications to the Boulder Field near RM 5.6. This work would result in disturbances along the streambank and within Icicle Creek that would be addressed in subsequent environmental review and permitting once project specifics are determined. This work would also likely require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification, which would further help to address potential impacts on wildlife.

### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project involves replacing fish screens at three different diversions on Lower Icicle Creek: LNFH/COIC, the City of Leavenworth, and IPID. Under this project, screens and associated infrastructure would be improved to bring all three intakes up to compliance with state and federal laws. This work would result in disturbances along the streambank and within Icicle Creek that would be addressed once project specifics are determined. This work would also likely require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification, which would help to further address potential impacts on wildlife.

#### Water Markets

There are no construction activities proposed under the Water Markets Project and therefore no potential short-term impacts to wildlife or wildlife habitat.

## 4.9.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Operation of the proposed facilities for this project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from the affected lakes. Long-term impacts on wildlife could occur if there was a substantial loss of habitat or from long-term disturbance of species from maintenance activities or changes in how lake levels are managed.

As discussed above, there would be no permanent loss of habitat. Because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID and USFWS personnel, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less than would occur compared to existing conditions.

The frequency in fluctuations in lake levels would increase compared to existing conditions because lake levels would be drawn down every year instead of rotating one or two lakes per year; however, the high and low lake water levels would not change. This variation would be consistent with natural fluctuations in lake level changes and no impacts on shorelines or vegetation and wetlands are anticipated (Section 4.8, Vegetation, and Section 4.18, Shorelines). Similarly, no significant impacts on wildlife are expected.

As discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. The main changes would be beneficial increases in flows during times when water levels would otherwise be low. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, flow changes on Icicle Creek would not occur at a level that would negatively affect the shoreline. For these reasons, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term impacts on wildlife.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

The majority of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project elements include pipelines or canal improvements that would occur in areas that have already been disturbed and would not result in long-term impacts on wildlife. Over the long-term, efficiencies gained would result in an increase in instream flows that would be beneficial to riparian habitat and associated wildlife species.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

In general, the potential impacts associated with the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project would be similar to those described for the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project (4.9.2.2, Long-term Impacts) with the exception of the COIC pump station and intake facilities. These facilities would result in the loss of a small area of riparian habitat. Any adverse impacts on wildlife would be likely minor because the

## 

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

amount of habitat lost would be small and would be addressed as required by applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts, such as compensating for the permanent loss of any sensitive areas (Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures). Over the long-term, this project would also contribute to beneficial increases in instream flows that would be beneficial to riparian habitat and associated wildlife species.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Increased conservation and re-use associated with this project is expected to lead to decreased return flows, which could decrease flows in the Wenatchee River downstream of the Leavenworth Wastewater Treatment Plant; however, the long-term effects on streamflow and any associated changes to riparian vegetation and associated wildlife habitat are expected to be negligible.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from Eightmile Lake. Wildlife impacts could occur over the long term from any permanent conversion of wildlife habitat, disturbance during maintenance, or any changes in operations with respect to how lake levels are managed.

As discussed above, there would be no permanent loss of habitat. Because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions. However, restoration of the facilities and re-operation of the lake would result in the ability to maintain the lake at higher, historical levels compared to existing conditions.

Under existing conditions, the maximum fill height of the lake is approximately 4,667 feet because the embankment portion of the dam has deteriorated. After the dam is restored, the lake would be able to fill to the historical high level of 4,671 feet. Under this project, lake levels would be managed to rise beginning in the late fall and would continue to approximately 4,666 feet, which would be the crest elevation of a notch in the proposed dam. The lake would remain at this height until stop logs are placed in the notch early in the summer. Placement of the stop logs would allow the lake level to continue to rise to the spillway elevation of 4,671 feet, equal to the historical full water surface elevation. The lake would stay at this level for less than a month in the early summer, after which time IPID would begin drawing down the lake by releasing water.

Compared with existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, this means that an additional area of shoreline would be under water. These areas have been historically inundated, but have not been under water since deterioration of the embankment. This change in lake levels could result in some changes to the vegetative community along the

fringes of the shoreline; however, this area is expected to be relatively small, on the order 3.6 acres of shoreline area inundated, and would not represent a substantial loss of habitat that is anticipated to adversely affect wildlife.

The project would also allow for the lake to be drawn down below the existing low lake levels to an elevation of 4,621 feet, which is approximately 22.4 feet below the existing low. This change would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed, mainly in the later summer months and early fall up to the point when the water would no longer be drawn down, generally around the end of September. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect wildlife habitat by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity or any other changes that would adversely affect wildlife.

As discussed in Section 3.5, Water Quality, changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. The main changes would be beneficial increases in flows during times when water levels would otherwise be low. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, flow changes on Icicle Creek would not occur at a level that would negatively affect the shoreline. For these reasons, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term impacts on wildlife.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The intent of the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project is to ensure that other projects implemented as part of the Icicle Strategy do not have negative effects on tribal fisheries, and tribal treaty and federally protected harvest rights. Depending on the specific actions, this could result in the loss of some small areas of vegetation and wetlands that provide wildlife habitat; however, these project elements are meant to preserve and enhance stream and riparian habitat in the system overall, leading to improved vegetation and wetland quality, improved habitat functions, and long-term benefits for wildlife.

Additionally, work within sensitive areas would require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts affecting sensitive areas (Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures). These requirements would be developed once project-specific details were available.

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

No long-term adverse impacts on wildlife and wildlife habitat are expected under the Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project. The purpose of this project is to improve the quality and functions of riparian and wetland habitats for wildlife. Improved water quality conditions would benefit wildlife species, including amphibians and stream invertebrates. In addition, work within sensitive areas would require multiple

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts, such as compensating for the permanent loss of any sensitive areas (Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures). These requirements would be developed once project-specific details are available.

### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

Under the Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project, the Icicle Creek Reserve established under Chapter 173-545 WAC would be increased by 0.4 cfs. Over the long-term, this amendment would ultimately result in the removal of an additional 0.4 cfs from Icicle Creek only after habitat and flow restoration elements are implemented. This project could adversely affect water quantity and quality in portions of Icicle Creek and thus could adversely affect dependent wildlife.

Potential impacts associated with the Instream Flow Rule Amendment are anticipated to be offset by the implementation of required instream flow and habitat restoration actions under this Program Alternative as well as several other projects associated with Alternative 1. Depending on the instream conditions at the time this reserve is accessed, there could be potential conflicts with the beneficial uses, most likely those associated with fish and wildlife habitat uses, designated for Icicle Creek.

No instream flow reduction would occur in the Wenatchee River because this project would move 0.4 cfs out of the Wenatchee River Reserve.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

Over the long term, the water conservation and water quality improvement elements proposed at LNFH for this project are expected to benefit water quality and associated wildlife in Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. As part of this project, LNFH would be required to secure an updated National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit and state Water Quality Certification for the LNFH through the implementation of facility upgrades and operational improvements. These actions would require compliance with relevant total maximum daily loads for the Wenatchee River Watershed and would ultimately be designed to avoid additional water quality impacts in the basin.

In addition, most of the work included under this project is designed to improve water use efficiency at LNFH and to develop additional groundwater supplies such that less water would need to be diverted from Icicle Creek for hatchery operations. Such actions would potentially support higher flows in the system, especially during late summer, which would benefit wildlife present within and along the creek.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

Long-term impacts associated with the Fish Passage Improvements Project would largely be beneficial; however, it is possible that some small areas of vegetation may be removed

that could affect wildlife. The extent of the impacts would depend on final design of the proposed project elements and whether the affected area is used by wildlife.

Any adverse impacts on vegetation would be likely less than significant because these impacts would be addressed as required by applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts, such as revegetating any disturbed areas and compensating for the permanent loss of any sensitive areas that could not otherwise be restored (Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures). These requirements would be developed once project-specific details were available.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project involves replacing fish screens along Icicle Creek. The potential for any impacts related to loss of riparian habitat that could adversely affect wildlife would be addressed in project-level review. Long-term operations would be beneficial to fish and aquatic species and by extension to the larger ecosystem in general. Therefore, no adverse long-term wildlife impacts are expected.

#### Water Markets

As noted in Section 4.5, Water Quality, the long-term impacts of the Water Markets Project on water quality would be beneficial. Therefore, there are no adverse long-term wildlife impacts that are expected.

# 4.9.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would also be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would not. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses wildlife in general by enhancing Icicle Creek aquatic and riparian habitat. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. Impacts of other projects considered under Alternative 2 are described under Alternative 1.

## 4.9.3.1 Short-term Impacts

#### IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

Construction of a new IPID pump exchange would require both in-water and riverbank work on the Wenatchee River, including the placement and removal of instream cofferdams, removal of streamside vegetation, and excavation of the streambed and bank. Depending on the specific location of the activities, construction could result in shortterm impacts on wildlife, primarily related to construction disturbance. Project activities with the potential to affect sensitive wildlife species would require authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to address these impacts (Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures). Specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting.

# 4.9.3.2 Long-term Impacts

### IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange facilities would likely result in the loss of a small area of riparian vegetation for the pump exchange station and intake facilities constructed along the right bank of the Wenatchee River, which could potentially affect wildlife, depending on the specific location. The project could also require clearing of vegetation along the delivery pipeline alignment, which would likely pass through existing agricultural properties and could impact orchard trees.

Any adverse impacts would be likely less than significant because the amount of area converted from vegetation to the new facilities would be small and would be addressed as required by applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts such as compensating for the permanent loss of any sensitive areas (Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures).

Operational changes associated with relocating the pump exchange would result in increased flows within Icicle Creek from the point of the existing diversion (RM 5.7) to the new location. Increased flows within the creek would be beneficial.

# 4.9.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 2 with the exception that the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3would be included while the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration project would not. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses wildlife in general by enhancing Icicle Creek aquatic and riparian habitat. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the legislative change. Impacts of other projects proposed under Alternative 3 are described in Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

# 4.9.4.1 Short-term Impacts

### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on wildlife or wildlife habitat are expected.

# 4.9.4.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

If the proposed Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority Project were enacted, there could be potential conflicts with instream flow allocations that could result in adverse impacts on wildlife and wildlife habitat. Under the proposed changes, junior domestic water rights could be exercised even when the Instream Flow Rule is not met, resulting in potential adverse impacts on water quality as a result of low-flow conditions. Under Alternative 3, flow improvement projects would be implemented. However, the timing of flow improvement might not always provide in-time mitigation for junior users.

# 4.9.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration project would be replaced with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement project, and the Upper Klonaqua and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would also be included. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses wildlife in general by enhancing Icicle Creek aquatic and riparian habitat. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with these projects compared to Alternative 1 and the No-action Alternative.

# 4.9.5.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

The Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would involve demolishing the existing dam, installing new piping, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures that would allow for an increase in the accessible storage at Eightmile Lake to 3,500 acre-feet. The spillway elevation would be raised to allow for storage at a higher level than current or historical water storage levels and the project would allow for additional draw down of the lake.

Construction activity could disrupt the use of riparian and forested habitat by native wildlife species to breed, forage, rest, and overwinter. As discussed in Section 3.9, Wildlife, the lakes are used by many species, including large and small mammals, reptiles, amphibians, cavity nesting birds, raptors, waterfowl, and a variety of songbirds. Waterfowl species such as common loons nest along the lake shoreline. Aquatic species such as amphibians could also be present during construction.

Construction activity would be limited to the dry lake margins and the existing structure for a period of 4 to 6 months. Although some vegetated areas would be used to stage construction equipment and temporarily provide housing for workers, there would be no permanent loss of habitat and the activities would not block access to adjacent habitat. As discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, risks of spills (e.g., fuel, chemicals, etc.) would

be very low because there would be limited use of powered equipment near water and work would occur in the dry after the lake was drawn down.

The greatest potential for short-term impacts on wildlife would occur as the result of increased noise during construction. Short-term increases in noise lasting approximately 4 to 6 months are described in Section 4.14, Noise, and would include some helicopter trips and possibly blasting. As noted, the majority of construction noise would be relatively minor and similar to noise levels that already occur under existing conditions related to ongoing operations and maintenance and recreational use. In general, in response to periodic increases in noise and activity, most wildlife species are expected to disperse to adjacent habitat areas to avoid impacts. However, particularly vulnerable species include special-status species, especially those that may be breeding during this time. These species are discussed in Section 4.10, Threatened and Endangered Species.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would further ensure that there were no significant impacts on wildlife. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, which could include measures such as implementing construction timing restrictions and no net loss of ecological functions and values (Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures).

### Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

Under the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project, wildlife could be adversely affected in the short-term from construction activity in a manner similar to what would occur as described above for the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (4.9.5.1, Short-term Impacts).

Construction activity could disturb the use of riparian and forested habitat used by native wildlife species to breed, forage, rest, and overwinter. As discussed in Section 3.9, Wildlife, riparian areas are used by many species, including large and small mammals, reptiles, amphibians, cavity nesting birds, raptors, waterfowl, and a variety of songbirds. Waterfowl species such as common loons could be nesting along the lake shoreline. Aquatic species such as amphibians could be present where in-water work is proposed.

Construction activity would be limited to the dry lake margins and the existing structure. Although some vegetated areas would be used to stage construction equipment and provide temporary housing for workers, there would be no permanent loss of habitat and the activities would not block access to adjacent habitat. As discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, risks of spills (e.g., fuel, chemicals, etc.) would be very low because there would be limited use of powered equipment near water and work would occur in the dry after the lake was drawn down.

The greatest potential for short-term impacts on wildlife would occur as the result of increased noise during construction. Short-term increases are described in Section 4.14, Noise, and would include some helicopter trips and possibly blasting. As noted, the majority of construction noise would be relatively minor. In general, in response to
periodic increases in noise and activity, most wildlife species are expected to disperse to adjacent habitat areas to avoid impacts. However, particularly vulnerable species include special-status species, especially those that may be breeding during this time. These species are discussed in Section 4.10, Threatened and Endangered Species.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would further ensure that there were no significant impacts on wildlife. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, which could include measures such as implementing construction timing restrictions and no net loss of ecological functions and values (Section 4.9.6, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Wildlife could be adversely affected in the short-term from construction activity in a manner similar to what would occur as described above for the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (4.9.5.1, Short-term Impacts).

Construction activity could disturb the use of riparian and forested habitat used by native wildlife species to breed, forage, rest, and overwinter. As discussed in Section 3.9, Wildlife, riparian areas are used by many species, including large and small mammals, reptiles, amphibians, cavity nesting birds, raptors, waterfowl, and a variety of songbirds. Waterfowl species such as common loons could be nesting along the lake shoreline. Aquatic species such as amphibians could be present where in-water work is proposed.

Construction activity would be limited to the dry lake margins and the existing structure. Although some vegetated areas would be used to stage construction equipment and provide temporary housing for workers, there would be no permanent loss of habitat and the activities would not block access to adjacent habitat. As discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, risks of spills (e.g., fuel, chemicals, etc.) would be very low because there would be limited use of powered equipment near water and work would occur in the dry after the lake was drawn down.

The greatest potential for short-term impacts on wildlife would occur as the result of increased noise during construction. Short-term increases are described in Section 4.14, Noise, and would include some helicopter trips and possibly blasting. As noted, the majority of construction noise would be relatively minor. In general, in response to periodic increases in noise and activity, most wildlife species are expected to disperse to adjacent habitat areas to avoid impacts. However, particularly vulnerable species include special-status species, especially those that may be breeding during this time. These species are discussed in Section 4.10, Threatened and Endangered Species.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would further ensure that there were no significant impacts on wildlife. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, which could include measures such as implementing construction timing restrictions and no net loss of ecological functions and values (Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures).

## 4.9.5.2 Long-term Impacts

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from Eightmile Lake. Because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. However, this project would result in the ability to maintain the lake at higher than historical levels compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Under existing conditions, the maximum fill height of the lake is approximately 4,667 feet because the embankment portion of the dam has deteriorated. After the dam is restored and raised, the lake would be able to fill to a new high water surface of 4,682 feet. Under this project, lake levels would be managed to rise beginning in the late fall and would continue to approximately 4,677 feet to the height of a notch in the proposed dam. The lake would remain at this height until stop logs are placed in the notch early in the summer. Placement of the stop logs would allow the lake level to continue to rise to the spillway elevation of 4,682 feet. The lake would stay at this level for less than a month in the early summer, after which time IPID would begin drawing down the lake by releasing water.

Compared with existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, this means that an additional area of shoreline, approximately 13.6 acres, would be under water for a part of each year. Shoreline areas up to 4,671 feet have been historically inundated, but areas above 4,671 feet to 4,682 feet have not. This additional area would be under water for a little less than a month each summer. This change in lake levels could result in some changes to the vegetative community along the shoreline. However, because of the availability of habitat in the surrounding area and the fact that increased water levels would not represent a permanent increase in the lake height, it would not represent a substantial loss of habitat and is not anticipated to adversely affect wildlife.

The project would also allow for the lake to be drawn down below existing lake levels to an elevation of 4,619 feet, which is approximately 24.4 feet lower than the existing low. This change would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed, mainly in the later summer months and early fall up to the point when the water would no longer be drawn down, generally around the end of September. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect wildlife by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity or any other changes that would adversely affect wildlife.

As discussed in Section 3.5, Water Quality, changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. The main changes would be beneficial increases in flows during times when water levels would otherwise be low.

As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, flow changes on Icicle Creek would not occur at a level that would negatively affect the shoreline. For these reasons, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term impacts on wildlife.

### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

Potential long-term impacts on wildlife would be similar to those described under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (see Section 4.9.5.2, Long-term Impacts). Potential benefits would mainly occur in Icicle Creek and would include an increased ability to augment stream flow in the late summer or during drought years, with flow augmentation primarily benefitting the section of Icicle Creek between Upper Klonaqua Lake and the IPID diversion.

As noted previously, compliance with applicable regulations, as discussed in Section 4.9.6, Mitigation Measures, would ensure there would be no net loss of important ecological functions that may be associated with impacts on any wildlife communities.

The frequency in fluctuations in lake levels in Upper Klonaqua Lake would increase compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. Lake levels would also be drawn down further compared to existing conditions.

The high lake level in Upper Klonaqua Lake would not change. The lake would still refill and outlet naturally through an existing channel to Lower Klonaqua Lake during most of the year. However, the new facilities would allow for the lake to be drawn down an additional 20 feet to allow for access to an additional 1,146 acre-feet of storage. The draw down would likely occur over a couple of months in the late summer. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect wildlife habitat by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity.

As discussed in Section 3.5, Water Quality, changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. The main changes would be beneficial increases in flows during times when water levels would otherwise be low. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, flow changes on Icicle Creek would not occur at a level that would negatively affect the shoreline. For these reasons, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term impacts on wildlife.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Potential long-term impacts on wildlife would be similar to those described under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (Section 4.9.5.2, Long-term Impacts). Potential benefits would mainly occur in Icicle Creek and would include an increased ability to augment stream flow in the late summer or during drought years with flow augmentation primarily benefitting the section of Icicle Creek between Upper Klonaqua Lake and the IPID diversion.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

As noted previously, compliance with applicable regulations, as discussed in Section 4.9.6, Mitigation Measures, would ensure there would be no net loss of important ecological functions that may be associated with impacts on any sensitive wildlife communities.

Because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by USFWS, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less than would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. However, lake levels would also be able to reach higher or lower levels compared to both existing conditions and historical levels.

The proposed enhancement project would increase the high-water storage levels in both Upper and Lower Snow Lakes by 5 feet compared with existing high levels. This change would result in the inundation of some upland vegetation that has grown along the shoreline areas between the current and proposed high lake levels, most likely occurring in the fall through the early summer when releases would be likely to begin. This could result in some changes to the vegetative community along the shoreline, similar to those described for the other lakes under this Program Alternative. However, these changes would not likely result in significant impacts on wildlife for the reasons described previously.

The project would also allow for the Lower Snow Lake to be drawn down 3 feet below the current lake level, which would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect wildlife habitat by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity.

As discussed in Section 3.5, Water Quality, changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. The main changes would be beneficial increases in flows during times when water levels would otherwise be low. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, flow changes on Icicle Creek would not occur at a level that would negatively affect the shoreline. For these reasons, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term impacts on wildlife.

Overall, potential adverse impacts would likely be less than significant because the potential loss or conversion of vegetation is expected to affect a relatively small area. Additionally, work within sensitive areas would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations, including NEPA, which would address the need for mitigation to reduce potential long-term impacts affecting wildlife (Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures).

## 4.9.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of the same projects as Alternative 1 except instead of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies, the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would be included.

### 4.9.6.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project**

This project would involve fully converting the IPID delivery systems to pressurized pipelines, removing the existing intakes on Icicle and Peshastin Creeks, and constructing three new pump stations and intakes on the Wenatchee River. Construction disturbance required throughout the entire delivery system for conversion to pressurized pipelines could result in short-term impacts on wildlife related to increase noise and temporary disturbance to surrounding vegetation.

Construction of the pump stations would require both in-water and riverbank work on the Wenatchee River, and Icicle and Peshastin Creeks, which could include the placement and removal of instream cofferdams, removal of streamside vegetation, and excavation of the streambed and bank. Project activities with the potential to affect sensitive wildlife species would require authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to address these impacts (Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures). Specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project

### 4.9.6.2 Long-term Impacts

The IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would likely result in the loss of a small area of riparian vegetation for the pump stations, which could potentially affect wildlife, depending on the specific location. The project could also require clearing of vegetation along the entire delivery pipeline alignment, which would likely pass through existing agricultural properties and could impact orchard trees or other wildlife habitat.

Any adverse impacts would be likely less than significant because the area converted from vegetation to the new facilities or cleared would be compensated and mitigated as required by applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts such as compensating for the permanent loss of any sensitive areas (Section 4.9.7, Mitigation Measures).

Operational changes associated with relocating the pump stations and removing the existing diversion facilities would result in increased flows within Icicle and Peshastin Creeks. Increased flows within the creek would be beneficial to wildlife to the extent that higher flows would support riparian vegetation and any associated wildlife habitat.

# 4.9.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

## 4.9.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Short-term impacts on wildlife would be mitigated by complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal regulations and obtaining required project-specific permits and approvals, such as any Shoreline Management Act shoreline permits; Critical Areas Review; HPAs; and CWA and Endangered Species Act compliance.

Common mitigation measures are likely to include pre-construction surveys, when deemed appropriate, conducting construction work in a manner to minimize disturbance of wildlife, ensuring no net loss of any important habitat or ecosystem functions or values, and possibly restricting the timing of some construction activities to avoid affecting particular species.

Specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting. Mitigation measures to address potential short-term impacts on wildlife and habitat are expected to be the same as those described for vegetation and wetlands in Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures.

## 4.9.7.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts on wildlife would be mitigated by complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal regulations and project-specific permits and approvals, as described under Short-term Impacts.

Specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting. Mitigation measures to address potential long-term impacts on wildlife and habitat are expected to be the same as those described for vegetation and wetlands in Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures.

# 4.10 Threatened and Endangered Species

This section describes the potential short- and long-term impacts that could affect the special-status plant, wildlife, and fish species identified in Section 3.10, Threatened and Endangered Species, from construction and operation related to the No-action Alternative and Program Alternatives. Impacts on fish, vegetation, and wildlife in general are addressed in Section 4.7, Fish; Section 4.8, Vegetation; and Section 4.9, Wildlife.

## 4.10.1 No-action Alternative

### 4.10.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various entities and agencies would undertake individual actions in the ALWA and in riparian areas along Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. This is anticipated to entail construction of water diversion modifications, general habitat enhancement projects, LNFH improvements, required fish screening upgrades, modernization of infrastructure at the Alpine Lakes including the restoration of the Eightmile Lake Dam, and improvements to existing irrigation systems to support agricultural reliability. Potential impacts would primarily be associated with projects that require construction. In the short term, construction activity could affect special-status species by causing noise disturbance and temporarily disturbing areas where habitat occurs as described in Section 4.8, Vegetation.

The agencies or entities implementing projects under the No-action Alternative would be required to comply with applicable local, state, and federal environmental review requirements, which would include compliance with the federal and state ESA, as described in Section 5.2, Table 5-2. In the event of any potential adverse impacts, project applicants would be required to implement appropriate mitigation measures to reduce impacts on special-status species, such as including any necessary timing restrictions for construction work and ensuring no net loss of important habitat and ecological values and functions (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures). Additionally, federal agencies are required to ensure that their actions do not adversely affect listed critical habitat. Therefore, short-term impacts on special-status species under the No-action Alternative are not expected to be significant.

### 4.10.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts under the No-action Alternative are anticipated to be largely beneficial for fish and wildlife species, especially those dependent on Icicle Creek (including special-status species), because many projects would seek to improve instream flows during the late summer and improve habitat conditions overall. The restoration of the dam at Eightmile Lake and re-operation of the lake would result in the ability to maintain the lake at higher, historical levels compared to existing conditions. This change in lake levels could result in some changes to the vegetative community along the fringes of the shoreline; however, this area is expected to be relatively small, on the order 3.6 acres of shoreline area inundated, and would not represent a substantial loss of habitat that is anticipated to adversely affect special-status species. Because both instream flow and fish habitat enhancement projects would not generally be coordinated with other activities in the Icicle project area, benefits are not anticipated to be as great as they would under the other Program Alternatives. Potential long-term benefits from such projects are also expected to be more localized, providing only minor overall benefits within the larger Icicle Creek Subbasin.

# 4.10.2 Alternative 1

Implementation of Alternative 1 has the potential to result in greater impacts on specialstatus species compared with the No-action Alternative because there would be a higher likelihood that certain projects would be implemented and the scale of certain efforts would likely be greater. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addressed special-status species in general by ensuring compliance with applicable regulations, including the ESA. The following sections describe the short- and long-term impacts that would occur under Alternative 1.

## 4.10.2.1 Short-term Impacts

### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Most of the work under the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would occur in upland areas. Some limited work would occur within the lake shorelines but within the dry when the lakes are drawn down at the end of the summer. Construction activity would last for a period of 2 to 4 weeks at each lake. Some small equipment may be packed in via various trails, but it is likely that most equipment and construction personnel would be transported to the project site by helicopter. Construction activity could disturb any special-status species that may be present during construction.

Listed plant species with the greatest potential to occur within the project site include showy stickseed (*Hackelia venusta*) and Wenatchee Mountains checkermallow (*Sidalcea oregana var. calva*); however, these species would not likely be affected by construction because the proposed activities would occur within areas where these species are very unlikely to be found. If activities were to occur outside of these areas, compliance with existing regulations would require the implementation of mitigation measures to minimize potential impacts as noted in Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures.

Listed animal species that could occur at or near the project sites include northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*), marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*), yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*), Canada lynx (*Lynx canadensis*), gray wolf (*Canis lupus*), grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos horribilis*), and wolverine (*Gulo gulo*). As noted in Section 3.10, Threatened and Endangered Species, there are no special-status fish species located within these lakes.

Although some vegetated areas would be used to stage construction equipment and provide temporary housing for workers, there would be no permanent loss of habitat and the activities would not block access to adjacent habitat areas. As discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, construction is not anticipated to result in significant water quality impacts.

Construction activities would also result in an increase in noise above background conditions that could disturb any species that may be present. However, the levels would

be similar to the noise that already occurs as the result of maintenance-related activities, including the use of helicopters, which have occurred and would continue regardless of this project. As noted in Section 3.15, Recreation, background noise includes regular recreational activity around each of the lakes, including hikers and overnight campers. If bothered by increased sound, generally speaking, special-status species would be able to temporarily relocate to other areas of similarly suitable habitat without significant impacts. This would be similar to what currently occurs related to operation and maintenance at the lakes.

There is a potential for more significant disturbance to occur if loud construction noise occurs during the breeding season. Special-status bird species are particularly vulnerable because nesting birds have been known to abandon their nests in response to sudden loud increases in noise; however, construction activity would occur in late summer, which is outside the breeding period for both marbled murrelet and northern spotted owl. Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would ensure that there were no significant impacts on special-status species. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, which could include measures such as implementing construction timing restrictions and ensuring no net loss of ecological functions and values for important habitat (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures).

### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Construction activities associated with this project include the conversion of IPID canals to pipelines and lining of irrigation canals with concrete. Short-term impacts that could adversely affect special-status species include disturbance from increased construction activity and noise and temporary disturbance of habitat. As noted in Section 4.14, Noise, construction-related noise is anticipated to be relatively minimal. Species in the area may temporarily relocate to other areas during periods of increased activity. Short-term impacts would be relatively limited because most of the work would occur within areas that are already disturbed, such as within rights-of-way and existing canal easements, during the off-season when the irrigation canals are dry, and away from where special-status fish species may be found.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would further ensure that there were no significant impacts on special-status species. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, which could include measures such as implementing construction timing restrictions and ensuring no net loss of ecological functions and values for important habitat (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures).

### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Potential impacts on special-status species associated with work affecting COIC canals and laterals would be similar to those described for the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project. This project would also involve construction of the COIC pump station, requiring in-water work along lower Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River, which would result in a slightly higher potential to adversely affect special-status species, particularly any fish

### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

that might be present during construction. Potential impacts include increased risk of disturbance or harm from construction activities, such as from installation of a cofferdam, increased potential for harm from noise and vibration, increased risks of water quality impacts adversely affecting aquatic habitat, and temporary loss of aquatic habitat during dewatering for in-water construction.

Work within waters of the United States or State or within irrigation canals or spillways that reconnect to these waters would require a CWA Section 404 Permit and associated Section 401 Water Quality Certification; work in other portions of the irrigation system could require local review and authorization. Compliance with these and other applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures could include limiting in-water work, excluding aquatic species from in-water work areas, and implementing construction timing restrictions (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Construction activities proposed under the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project include pipeline replacement and meter installation. These activities are unlikely to adversely affect special-status species because the work would be done in areas that are already developed that provide minimal to no habitat.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project involves demolishing an existing dam, installing a new low-level outlet pipeline, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures to restore the maximum water storage level in the lake to an elevation of 4,671 feet and restore the accessible storage in the lake to the volume permitted by IPID's water right (2,500 acre-feet). Construction activity would occur along the shorelines and within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lake has been drawn down and in Eightmile Creek immediately downstream of the dam. While most construction equipment (potentially including a small tracked excavator) and materials would likely be flown into the project site via helicopter, IPID is considering the option of walking in a larger tracked excavator or a spider excavator. The trail to access the project site requires several stream crossings and parallels several potential wetlands (Figure 3-10).

Listed plant species with the greatest potential to occur within the project site include showy stickseed and Wenatchee Mountains checkermallow; however, these species would not likely be affected by construction because the proposed activities would occur within dry lake margins or the existing structures where these species are very unlikely to be found. If activities were to occur outside of these areas, compliance with existing regulations would require the implementation of mitigation measures to minimize potential impacts as noted in Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures. Listed animal species that could occur near the project site include northern spotted owl, marbled murrelet, yellow-billed cuckoo, Canada lynx, gray wolf, grizzly bear, and wolverine. There are no special-status fish species located at this lake.

Although some vegetated areas would be used to stage construction equipment and provide temporary housing for workers, there would be no permanent loss of habitat and the activities would not block access to adjacent habitat areas. As discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, potential impacts affecting water quality would be low.

Construction activities would also result in an increase in noise above background conditions that could disturb any species that may be present. However, most construction activities would result in noise levels similar to those that already occur and would continue for maintenance unrelated to this project. As noted in Section 3.15, Recreation, background noise includes regular recreational activity around the lake, including hikers and overnight campers. If bothered by increased sound, generally speaking, special-status species would be able to temporarily relocate to other areas of similarly suitable habitat without significant impacts. This would be similar to what currently occurs related to operation and maintenance at the lakes.

There is a potential for more significant disturbance to occur if loud construction noise occurs during the breeding season. Construction for this project could involve blasting. Special-status bird species are particularly vulnerable because nesting birds have been known to abandon their nests in response to sudden loud increases in noise; however, construction activity would occur in late summer, which is outside the breeding period for both marbled murrelet and northern spotted owl. Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would ensure there were no significant impacts on special-status species. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, which could include measures such as implementing construction timing restrictions and ensuring no net loss of ecological functions and values for important habitat (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The details of the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project and the specific impacts on fish and wildlife species are not known at this time but are expected to require ground disturbance and likely in-water work on lower Icicle Creek. Depending on the specific location of the activities, construction could result in short-term impacts on special-status species, similar to those described above. Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would ensure that there were no significant impacts on special-status species. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, which could include measures such as implementing construction timing restrictions and ensuring no net loss of ecological functions and values for important habitat (Section 4.10.6, Mitigation Measures).

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The details of the Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project and the specific impacts on fish and wildlife species are not known at this time, although construction is expected to involve grading; planting and thinning vegetation; hauling and placing logs, rock, soil, and other materials; and some in-water work on lower Icicle Creek. Depending on the specific location of the activities, construction could result in short-term impacts on special-status species, similar to those described above. Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would ensure there were no significant impacts on special-status species. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, which could include measures such as implementing construction timing restrictions and ensuring no net loss of ecological functions and values for important habitat (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

There are no construction activities proposed under the Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project and therefore no potential short-term impacts to special-status species.

### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

This project includes various elements geared towards improving water quality and hatchery rearing conditions at the LNFH. In general, construction of these elements has the potential to affect special-status species, depending on the specific location and type of disturbance. Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential short-term impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined.

Similar to the construction activities described above, various authorizations are likely to be required that would ensure potential impacts would be avoided, minimized, or compensated as noted in Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The details of the Fish Passage Improvements Project and the specific impacts on fish and wildlife species are not known at this time, although construction is expected to involve in-water work and some streambank alterations along lower Icicle Creek. Depending on the specific location of the activities, construction could result in shortterm impacts on special-status species, similar to those described above. Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would ensure there were no significant impacts on special-status species. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, which could include measures such as implementing construction timing restrictions and ensuring no net loss of ecological functions and values for important habitat (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The details of the Fish Screen Compliance Project and the specific impacts on fish and wildlife species are not known at this time, although construction is expected to involve in-water work and some streambank alterations along lower Icicle Creek. Depending on the specific location of the activities, construction could result in short-term impacts on special-status species, similar to those described above. Project activities are expected to require authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits and approvals issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to address any significant impacts on special-status species (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures). These measures would be developed to address any such impacts once project-level information is available.

#### Water Markets

There are no construction activities proposed under the Water Markets Project and therefore no potential short-term impacts to non-fish listed species and associated habitats.

### 4.10.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Operation of the proposed facilities for this project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from the affected lakes. Over the long term, the greatest potential for affecting special-status species would be related to changes in how the lakes are managed and the resulting changes in flows in Lower Icicle Creek.

Under this project, the frequency in fluctuations in lake levels would increase compared to existing conditions because some portion of each lake would be drawn down every year instead of relying on only one or two lakes per year; however, the high and low lake water levels at the lakes would not change. Although total water withdrawn would increase, operation of the proposed project would also potentially result in less draw down at any one lake because releases would be spread across all lakes and releases would be optimized to meet instream and water supply needs in Icicle Creek. Lake level variation would largely remain within the same parameters as existing conditions.

As noted in Sections 4.5, Surface Water Quality; 4.7, Fish; 4.8, Vegetation; and 4.9, Wildlife, re-operation of the lakes is not anticipated to result in significant changes affecting aquatic or terrestrial species. This is because although lakes could be affected each year compared to every few years, the changes in lake levels (e.g., highs and lows) would be consistent with existing operations and the current seasonal pattern of change, and is not expected to result in significant changes in ecosystem processes.

Additional flows released from these lakes would also be more evenly spread out across receiving streams that flow into Icicle Creek and eventually the Wenatchee River. This is expected to result in conditions more similar to the natural flow regime of these lakes

### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

than otherwise would occur under existing conditions, benefiting special-status species in Icicle Creek, including ESA-listed spring-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), steelhead (*O. mykiss*), and bull trout. These benefits are generally anticipated to extend to any listed critical habitat and essential fish habitat within Icicle Creek and its tributaries and the Wenatchee River.

With more efficient operation of the lakes, flow releases to lower Icicle Creek could be better targeted to the periods when they are needed. In general, this would mean that there would be lower contributions to peak flows early in the season and there would be higher contributions, estimated at up to 30 cubic cfs, when flows are low later in the summer.

As part of the Guiding Principles, flows would also be managed to benefit these species and minimize adverse impacts. For example, lake releases would ramp down gradually toward the end of the augmentation period to avoid stranding fish, and releases from these lakes would be limited in September to avoid negative affects to spawning bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*).

As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, efforts to characterize the impacts of the managed flows on special-status species are ongoing and future monitoring is also planned to determine whether additional mitigation measures could be needed to address potential impacts. For example, studies have looked at how instream flow releases affect important characteristics of bull trout Critical Habitat in French and Leland Creeks, including potential impacts on the food base and groundwater connectivity. Continued coordination on the development of the Icicle Strategy along with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would help to address potential impacts on special-status species as noted in Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures.

### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

The majority of the project elements include pipelines or canal improvements that would occur in areas that have already been developed and would not result in long-term adverse impacts on special-status species.

As noted in Section 4.7, Fish, in the long term, this project would also contribute to beneficial increases in instream flows downstream of the current IPID diversion in the lower 5.7 RMs of Icicle Creek and in the Wenatchee River downstream of Icicle Creek. Improving irrigation system efficiency is intended to benefit special-status species in Icicle Creek, including ESA-listed spring-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), steelhead (*O. mykiss*), and bull trout, by allowing more water to remain in the creek downstream of the IPID irrigation diversions from April through September.

### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Replacing canals and laterals with piping would occur in areas that have already been developed and would not result in long-term adverse impacts on special-status species. A pump station near the confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River would

potentially result in long-term changes affecting habitat. As part of this project, a new pump station would be constructed on the Wenatchee River or Lower Icicle Creek. These facilities would result in the loss of a small area of riparian vegetation and, depending on the specific location, could affect special-status fish species.

Compliance with applicable regulations would be required to ensure there is no net loss of ecological functions or values associated with siting the pump station and that there would be no significant impacts affecting special-status species. Therefore, there would be no significant long-term adverse impacts on special-status species expected. The longterm impacts associated with this project would be beneficial with respect to fish and wildlife in general, including special-status species.

As noted in Section 4.7, Fish, in the long term, this project would also contribute to beneficial increases in instream flows downstream of the current COIC diversion in the lower 4.5 RMRMs of Icicle Creek and in the Wenatchee River downstream of Icicle Creek. Improving irrigation system efficiency is intended to benefit special-status species in Icicle Creek, including ESA-listed spring-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), steelhead (*O. mykiss*), and bull trout, by allowing more water to remain in the creek downstream of COIC irrigation diversions during the irrigation season.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

As discussed in Section 4.7, Fish; Section 4.8, Vegetation; and Section 4.9, Wildlife, this project is not expected to result in adverse long-term impacts on threatened and endangered species. Over the long term, the impacts are expected to be beneficial as the result of improved instream flows, which would also provide benefits for special-status fish species.

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from Eightmile Lake. Over the long term, the greatest potential for affecting special-status species would be related to changes in how the lakes are managed and the resulting changes in flows in lower Icicle Creek.

Because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions. However, this project would result in the ability to maintain the lake at historical levels compared to existing conditions.

Under existing conditions, the maximum fill height of the lake is approximately 4,667 feet because the embankment portion of the dam has deteriorated. After the dam is restored, the lake would be able to fill to the historical high level of 4,671 feet. Under this project, lake levels would be managed to rise beginning in the late fall and would continue to approximately 4,666 feet, which would be the crest elevation of a notch in the

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

proposed dam. The lake would remain at this height until stop logs are placed in the notch early in the summer. Placement of the stop logs would allow the lake level to continue to rise to the spillway elevation of 4,671 feet, equal to the historical full water surface elevation. The lake would stay at this level for less than a month in the early summer, after which time IPID would begin drawing down the lake by releasing water.

Compared with existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, this means that an additional area of shoreline would be under water. These areas have been historically inundated, but have not been under water since deterioration of the embankment. This change in lake levels could result in some changes to the vegetative community along the fringes of the shoreline; however, this area is expected to be relatively small, on the order of 3.6 acres of shoreline area inundated, and would not represent a substantial loss of habitat that is anticipated to adversely affect special-status species.

The project would also allow for the lake to be drawn down below the existing low lake levels to an elevation of 4,621 feet, which is approximately 22.4 feet below the existing low. This change would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed, mainly late in the summer and early fall up to the point when the water would no longer be drawn down, generally around the end of September. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect vegetation or wetlands by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity or any other changes that would adversely affect special-status species.

Restoration of the dam would result in the ability to release up to 9.5 additional cfs from the lake relative to existing conditions. Increased flows would be released from the dam into Eightmile Creek, which flows into Icicle Creek. Increased flows would occur from the point of release at Eightmile Lake Dam down to the IPID diversion at RM 5.7.

As discussed in Section 4.7, Fish, the potential impacts associated with increased flows would generally be beneficial with respect to fish and aquatic invertebrates. The benefits are mainly associated with increasing aquatic habitat in lower Icicle Creek in the later summer months and improving fish passage to the upper reaches (above the Boulder Field at RM 5.6) of Icicle Creek and its tributaries, benefiting special-status species in Icicle Creek, including ESA-listed spring-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), steelhead (*O. mykiss*), and bull trout. However, there remains uncertainty around how increased flows might affect fish habitat within the study area or interaction within and between fish species, including any special-status fish that may be present. For additional information, see Section 4.7, Fish.

As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, the Guiding Principles require flows to be managed to benefit aquatic species and minimize adverse impacts. An example of a strategy under consideration is prioritizing the timing of releases relative to potential impacts on downstream aquatic habitat. Continued coordination on the development of the Icicle Strategy along with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would help to address potential impacts on special-status species as noted in Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures.

### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The purpose of the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project is to protect and enhance the tribal fishery, which, depending on the specific actions, could result in the loss of some small areas of terrestrial or aquatic habitat used by special-status species; however, these project elements are meant to preserve and enhance stream and riparian habitat in the system overall, leading to improved habitat functions and long-term benefits for fish and wildlife in general, including special-status species.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would ensure that there were no significant impacts on special-status species. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures).

### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

As discussed in Sections 4.7, Fish; 4.8, Vegetation; and 4.9, Wildlife, the Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project is not expected to result in adverse long-term impacts on fish and wildlife, including special-status species. Over the long term, the impacts are expected to be beneficial by providing improved instream and riparian habitat conditions.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would ensure that there were no significant impacts on special-status species. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures).

### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

As provided for in the Wenatchee Instream Flow Rule (Chapter 173-545 WAC), this project would increase the Icicle Reserve after implementation of instream flow and habitat restoration actions. The Icicle Reserve increase would be 0.4 cfs and offset by an equal reserve reduction for the mainstem Wenatchee River. This would create a 0.4 cfs impact on Icicle Creek, which does not exist under current conditions. This impact is anticipated to be offset by the implementation of other projects that benefit streamflow under Alternative 1.

Depending on the instream conditions at the timing and location of this 0.4 cfs impact, there could be potential conflicts with the other uses, most likely those associated with fish and wildlife habitat uses designated for Icicle Creek, which could adversely affect special-status species on a localized basis.

### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

As discussed in Sections 4.7, Fish; 4.8, Vegetation; and 4.9, Wildlife, this project is not expected to result in adverse long-term impacts on fish and wildlife but rather, would improve water quantity and water quality, which would benefit fish and wildlife in general, including any special-status species. Most the work included under this project is designed to improve water use efficiency at LNFH and to develop additional groundwater supplies

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

such that less water would need to be diverted from Icicle Creek for hatchery operations. Such actions would potentially support higher flows in the system, especially during late summer, which would benefit special-status species present within and along the creek.

### **Fish Passage**

As discussed in Sections 4.7, Fish; 4.8, Vegetation; and 4.9, Wildlife, the long-term impacts on fish and wildlife under the Fish Passage Project are generally anticipated to be beneficial because of increased access to additional habitat for listed fish species and the associated general improvement in ecosystem function. As discussed in Section 4.7, Fish, the potential impacts associated with increased flows would generally be beneficial with respect to fish and aquatic invertebrates and listed critical habitat. The benefits are mainly associated with increasing aquatic habitat in lower Icicle Creek in the later summer months and improving fish passage to the upper reaches (above the Boulder Field at RM 5.6) of Icicle Creek and its tributaries. However, there remains uncertainty around how increased flows might affect fish habitat or interaction within and between fish species, including any special-status fish that may be present within the study area. For additional information, see Section 4.7, Fish.

Potential long-term impacts on special-status species, particularly listed fish, would be addressed during project design. Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would ensure there were no significant impacts on special-status species. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures).

### **Fish Screen Compliance**

As discussed in Section 4.7, Fish, and Section 4.9, Wildlife, the long-term impacts on fish and wildlife, including special-status species, under the Fish Screen Compliance Project are generally anticipated to be beneficial because of increased protection and improved passage conditions for listed fish species and the associated general improvement in ecosystem function. Under this project, screens and associated infrastructure would be improved to bring all three intakes up to compliance with state and federal laws. Improvements to fish screens are intended to provide a long-term benefit to fish.

Any adverse impacts associated with screen improvements would be likely less than significant because these impacts would be addressed as required by applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts such as revegetating any disturbed areas and compensating for the permanent loss of any sensitive areas that could not otherwise be restored (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures). These requirements would be developed once project-specific details were available.

#### Water Markets

As discussed in Section 4.7, Fish, and Section 4.9, Wildlife, the long-term impacts on fish and wildlife, including special-status species, under the Water Markets Project are generally anticipated to be beneficial because of the potential to increase instream flows that would provide for improved ecological function and habitat values.

## 4.10.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would not. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addressed special-status species in general by ensuring compliance with applicable regulations, including the ESA. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. Impacts of other projects proposed under Alternative 2 are described under Alternative 1.

### 4.10.3.1 Short-term Impacts

### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

Construction of a new IPID pump exchange would require both in-water and riverbank work on the Wenatchee River, including the placement and removal of instream cofferdams, removal of streamside vegetation, and excavation of the streambed and bank. Depending on the specific location of the activities, construction could result in shortterm impacts on special-status species, primarily related to construction disturbance. Project activities with the potential to affect these species would require authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to address these impacts (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures). Specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting.

### 4.10.3.2 Long-term Impacts

### IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project facilities would likely result in the loss of a small area of riparian vegetation for the pump exchange station and intake facilities constructed along the right bank of the Wenatchee River and, depending on the specific location, could potentially affect special-status species. The project could also require clearing of vegetation along the delivery pipeline alignment, which would likely pass through existing agricultural properties and could impact orchard trees. Depending on the specific location, long-term operation could affect special-status fish species.

Generally speaking, the overall impacts associated with this project are expected to be beneficial because instream flows would increase by approximately 25 cfs between the

### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

current IPID diversion (RM 5.7) and the new pump station location, yet to be determined, during late summer pump station operation. This project is intended to benefit specialstatus species in Icicle Creek, including ESA-listed spring-run Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout, by replacing diversions from Icicle Creek with water pumped to irrigation canals from the Wenatchee River. Increased flows in Icicle Creek are likely to improve fish passage through obstructions in Icicle Creek during summer, particularly benefiting anadromous and migratory salmon, steelhead, and bull trout by allowing access to high-quality habitat in the upper reaches of Icicle Creek.

Any adverse impacts on special-status species would be likely less than significant because the amount of area converted from vegetation to the new facilities would be small. Potential operational impacts affecting fish species would be addressed as required by applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals.

# 4.10.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 with the exception that the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 project would be included while the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would not. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addressed special-status species in general by ensuring compliance with applicable regulations, including the ESA. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project. Impacts associated with other projects proposed under Alternative 3 are described in Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

## 4.10.4.1 Short-term Impacts

### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on special-status species.

## 4.10.4.2 Long-term Impacts

### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

If the proposed Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project were enacted, there could be potential conflicts with instream flow allocations that could result in adverse impacts on special-status species, primarily fish. Under the proposed changes, junior domestic water rights could be exercised even when the Instream Flow Rule is not met. This could result in potential adverse impacts on water quality as a result of low-flow conditions that could adversely affect special-status species, mainly fish. Under Alternative 3, there would be flow improvement projects implemented. However, the timing of flow improvements might not always provide in-time mitigation for junior users.

# 4.10.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1. The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would be replaced with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project, and the Upper Klonaqua Lake and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would be included. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addressed special-status species in general by ensuring compliance with applicable regulations, including the ESA. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with these projects compared to Alternative 1 and the No-action Alternative.

### 4.10.5.1 Short-term Impacts

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

This project would involve demolishing the existing dam, installing a new low-level outlet pipeline, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures that would allow for an increase in the accessible storage at Eightmile Lake to 3,500 acre-feet. The spillway elevation would be raised to allow for storage at a higher level than current or historical water storage levels and the project would allow for additional draw down of the lake.

Listed plant species with the greatest potential to occur within the project site include showy stickseed and Wenatchee Mountains checkermallow; however, these species would not likely be affected by construction because the proposed activities would occur within dry lake margins or the existing structures where these species are very unlikely to be found. If activities were to occur outside of the work areas, compliance with existing regulations would require the implementation of mitigation measures to minimize potential impacts as noted in Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures.

Listed animal species with the greatest potential to occur near the project site include northern spotted owl, marbled murrelet, yellow-billed cuckoo, Canada lynx, gray wolf, grizzly bear, and wolverine. There are no special-status fish species located at this lake.

Although some vegetated areas would be used to stage construction equipment and provide temporary housing for workers, there would be no permanent loss of habitat and the activities would not block access to adjacent habitat areas. As discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, potential impacts affecting water quality would be low.

Construction activities would also result in an increase in noise above background conditions that could disturb any species that may be present. However, most construction activities would result in noise levels similar to those that already occur and would continue for maintenance unrelated to this project. As noted in Section 3.15, Recreation, background noise includes regular recreational activity around the lake, including hikers and overnight campers. If bothered by increased sound, generally speaking, special-status species would be able to temporarily relocate to other areas of

similarly suitable habitat without significant impacts. This would be similar to what currently occurs related to operation and maintenance at the lake.

There is a potential for more significant disturbance to occur if loud construction noise occurs during the breeding season. Construction for this project could involve blasting. Special-status bird species are particularly vulnerable because nesting birds have been known to abandon their nests in response to sudden loud increases in noise; however, construction activity would occur in late summer, which is outside the breeding period for both marbled murrelet and northern spotted owl. Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would ensure there were no significant impacts on special-status species. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, which could include measures such as implementing construction timing restrictions and ensuring no net loss of ecological functions and values for important habitat (Section 4.10.6, Mitigation Measures).

### Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

Special-status species could be adversely affected in the short-term from construction activity in a manner similar to what would occur as described above for the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (Section 4.10.5.1, Short-term Impacts). The same special-status species have the potential to occur at this project site.

Construction activity would mainly occur in the dry lake margins in the late summer when the lake is drawn down. Although some vegetated areas would be used to stage construction equipment and provide temporary housing for workers, there would be no permanent loss of habitat and the activities would not block access to adjacent habitat. As discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, risks of spills (e.g., fuel, chemicals, etc.) would be very low because there would be limited use of powered equipment near water and work would occur in the dry after the lake was drawn down.

Construction activities would also result in an increase in noise above background conditions that could disturb any species that may be present. However, most construction activities would result in noise levels similar to those that already occur and would continue for maintenance unrelated to this project. As noted in Section 3.15, Recreation, background noise includes regular recreational activity around the lakes, including hikers and overnight campers. If bothered by increased sound, generally speaking, special-status species would be able to temporarily relocate to other areas of similarly suitable habitat without significant impacts. This would be similar to what currently occurs related to operation and maintenance at the lakes.

There is a potential for more significant disturbance to occur if loud construction noise occurs during the breeding season. Construction for this project could involve blasting. Special-status bird species are particularly vulnerable because nesting birds have been known to abandon their nests in response to sudden loud increases in noise; however, construction activity would occur in late summer, which is outside the breeding period for both marbled murrelet and northern spotted owl. Compliance with applicable local,

state, and federal regulations would ensure there were no significant impacts on specialstatus species. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, which could include measures such as implementing construction timing restrictions and ensuring no net loss of ecological functions and values for important habitat (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Special-status species could be adversely affected in the short-term from construction activity in a manner similar to what would occur as described above for the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (4.10.5.1, Short-term Impacts). The same special-status species have the potential to occur at this project site.

Construction activity would occur primarily in the dry lake margins in the late summer when the lake is drawn down. Although some vegetated areas would be used to stage construction equipment and temporarily provide housing for workers, there would be no permanent loss of habitat and the activities would not block access to adjacent habitat. As discussed in Section 4.5, Water Quality, risks of spills (e.g., fuel, chemicals, etc.) would be very low because there would be limited use of powered equipment near water and work would occur in the dry after the lake was drawn down.

Construction activities would also result in an increase in noise above background conditions that could disturb any species that may be present. However, most construction activities would result in noise levels similar to those that already occur and would continue for maintenance unrelated to this project. As noted in Section 3.15, Recreation, background noise includes regular recreational activity around each of the lakes, including hikers and overnight campers. If bothered by increased sound, generally speaking, special-status species would be able to temporarily relocate to other areas of similarly suitable habitat without significant impacts. This would be similar to what currently occurs related to operation and maintenance at the lakes.

There is a potential for more significant disturbance to occur if loud construction noise occurs during the breeding season. Construction for this project could involve blasting. Special-status bird species are particularly vulnerable because nesting birds have been known to abandon their nests in response to sudden loud increases in noise; however, construction activity would occur in late summer, which is outside the breeding period for both marbled murrelet and northern spotted owl. Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would ensure there were no significant impacts on special-status species. If needed, mitigation would be developed during project-level review, which could include measures such as implementing construction timing restrictions and ensuring no net loss of ecological functions and values for important habitat (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures).

## 4.10.5.2 Long-term Impacts

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

Operation of the proposed facilities for this project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from Eightmile Lake. Over the long term, the greatest potential for affecting special-status species would be related to changes in how the lakes are managed and the resulting changes in flows in lower Icicle Creek.

Because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. However, this project would result in the ability to maintain the lake at higher than historical levels compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Under existing conditions, the maximum fill height of the lake is approximately 4,667 feet because the embankment portion of the dam has deteriorated. After the dam is restored, the lake would be able to fill to a new high water surface of 4,682 feet. Under this project, lake levels would be managed to rise beginning in the late fall and would continue to approximately 4,677 feet to the height of a notch in the proposed dam. The lake would remain at this height until stop logs are placed in the notch early in the summer. Placement of the stop logs would allow the lake level to continue to rise to the spillway elevation of 4,682 feet. The lake would begin drawing down the lake by releasing water. These changes would increase the accessible storage to 3,500 acre-feet, which is 1,000 acre-feet more than currently permitted by IPID's water right.

Compared with existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, this means that an additional area of shoreline, approximately 13.6 acres, would be under water for a part of each year. Shoreline areas up to 4,671 feet have been historically inundated, but areas above 4,671 feet to 4,682 feet have not. This additional area would be under water for a little less than a month each summer. This change in lake levels could result in some changes to the vegetative community along the shoreline. However, because of the availability of habitat in the surrounding area and the fact that increased water levels would not represent a permanent increase in the lake height, it would not represent a substantial loss of habitat that is anticipated to adversely affect special-status species.

The project would also allow for the lake to be drawn down below existing lake levels to an elevation of 4,619 feet, which is approximately 24.4 feet lower than the existing low. This change would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed, mainly in the later summer months and early fall up to the point when the water would no longer be drawn down, generally around the end of September. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect vegetation or wetlands by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity or any other changes that would adversely affect special-status species.

As discussed in Section 4.7, Fish, the potential impacts associated with increased flows would generally be beneficial with respect to fish and aquatic invertebrates. The benefits are mainly associated with increasing aquatic habitat in lower Icicle Creek in the later summer months and improving fish passage to the upper reaches (above the Boulder Field at RM 5.6) of Icicle Creek and its tributaries. However, there remains uncertainty around how increased flows might affect fish habitat within Eightmile Creek or interaction within and between fish species, including special-status fish. For additional information, see Section 4.7, Fish.

As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, the Guiding Principles require flows to be managed to benefit aquatic species and minimize adverse impacts. An example of a strategy under consideration is prioritizing the timing of releases relative to potential impacts on downstream aquatic habitat. Continued coordination on the development of the Icicle Strategy along with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would help to address potential impacts on special-status species as noted in Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would provide the ability to store and release additional flows from Upper Klonaqua Lake, which would represent a change compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative as discussed further below. Over the long term, the greatest potential for impacts affecting fish and aquatic invertebrates would be related to the relative changes in lake levels and the resulting changes in flows in lower Icicle Creek.

The frequency in fluctuations in lake levels in Upper Klonaqua Lake would increase compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. Lake levels would also be drawn down further compared to existing conditions.

The high lake level in Upper Klonaqua Lake would not change. The lake would still refill and outlet naturally through an existing channel to Lower Klonaqua Lake during most of the year. However, the new facilities would allow for the lake to be drawn down an additional 20 feet to allow for access to an additional 1,146 acre-feet of storage. The draw down would likely occur over a couple of months in the late summer. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect special-status species, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity.

Modifications at Upper Klonaqua Lake would also result in the ability to release up to an additional 5 to 20 cfs from the lake. Increased flows would be released from the dam into a downstream tributary, which flows into Icicle Creek. Increased flows would occur from the point of release at Klonaqua Dam down to the IPID diversion at RM 5.7.

As discussed in Section 4.7, Fish, the potential impacts associated with increased flows would generally be beneficial with respect to fish and aquatic invertebrates. The benefits

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

are mainly associated with increasing aquatic habitat in lower Icicle Creek in the later summer months and improving fish passage to the upper reaches (above the Boulder Field at RM 5.6) of Icicle Creek and its tributaries. However, there remains uncertainty around how increased flows might affect fish habitat immediately downstream of the lake or interaction within and between fish species, including special-status fish. For additional information, see Section 4.7, Fish.

As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, the Guiding Principles require flows to be managed to benefit aquatic species and minimize adverse impacts. An Example of a strategy under consideration is prioritizing the timing of releases relative to potential impacts on downstream aquatic habitat. Continued coordination on the development of the Icicle Strategy along with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would help to address potential impacts on special-status species as noted in Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures.

### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

The Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would provide the ability to store and release additional flows at the lake, which would represent a change compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative as discussed further below. Operation of the proposed facilities for this project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from the lakes. Long-term impacts on special-status species could occur if there were any lasting impacts on critical habitat or long-term disturbance to these species from maintenance activities or changes in how lake levels are managed.

As discussed above, there would be no permanent loss of habitat, which would include designated critical habitat. Because the facilities would be newer and remotely operated by USFWS, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less than would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. However, lake levels would also be able to reach higher or lower levels compared to both existing conditions and historical levels.

The proposed enhancement project would increase the high-water storage levels in both Upper and Lower Snow Lakes by 5 feet compared with existing high levels. This change would result in the inundation of some upland vegetation that has grown along the shoreline areas between the current and proposed high lake levels, most likely occurring in the fall through the early summer when releases would be likely to begin. This could result in some changes to the vegetative community along the shoreline, similar to those described for the other lakes under this Program Alternative. However, these changes would not likely result in significant impacts on special-status species for the reasons described previously.

The project would also allow for Lower Snow Lake to be drawn down 3 feet below the current lake level, which would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect vegetation or wetlands by

comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity.

As discussed in Section 4.7, Fish, the potential impacts associated with increased flows would generally be beneficial with respect to fish and aquatic invertebrates. The benefits are mainly associated with increasing aquatic habitat in lower Icicle Creek in the later summer months and improving fish passage to the upper reaches (above the Boulder Field at RM 5.6) of Icicle Creek and its tributaries. However, there remains uncertainty around how increased flows might affect fish habitat immediately downstream of the lakes or interaction within and between fish species, including special-status fish. For additional information, see Section 4.7, Fish.

As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, the Guiding Principles require flows to be managed to benefit aquatic species and minimize adverse impacts. An example of a strategy under consideration is prioritizing the timing of releases relative to potential impacts on downstream aquatic habitat. Continued coordination on the development of the Icicle Strategy along with compliance with applicable regulatory requirements would help to address potential impacts on special-status species as noted in Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures.

## 4.10.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of the same projects as Alternative 1 except instead of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies, the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange would be included.

## 4.10.6.1 Short-term Impacts

### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project**

This project would involve fully converting the IPID delivery systems to pressurized pipelines, removing the existing intakes on Icicle and Peshastin Creeks, and constructing three new pump stations and intakes on the Wenatchee River. Construction disturbance required throughout the entire delivery system for conversion to pressurized pipelines could result in short-term disturbance of special-status from increased noise and short-term impacts on vegetation.

Construction of the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would require both inwater and riverbank work on the Wenatchee River and Icicle and Peshastin Creeks, including the placement and removal of instream cofferdams, removal of streamside vegetation, and excavation of the streambed and bank. Construction disturbance required throughout the entire delivery system for conversion to pressurized pipelines could result in short-term impacts on any special-status species that may be found within these areas as discussed further in Section 4.7.

Project activities with the potential to affect these species would require authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to address these impacts (Section 4.10.7, Mitigation Measures). Specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting. Such measures could include limiting in-water work, excluding aquatic species from in-water work areas, and implementing construction timing restrictions.

## 4.10.6.2 Long-term Impacts

### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project**

The project would likely result in the loss of a small area of riparian vegetation for the new pump stations and intake facilities constructed along the Wenatchee River and, depending on the specific location, could potentially affect special-status species. The project could also require clearing of vegetation along the delivery pipeline alignment, which would likely pass through existing agricultural properties and could impact orchard trees. Depending on the specific location, long-term operation could affect special-status fish species.

Generally speaking, the overall impacts associated with this project are expected to be beneficial because instream flows would in Icicle and Peshastin Creeks during late summer pump station operation. This project is intended to benefit special-status species in Icicle Creek, including ESA-listed spring-run Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout, by replacing diversions from Icicle Creek and Peshastin Creek with water pumped to irrigation canals from the Wenatchee River. Increased flows in Icicle Creek are likely to improve fish passage through obstructions in Icicle Creek during summer, particularly benefiting anadromous and migratory salmon, steelhead, and bull trout by allowing access to high-quality habitat in the upper reaches of Icicle Creek.

Any adverse impacts would be likely less than significant because the area converted from vegetation to the new facilities or cleared would be compensated and mitigated. Potential operational impacts affecting fish species would be addressed as required by applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals.

# 4.10.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

## 4.10.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Short-term impacts on special-status species would be mitigated by complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal regulations and obtaining required project-specific permits and approvals, such as any Shoreline Management Act shoreline permits, Critical Areas Review, HPAs, CWA compliance, and ESA compliance.

Common mitigation measures are likely to include pre-construction surveys, when deemed appropriate, conducting construction work in a manner to minimize disturbance of special-status species, ensuring no net loss of any important habitat or ecosystem functions or values, and possibly restricting the timing of some construction activities to avoid affecting particular special-status fish and wildlife species, in particular during critical life stages (i.e., breeding or mating).

Specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting. As long as any blasting occurs outside sensitive breeding periods for special-status species with a high potential to be in the project vicinity, mitigation measures to address potential short-term impacts on special-status species are expected to be the same as those described for vegetation and wetlands in Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures.

### 4.10.7.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts on special-status species would be mitigated by complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal regulations and project-specific permits and approvals, as described above under Short-term Impacts.

Specific mitigation measures to address any potential long-term impacts would be developed as part of any future project-level review and permitting. Mitigation measures to address potential long-term impacts on special-status species and their habitat are expected to be similar to those described for vegetation and wetlands in Section 4.8.7, Mitigation Measures, but may also include subsequent monitoring activities.

# 4.11 Aesthetics

This section describes the potential short- and long-term environmental impacts that could affect the resources identified in Section 3.11, Aesthetics, from construction and operation related to the No-action Alternative and Program Alternatives.

To assess the potential impacts, key viewpoints within the Icicle Creek Watershed project area were selected based in part on a GIS viewshed analysis, refined through field observations. Key viewpoints are specific locations where sensitive viewer groups would be able to see aesthetic changes. Sensitive viewer groups represent multiple user groups who are more sensitive to aesthetic changes because their underlying activity relies in part on the aesthetic setting. The magnitude of an impact depends on, among other factors, the number of individuals exposed to a change and their collective sensitivity to the change.

Once the Icicle project area was defined, the GIS viewshed analysis involved identifying specific locations from which important aesthetic resources (e.g., scenic views, landscape features) can be seen. When available, information about how people use the Icicle project area (e.g., recreational use data) was overlaid to show where there is a concentrated area of potentially sensitive viewers. For a general example, a trailhead that

### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

opens onto a panoramic overlook could represent a key viewpoint within a study area. Places where project changes are planned, such as a newly proposed facility, are also identified. A GIS analysis is then conducted to determine the visibility of project changes for sensitive viewers at each key viewpoint. The location of key viewpoints and representative views at these locations are presented in the discussion of Program Alternatives below.

# 4.11.1 No-action Alternative

### 4.11.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various agencies and other entities would continue to undertake individual actions to restore and enhance fish and aquatic resources in the Icicle project area and maintain existing infrastructure, but those actions would not be part of a coordinated program implemented with the support of the Icicle Work Group. Actions implemented by individual agencies and entities to restore and enhance fish and aquatic resources could include upgrading irrigation infrastructure at the Alpine Lakes and constructing diversion improvements, irrigation system upgrades, LNFH improvements, and fish passage work.

Under the No-action Alternative, short-term impacts on aesthetics would primarily occur as the result of construction-related activities. Visual changes resulting from these activities could include short-term dewatering of stream segments and increased activity, including the transport of construction materials, and the operation of construction equipment. In some cases, construction may require vegetation removal, grading, and stockpiling soil. Depending on the specific location of these activities, there is a potential for aesthetic changes to be disruptive in the short-term; however, most of these changes would be temporary (i.e., lasting only for the duration of the construction activity) and would, therefore, not be likely to be significant.

In addition, as noted in Section 4.8, Vegetation, any potentially significant impacts related to removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation types that constitute important habitat would be addressed prior to construction by compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits and approvals. For instance, Chelan County Code requires riparian buffer protection and mitigation, with buffer widths determined based on Environment Designation and intensity of use as shown in Table 4-2 in Section 4.8, Vegetation.

A habitat management and mitigation plan may be required to avoid degradation of the riparian habitat function, structure, and value. Mitigation requirements would also provide aesthetic benefits.

### 4.11.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts under the No-action Alternative are anticipated to be largely beneficial for aesthetics because the projects likely to be implemented are expected to improve habitat and upgrade aging and degraded infrastructure. However, there would be no coordinated and integrated effort to ensure that the projects move forward in a wellplanned manner, and thus these benefits are not anticipated to be as great as they would under the other Program Alternatives. In addition, project proponents may have less input or coordination with other stakeholders on the visual impact of a specific project that moves forward under the No-action Alternative. For example, if the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation project or the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration project were to move forward as individual projects without input from a coordinated IWG, there might be less emphasis placed on making sure the infrastructure blends in aesthetically with the environment. Potential long-term benefits from such projects are also expected to be more localized, providing only minor overall benefits within the larger Icicle Creek Subbasin.

## 4.11.2 Alternative 1

Implementation of Alternative 1 has the potential to result in greater impacts on aesthetics compared with the No-action Alternative because there would be higher likelihood that certain projects would be implemented and the scale of certain efforts would likely be greater. The following sections describe existing viewpoints and the short- and long-term impacts that would occur under Alternative 1.

### 4.11.2.1 Short-term Impacts

This section addresses the potential for short-term impacts on aesthetics anticipated with implementation of individual projects under Alternative 1.

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

The Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would improve management and releases of stored water at five lakes in the upper Icicle Creek Subbasin to meet agricultural needs. It would also increase instream flows for fish and improve reliability for agricultural use.

The sensitive viewers for this project are predominately recreation users (e.g., hikers and campers) who visit the Alpine Lakes as discussed in greater detail in Section 3.15, Recreation. Impacts on recreational use are described in greater detail in Section 4.15, Recreation.

The areas from which it would be possible to see proposed project changes are presented in orange in Figures 4-1 through 4-5 at each lake. This viewshed analysis is based on topographic relief and does not take into account obstructions that may limit views, such as vegetation, and is therefore a conservative representation. Viewpoints within these areas were selected as representative because these are locations from which the most recreational users are likely to be able to see project changes.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT



#### Figure 4-1. Colchuck Lake Viewshed

Figure 4-2. Eightmile Lake Viewshed



# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES



Figure 4-3. Upper and Lower Klonaqua Lakes Viewshed

Figure 4.4 Snow Lake Viewshed



#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT



#### Figure 4-5. Square Lake Viewshed

Representative views from the selected viewpoints at each lake are presented in Figures 4-6 through 4-14. In general, the aesthetic setting around the lakes where proposed changes would take place consist of views of the lakes and surrounding forested areas and in some cases contain mountain views. For the most part, the views are relatively open and consist of largely intact views of undeveloped wilderness.



Figure 4-6. Colchuck Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking Northeast (August)

Viewpoint 1 at Colchuck Lake is along the trail north of the Lake. This location has views of conifers, snags, a large boulder, and the lake shoreline in the foreground; the lake, dam, large wood material in the lake, and forested shoreline in the midground; and further forested slopes and the sky in the background.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT





Viewpoint 2 at Colchuck Lake occurs along the southern shoreline near camping sites. This location includes views of boulders and the lake shoreline in the foreground, forested slopes on either side of the lake in the midground, and further peaks and the sky in the background.


Figure 4-8. Eightmile Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking West (August)

Viewpoint 1 at Eightmile Lake is located along the berm of the existing dam east of the lake. This location includes views of boulders, large wood material, dam infrastructure and the lake edge in the foreground; the lake and forested slopes in the midground; and further forested and alpine peaks as well as sky in the background.



#### Figure 4-9. Eightmile Lake Viewpoint 2: Looking Southeast (July)

Viewpoint 2 at Eightmile Lake is located near the trail running along the north side of the lake. This location includes views of the lake in the foreground; the lake, lake edge, and dam infrastructure in the midground; and forested and rock slopes in the background.



Figure 4-10. Klonaqua Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking Southwest (July)

Viewpoint 1 at Klonaqua Lake is located at the terminus of the trail to the lake. The location includes views of conifers and snags in the foreground, the lake and forested slope in the midground, and alpine peaks and the sky in the background.

Figure 4-11. Snow Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking East (August)



Viewpoint 1 at Snow Lake is located along the trail in between Upper and Lower Snow Lakes. This location includes views of groundcover and small conifers, cobbles, boulders, shallow water, and large wood material in the foreground; the lake, aquatic vegetation, and a conifer forest in the midground; and a sloped conifer forest in the background.



#### Figure 4-12. Upper Snow Lake Viewpoint 2: Looking West (August)

Viewpoint 2 at Snow Lake is located at the northeast corner of Upper Snow Lake. This location features views of driftwood and the bare shoreline bank in the foreground; the lake, snags, and conifers in the midground; and forested edge of the lake, further peaks, and sky in the background.



Figure 4-13. Snow Lake Viewpoint 3 (Nada Lake): Looking Southwest

Viewpoint 3 at Snow Lake/Nada Lake is found along the trail west of Nada Lake. This location features views of boulders, the existing gatehouse, and outlet.



Figure 4-14. Square Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking West (September)

Viewpoint 1 at Square Lake is located at the terminus of the trail to the lake. The location includes views of the tops of conifer trees in the foreground, the lake and forested edge of the lake in the midground, and alpine slopes in the background.

In the short term, construction activities would result in some aesthetic changes visible to recreationalists who may be present at the time of construction. Construction activities associated with this project would involve replacing existing gates and installing solar panels, flow monitors, and motorized actuators at each of the lakes. Visual changes would include increased activity and the presence of hand-held construction tools, materials, and temporary worker housing near each dam. Most of the work would occur in upland areas with limited work occurring within the dry shorelines when the lakes are drawn down at the end of the summer.

- Depending on the specific location of these activities, there is a potential for aesthetic changes to be disruptive in the short term; however, construction activity would not be easily seen from many representative viewpoint locations as discussed further below. This is because in these locations, project changes are either obstructed by topography or vegetation or are too far away to be very noticeable.
- Colchuck Lake: construction activities would be visible from Viewpoint 1, but not from Viewpoint 2.
- Eightmile Lake: construction activities would be visible from Viewpoint 1, but not from Viewpoint 2.
- Lower Klonaqua Lake: construction activities would not be visible from the viewpoint.
- Snow Lake: construction activities would be visible from Viewpoint 3 only.
- Square Lake: construction activities would not be visible from the viewpoint.

Even when project activity may occur in areas where recreationalists would be located in close proximity, such as would be the case at Eightmile Lake, disturbance and associated aesthetic changes would be temporary (i.e., lasting only for the duration of the construction activity or about 2 to 4 weeks at each lake) and would not differ in duration or magnitude of change from the existing maintenance activities currently taking place or that would continue under the No-action Alternative. For these reasons, short-term aesthetic impacts are not likely to be significant.

## **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

The IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project involves improving irrigation delivery and onfarm efficiencies. Construction activities associated with this project could include lining and piping irrigation canals throughout the IPID service area. These activities would require the use of excavators, compactors, and other heavy equipment, such as dump trucks that would represent short-term changes to the aesthetic surroundings. However, construction activities would be occurring in areas that are already developed and in agricultural use. As a result, it is expected that there would be limited sensitivity of viewers to short-term changes and the potential impacts would not be significant. As noted previously, any vegetation removal would be mitigated through compliance with local, state, and federal requirements. If additional mitigation is required, it would be developed through project-level review as discussed in greater detail in Section 4.11.7, Mitigation Measures.

## **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

The potential aesthetic impacts associated with the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project would largely be similar to those described above except that this project would also include construction of a new COIC pump station along the right bank of the Wenatchee River somewhere near its confluence with Icicle Creek or along the left bank of Icicle Creek near its confluence with the Wenatchee River. Depending on the site that is selected, construction could result in short-term aesthetic impacts associated with vegetation clearing, grading, soil stockpiling, and general construction activity.

Representative viewpoints where sensitive viewers would be able to see aesthetic changes are presented for the Wenatchee River (Figure 4-15). The areas from which it would be possible to see proposed project changes are presented in orange. These viewpoints were selected because of their proximity to potential pump station locations and their accessibility for recreationalists using hand-boat launch facilities (Icicle Creek Viewpoint 1) and the creek or river for boating (all viewpoints). Views from each of these viewpoints are presented in Figures 4-16 through 4-18.



Figure 4-15. Wenatchee River Viewshed: Viewpoints 1 through 3

Figure 4-16. Wenatchee River Viewpoint 1: Looking Northwest (September)



This viewpoint is found near a public water access point along the river. The location includes views of the creek; the gravel, cobble, and boulder bank in the foreground; and the creek, bridge, armored bank, and upland and riparian vegetation in the midground.



#### Figure 4-17. Wenatchee Viewpoint 2: Looking Northeast (September)

This viewpoint is found at the water's edge accessible from upland private properties. The location features views of the river and gravel/cobble bank in the foreground, the creek and deciduous riparian vegetation in the midground, and conifer slopes and sky in the background.



Figure 4-18. Wenatchee Viewpoint 3: Looking Northeast (September)

This viewpoint is found along the shoreline slope accessible from upland private properties. The location features views of the gravel bank and herbaceous vegetation in the foreground; the creek, vegetated gravel bar, and riparian vegetation in the midground; and further riparian vegetation and upland forest slope and sky in the background.

Visual changes resulting from project activities could include short-term dewatering of stream segments through cofferdam construction and increased construction activity overall, including the transport of construction materials and the operation of construction equipment. In some cases, construction may require vegetation removal, grading, and stockpiling soil. Depending on the specific location of these activities, there is a potential for aesthetic changes to be disruptive in the short term; however, most of these changes would be temporary (i.e., lasting only for the duration of the construction activity) and would therefore not be likely to be significant.

In addition, any potentially significant impacts related to removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation types that constitute important habitat would be addressed prior to construction by compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits and approvals. This would include riparian vegetation, with potential mitigation requirements providing aesthetic benefits. If additional mitigation is required, it would be developed through project-level review as discussed in greater detail in Section 4.11.7, Mitigation Measures.

### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

The Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project focuses on conservation projects in the City of Leavenworth and Chelan County and implements municipal and rural water efficiency projects such as leak detection and repair, meter installation, and implementation of water conservation measures to improve domestic supply. Any construction activities proposed under this project would occur in areas that are already developed and would be minimal. Therefore, potential short-term impacts on aesthetics would be less than significant.

## **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would involve rebuilding the dam and outlet facilities to allow for restoration of water storage levels and useable storage volumes to their historical levels. The existing dam and embankment structure has eroded, which has limited the volume of water that can be stored in Eightmile Lake. This would help to increase the amount of water available in lower Icicle Creek, primarily in the late summer and fall.

The sensitive viewers for this project are predominately recreation users (e.g., hikers and campers) who would be visiting Eightmile Lake during construction activities. However, recreational access is currently limited due to damage caused by the Jack Creek fire that burned to lakeshore at Eightmile Lake during the summer of 2017. The subsequent emergency declarations made by IPID and local emergency response officials have resulted in USFS limiting access to Eightmile Lake. Impacts on recreational use are described in greater detail in Section 4.15, Recreation.

The locations where it would be possible to see proposed project changes, including construction-related disturbance in the short term, are presented in orange in Figure 4-2. This viewshed analysis is based on topographic relief and does not take into account obstructions that may limit views such as vegetation. Viewpoints 1 and 2 were selected as

representative for this project because these are locations from which the most recreational users are likely to be able to see the areas where project changes are proposed.

This project involves demolishing the existing dam, installing new piping, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures. Construction activity would occur along the banks and within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lake has been drawn down. Short-term impacts on aesthetics would be moderate because while most of the work and staging would occur within areas that are already disturbed and developed, the construction work would require flying in or "walking in" an excavator and other equipment, clearing vegetation, and blasting or rock-hammering the existing structure and bedrock. Specifically, replacement of the low-level outlet pipe below the dam would require excavation and movement of rock to a depth of as much as 10 to 15 feet below the existing ground surface. Construction of a 99-foot-long spillway northeast of the dam face, and a 75-foot-long spillway south of the existing dam would require the removal of some natural vegetation, placement of concrete, and moving and placing earth and rock.

These changes would be highly visible from Viewpoint 1, which is adjacent to the main construction activity. The work would also be visible from Viewpoint 2, although it would occur about 0.25 mile away from this location. Overall, short-term aesthetic impacts would be moderate.

Any potentially significant impacts related to removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation types that constitute important habitat would be addressed prior to construction by compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits and approvals. This would include riparian vegetation, with potential mitigation requirements providing aesthetic benefits.

## **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The focus of this project is to ensure that there would be no adverse effects on tribal fishing as a result of implementing other projects as part of the overall Icicle Creek Strategy. Although the specific activities are not yet defined, there are some elements under consideration, including the construction of facilities such as new plumbing to create a bubble curtain, sprayer, or other minor modifications near the spillway in front of the LNFH to promote favorable fishing conditions.

Project activities are anticipated to largely occur along lower Icicle Creek. Depending on the specific location of the activities, construction activities could be visible to recreational users. For any project elements occurring near LNFH, some aesthetic changes could be visible to trail users near LNFH or kayakers in Icicle Creek.

A representative viewpoint where potentially sensitive viewers would be able to see aesthetic changes is shown in Figure 4-19 and a representative view in Figure 4-20. This viewpoint was selected because of its proximity to potential project changes and its accessibility for recreationalists visiting the LNFH.

Figure 4-19. Icicle Creek Viewpoint 1



Figure 4-20. Icicle Creek Viewpoint 1: Looking Southwest



This viewpoint is located along the spillway structure of the LNFH. The location features views of the spillway and conifer vegetation in the foreground; the creek, shoreline edge, and coniferous riparian vegetation in the midground; and conifer slopes and sky in the background.

In the short term, project activities would likely include staging equipment, grading, and vegetation removal. Even though some activities may result in short-term aesthetic changes, these activities would be temporary and changes would be consistent with the developed character of the surrounding landscape and are therefore not anticipated to be significant.

In addition, any potentially significant impacts related to removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation types that constitute important habitat would be addressed prior to construction by compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits and approvals. This would include riparian vegetation, with potential mitigation requirements providing aesthetic benefits. If additional mitigation is required, it would be developed through project-level review as discussed in greater detail in Section 4.11.7, Mitigation Measures.

## Habitat Protection and Enhancement

Habitat protection and enhancement proposed under this project could involve grading; planting and thinning vegetation; hauling and placing logs, rock, soil, and other materials; and some in-water work on lower Icicle Creek. These activities could temporarily impact natural areas for clearing and grading activities; however, enhancement would, over time, benefit aesthetics. Therefore, even though some activities could result in short-term aesthetic changes, these impacts would be temporary. Therefore, it is not anticipated that they would be significant.

In addition, any potentially significant impacts related to removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation types that constitute important habitat would be addressed prior to construction by compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits and approvals. This would include riparian vegetation, with potential mitigation requirements providing aesthetic benefits. If additional mitigation is required, it would be developed through project-level review as discussed in greater detail in Section 4.11.7, Mitigation Measures.

## Instream Flow Rule Amendment

No short-term aesthetic impacts are anticipated from this project because no construction would be required.

## Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

This project includes various elements geared towards improving water quality and hatchery rearing conditions at the LNFH. In general, construction of these elements has the potential to affect natural areas and views in the short term, depending on the specific location and type of disturbance. Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential short-term impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined, which would address in greater detail the potential for aesthetic impacts.

In general, while the magnitude of potential aesthetic impacts would depend on the scale of the proposed construction activities, these changes would occur within an already developed landscape and are anticipated to be less than significant. In addition, any impacts would be further addressed through implementation of mitigation measures as described in Section 4.11.7, Mitigation Measures.

## **Fish Passage Improvements**

The specifics of the Fish Passage Improvements Project are not yet determined; however, it is anticipated that some improvements would be made at three locations on lower Icicle Creek: existing LNFH instream structures and the Boulder Field near RM 5.6. This work would require the use of excavators, dump trucks, and possibly a crane and would result in some disturbance in the short term that would alter existing views along lower Icicle Creek.

The sensitive viewers for this project are predominately recreation users (e.g., hikers and campers) who would be accessing the Snow Lake Trailhead, which passes over the Boulder Field, or recreation users on the trails at the LNFH during construction activities. The viewshed for this project is shown in Figure 4-21 with areas from which it would be possible to see proposed project changes presented in orange. This includes select viewpoints where individuals would be able to see aesthetic changes related to this project. Representative viewpoints were chosen because these are the locations where a relatively high number of individuals are likely to be able to see potential project activities. Figures 4-22 through 4-24 provide representative views from all three viewpoints.



Figure 4-21. Icicle Creek Fish Passage Improvements Viewshed

Figure 4-22. Icicle Creek Viewpoint 1: From Structure 5 Looking Upstream (Mid-water, 450 cubic feet per second [cfs])



Viewpoint 1 is accessible from trails within the LNFH. This location includes views of Icicle Creek in the foreground; shrub and herbaceous vegetation along an island and sides of banks as well as conifer forest in the midground; and sloped conifer forest and sky in the background.



Figure 4-23. Icicle Creek Viewpoint 2: From Structure 2 Looking Downstream (Mid-water, 390 cfs)

Viewpoint 2 is accessible from trails within the LNFH. This location includes views of Icicle Creek, Structure 2 infrastructure, and willows and conifers in the foreground; the creek, herbaceous and shrub riparian plants, and the edge of upland forest in the midground; and conifer forested slopes in the background.

Figure 4-24. Icicle Creek Viewpoint 3: From Boulder Field Looking Upstream (Low-water, 85 cfs)



Viewpoint 3 is located at the pedestrian bridge of the Snow Lake Trailhead. This location includes views of channel boulders and the creek in the foreground; boulders, herbaceous vegetation, and conifers in the midground; and vegetated slopes and talus in the background.

Depending on the specific location of the activities, construction activities are likely to be most visible to those who are recreating or fishing along this corridor. For any project elements occurring near LNFH, some aesthetic changes may be visible to trail users and fishers near LNFH or kayakers in Icicle Creek.

In the short-term, project activities would likely include staging equipment, grading, and vegetation removal, which would temporarily change the existing aesthetic character of each work site. Even though some activities could result in short-term aesthetic changes to typical views along lower Icicle Creek (Figures 4-22 through 4-24), these activities would be temporary and not anticipated be significant.

In addition, any potentially significant impacts related to removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation types that constitute important habitat would be addressed prior to

construction by compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits and approvals. This would include riparian vegetation, with potential mitigation requirements providing aesthetic benefits. If additional mitigation is required, it would be developed through project-level review as discussed in greater detail in Section 4.11.7, Mitigation Measures.

### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project involves replacing fish screens at three different diversions on lower Icicle Creek: LNFH/COIC, the City of Leavenworth, and IPID. Under this project, screens and associated infrastructure would be improved to bring all three intakes up to compliance with state and federal laws. These activities would involve the use of excavators, dump trucks, compaction equipment, concrete mixers, and other equipment as needed to move earth and other equipment materials. Although there would be some minor impacts to surrounding areas during construction because of removal and replacement of screens as well as inadvertent vegetation trampling, these impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

In the short term, project activities would likely include staging equipment, grading, and vegetation removal, which would temporarily change the existing aesthetic character of each work site. Even though some activities could result in short-term aesthetic changes to typical views along lower Icicle Creek, these locations are not as visible from key areas used most by recreationalists, such as the trailhead to Upper and Lower Snow Lakes, private resorts, and recreation parking areas (Figure 4-25). Even if these activities are visible, they would not result in extensive changes and would be temporary. For these reasons, they are not anticipated to be significant.



#### Figure 4-25. Icicle Creek Viewshed

### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

In addition, any potentially significant impacts related to removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation types that constitute important habitat would be addressed prior to construction by compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits and approvals. This would include riparian vegetation, with potential mitigation requirements providing aesthetic benefits. If additional mitigation is required, it would be developed through project-level review as discussed in greater detail in Section 4.11.7, Mitigation Measures.

### Water Markets

No short-term aesthetic impacts are anticipated from the Water Markets Project because no construction would be required.

## 4.11.2.2 Long-term Impacts

### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

The greatest potential for aesthetic impacts over the long term could occur as the result of any permanent changes to the existing aesthetic character as the result of introducing new elements into the viewshed and changes with respect to how lake levels are managed.

This project would result in updates to the existing infrastructure that are not expected to be substantially noticeable in the long term. The proposed updates would include replacing existing mechanical actuators with similar-looking motorized actuators. Power would be supplied by tree- or pole-mounted solar panels and antennas (Figure 4-26), and stamped concrete and plastic boulder utility covers would be used to enclose and protect the actuators and control (Figures 4-27 and 4-28). Because these elements would be incorporated to minimize long-term aesthetic changes and to match the natural character at each lake, infrastructure upgrades are not anticipated to result in significant long-term impacts on aesthetics.



Figure 4-26. Representative Photo: Solar-panel Associated with Existing Trees

Figure 4-27. Representative Photo: Actuator



Photo credit: ell brown via VisualHunt / CC BY

### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT



Figure 4-28. Representative Photo: Utility Cover

Photo credit: fekaylius via Visual hunt / CC BY-SA

Operation of the proposed facilities for this project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from the affected lakes. Because the facilities would be newer and largely operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes, or activities needed to maintain the facilities, are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions.

However, this project would result in increased frequency in fluctuations in lake levels compared to existing conditions. This is because lake levels would be drawn down every year instead of rotating one or two lakes per year.

Although the lakes would be drawn down more frequently, the high and low lake levels would not change. The variation in lake levels would be consistent with the general pattern that currently occurs and would continue to occur under the No-action Alternative:

- Highest water levels would continue to occur following spring thaw from April to July.
- Draw down to lower levels would still occur beginning in July or August with the lowest levels reached by early October.
- Autumn precipitation would contribute to lake levels rising slightly until the winter freeze occurs beginning in October or November.

Representative high- and low-water views for all five of the Alpine Lakes are presented below (Figures 4-29 through 4-42). As noted previously, these views would not be altered in terms of an individual's ability to view the lake and surrounding area; however, there would be a greater chance of encountering lower water conditions and greatest amount of shoreline (as shown in the representative low water figures below) during the later summer or early fall.

Specifically, automating the lake infrastructure would involve installed controls and telemetry that would allow for IPID and the USFWS to remotely control releases from the lakes. With better control, IPID and the USFWS would be able to optimize releases to meet water supply needs and help achieve instream flow targets in Icicle Creek. Automation would likely result in more frequent, targeted, controlled releases. However, a majority of the water would still be needed at the same time of year (late summer) to meet water supply and instream flow needs. Overall, the impact to aesthetics in the Alpine Lakes would be less than significant for this project.

### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT



Figure 4-29. Colchuck Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking Northeast, High Water

Timing: Water is typically high May to early July.

#### Figure 4-30. Colchuck Viewpoint 1: Looking Northeast, Low Water



Timing: Water is typically low late September to early October.



Figure 4-31. Colchuck Lake Viewpoint 2: Looking North, High Water

Timing: Water is typically high May to early July.

Figure 4-32. Colchuck Lake Viewpoint 2: Looking North, Low Water



Timing: Water is typically low late September to early October.



### Figure 4-33. Eightmile Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking West, High Water

Timing: Water is typically high May to early July.

Figure 4-34. Eightmile Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking West, Low Water



Timing: Water is typically low late September to early October.



Figure 4-35. Lower Klonaqua Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking Southwest, High Water

Timing: Water is typically high May to early July.

Figure 4-36. Lower Klonaqua Viewpoint 1: Looking Southwest, Low Water



Timing: Water is typically low late September to early October.



#### Figure 4-37. Lower Snow Lake Viewpoint 1: Looking East, High Water

Timing: Water is typically high May to early July.

Figure 4-38. Lower Snow Viewpoint 1: Looking East, Low Water



Timing: Water is typically low late September to early October.



Figure 4-39. Upper Snow Viewpoint 2: Looking West, High Water

Figure 4-40. Upper Snow Viewpoint 2: Looking West, Low Water



Timing: Water is typically low late September to early October.

#### Figure 4-41. Square Viewpoint 1: Looking West



Timing: Water is typically high May to early July.

Figure 4-42. Square Viewpoint 1: Looking West



Timing: Water is typically low late September to early October.

Likewise, as discussed in Section 3.3, Surface Water Resources, changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. Views of high- and low-water flows that currently occur within at the representative viewpoints are shown in Figures 4-43 through 4-48. With implementation of this project, seasonal flows would remain within this same level of natural variation.

The goal of the proposed project would be to make additional water available to meet Icicle Creek instream flow goals outlined in the Guiding Principles of 100 cfs during normal and wet years and 60 cfs during drought years.

Compared with existing conditions, this would result in additional flows in the later summer and early fall. Overall, the impact to aesthetics on Icicle Creek would be less than significant for this project.

Figure 4-43. Icicle Creek Viewpoint 3: From Boulder Field Looking Upstream, High Water



Timing: High flows in Icicle Creek typically occur from April to June.

Figure 4-44. Icicle Creek Viewpoint 3: From Boulder Field Looking Upstream, Low Water



Timing: Low Flows in Icicle Creek typically occur from August to early October.

## ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT



Figure 4-45. Icicle Creek Viewpoint 2: From Structure 2 Looking Downstream, High Water

Timing: High flows in Icicle Creek typically occur from April to June.

Figure 4-46. Icicle Creek Viewpoint 2: From Structure 2 Looking Downstream, Low Water



Timing: Low Flows in Icicle Creek typically occur from August to early October.



Figure 4-47. Icicle Creek Viewpoint 1: From Structure 5 Looking Upstream, High Water

Timing: High flows in Icicle Creek typically occur from April to June.

Figure 4-48. Icicle Creek Viewpoint 1: From Structure 5 Looking Upstream, Low Water



Timing: Low Flows in Icicle Creek typically occur from August to early October.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

The majority of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project elements include pipelines or canal improvements that would occur in areas that have already been disturbed and would not result in long-term impacts on aesthetics. Over the long term, efficiencies gained would also result in increases in instream flows along lower Icicle Creek downstream of the IPID Diversion at RM 2.4, mainly during late summer and early fall, compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. The potential long-term impacts associated with flow changes on Icicle Creek would result in similar types of impacts to those described as the result of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project in this section.

### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

In general, the potential impacts associated with the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project would be similar to those described above. The project would involve replacing an existing ditch that has some aesthetic benefit to those who live near it, with buried pipelines. However, the ditch cover would be restored to a more natural state, which could be viewed as an overall benefit to the general aesthetic of the ditch. In addition, the project would result in construction of a new COIC pump station and intake facilities along the right bank of the Wenatchee River near its confluence with Icicle Creek, or along the left bank of Icicle Creek near its confluence with the Wenatchee River. These facilities would result in the loss of a small area of riparian vegetation and result in a permanent aesthetic change as the result of a new pump station facility similar to the one shown in Figure 4-49. However, the proposed pump station would likely be close to residences and would include a building (Figure 4-50) over the pumps to mitigate for noise and aesthetic impact.



Figure 4-49. Representative Photo: Pump Station Intake Features and Armored Bank



Figure 4-50. Representative Photo: Pump Station Building (Prior to Revegetation)

Depending on the location of the COIC pump station, there is a potential that the new facility would represent a moderate level of contrast between the surrounding natural or pastoral view and the new structure. In addition to a building, additional treatment would likely be included, such as screening with vegetation or fencing. Representative views of areas under consideration are shown in Figures 4-16 through 4-18.

Depending on which location is selected by COIC, the pump station could likely not be very visible to sensitive viewers, except from certain viewpoints on the river. For example, a pump station at Wenatchee River Viewpoint 1 (Figure 4-16) would only be far below the roadway and would likely only be visible from the public river access or residences across the river. A pump station at Wenatchee River Viewpoint 2 (Figure 4-17) would also be visible from the river and residences near the river, but could be hidden by preserving or enhancing riparian vegetation. A pump station near Icicle Creek Viewpoint 3 (Figure 4-18) would be located in a forested area along Icicle Creek and would not likely be visible from any residences. It would only be visible from the creek. Additionally, with a pump station building around the facility, the views would be consistent with the surrounding rural and residential development that currently exists.

Over the long term, relocation of the COIC diversion and efficiencies gained by replacing the delivery system would also result in increases in instream flows along lower Icicle Creek, mainly during late summer and early fall, compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. The potential long-term impacts associated with flow changes on Icicle Creek would result in similar types of impacts to those described as the result of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project in this section.

## **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Increased conservation and re-use associated with this project is expected to lead to decreased return flows, which could decrease flows in the Wenatchee River downstream of the Leavenworth Wastewater Treatment Plant; however, the long-term effects on streamflow and any associated aesthetic changes are expected to be negligible.

## **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

The greatest potential for impacts on aesthetics over the long term would occur as the result of replacing the existing dam structure and low-level outlet pipeline at Eightmile Lake with a new dam and spillway facilities, low-level outlet pipeline, and controls. The project would likely decrease maintenance and allow for remote operations with respect to how the lake level is managed. The project would be managed, with the other Alpine Lakes, to meet water supply and instream flow needs in lower Icicle Creek instead of for agricultural purposes alone.

Sensitive viewers for this project are predominately recreation users (e.g., hikers and campers) who would be visiting Eightmile Lake, as discussed in greater detail in Section 3.15, Recreation. Impacts on recreational use are described in greater detail in Section 4.15, Recreation.

The areas from which it is possible to see proposed project changes are presented in orange in Figure 4-2. Viewpoints 1 and 2 (existing views shown in Figures 4-8 and 4-9) were selected as representative because these are the locations from which the most recreational users are likely to be able to see the proposed project changes.

For this project, the existing dam would be rebuilt with new facilities that would restore IPID's ability to store water to the historical spillway elevation. The dam and embankment have been eroded, which has reduced the elevation to which water can be stored and the volume of storage available for release to enhance water supply. The new dam would have a primary spillway elevation equal to the existing dam, but the spillway facilities would be larger, and the top of the dam would be higher in order to meet current dam safety design requirements for spillway facilities and freeboard. The facilities would be constructed with concrete, native rock, and native earth in a manner to minimize contrast with the natural surroundings. As such the new dam facility is expected to result in a less than significant impact to aesthetics because the height of the dam would be similar to existing conditions, degraded elements of the facility. Additionally, with time,

surrounding vegetation and the weathering properties of the lake and weather would further integrate this feature into the surrounding landscape.

Because the facilities would be newer and largely operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes, or activities needed to maintain the facilities, are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. However, restoration of the facilities and re-operation of the lake would result in the ability to fill the lake to the levels at which water was historically stored, and lower lake levels below the existing low-level outlet would provide access to the useable storage allowed by IPID's water right. These represent changes in lake level compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Compared with existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, this means that an additional area of shoreline would be under water mainly in the late spring and early summer, when IPID is trying to capture the last bit of snowmelt runoff. These areas have been historically inundated but have not been under water since deterioration of the embankment. This change in lake level would result in minimal changes in the vegetative community along the fringes of the shoreline, but otherwise there would be very limited changes to aesthetics from existing high water views.

Under current conditions, pumping or siphoning is occasionally used to draw the lake level down below the existing low level outlet; however, in most cases, the low lake levels do not extend below the existing outlet. The project would also result in the potential to expose about 3.6 acres more of lake bed when fully drawn down, compared to these more typical low-water conditions. Draw down would occur mainly in the later summer and early fall, with the lowest lake levels occurring at the end of the release period, generally around the end of September. Figure 4-51 illustrates existing and proposed low- and high-water levels.

Figures 4-52 and 4-53 show existing and simulated views of the lake. Figure 4-52 compares existing and proposed views from Viewpoint 2 under higher lake levels. in Figure 4-53 shows existing and simulated conditions from Viewpoint 1. Although an additional area of lakeshore would be inundated compared to existing conditions, as shown in the simulations of the proposed conditions, these changes mostly occur in the midground to background and are not easily discernible.

Figure 4-54 shows how views would differ when the lake is drawn down. Although foreground views would change because there would be a greater area of exposed lakebed, views during this time already include exposed shoreline. In addition, midground and background views would still provide a natural view of the lake. For these reasons, long-term aesthetic impacts associated with lake level changes are considered to be moderate but not significant.

#### Figure 4-51. Eightmile Lake Water Levels


Figure 4-52. Eightmile Lake Viewpoint 2: Eightmile Lake Dam, Existing and Simulated Views



Figure 4-53. Eightmile Lake Viewpoint 1: High Lake Conditions, Existing and Simulated Views



Figure 4-54. Eightmile Lake Viewpoint 1: Low Lake Level, Existing and Simulated Views



Over the long term, this project would also result in increases in instream flows along lower Icicle Creek, mainly during late summer and early fall, compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. The potential long-term impacts associated with flow changes on Icicle Creek would result in similar types of impacts to those described as the result of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project in this section.

# Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement

The purpose of this project is to protect and enhance the tribal fishery, which, depending on the specific actions, could result in the loss of some small areas of vegetation and possibly the construction of some minor new facilities; however, these project elements are meant to preserve and enhance stream and riparian habitat and would most likely result in long-term beneficial changes to aesthetic resources. Additionally, work within sensitive areas would require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts affecting sensitive areas (Section 4.11.7, Mitigation Measures). These requirements would be developed once project-specific details were available.

# Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The purpose of Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project is to protect and enhance habitat within the lower Icicle Creek corridor, which could require work along the natural shoreline project sites. Although these activities could affect small areas of native vegetation, the purpose of this project is to preserve and enhance stream and riparian habitat, which would likely lead to improvement of natural views over time.

Compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require implementation of BMPs and, if needed, additional mitigation would be developed during project-level review to address potentially significant impacts. Such measures could include generally incorporating improvements into the landscape to minimize contrast between project elements and the surrounding view (Section 4.11.7, Mitigation Measures). With implementation of BMPs and any required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on aesthetics would be less than significant.

# Instream Flow Rule Amendment

Under the Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project, the Icicle Reserve established under Chapter 137-545 WAC would be increased to support future domestic water supply demands projected through 2050. Over the long term, this amendment would ultimately result in the removal of an additional 0.4 cfs water from Icicle Creek after habitat and instream flow restoration elements are implemented. Additional water withdrawals could result in reduced instream flows in Icicle Creek, which could impact natural areas along the shoreline bank because there could be less water to support vegetation. However, potential impacts would be offset by the implementation of required instream flow and habitat restoration actions under Alternative 1. Changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system and illustrated in Section 4.11.2.2, Long-term Impacts, Irrigation Efficiencies.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

The potential long-term adverse impacts on natural shoreline areas would occur in areas where new facilities resulted in the conversion or loss of vegetation. Potential adverse impacts would likely be minor because the potential permanent loss of vegetation is expected to affect a relatively small area. Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential aesthetic impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

Although the specifics of the Fish Passage Improvements Project have not yet been determined, it is expected that long-term aesthetic changes would occur mainly at the Boulder Field (Figure 4-24) where the existing conditions would be altered to improve fish passage. Other potential project elements under consideration mainly include operational changes at Structures 2 and 5. To improve passage at the Boulder Field, it is anticipated that alteration to the stream channel would be required to create improved conditions for fish passage. Long-term impacts are not anticipated to be significant because the design does not include the introduction of any new elements or facilities but rather would maintain the overall natural conditions at this location.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

No impacts on aesthetics are anticipated from the Fish Screen Compliance Project over the long term because the project would replace degraded fish screens with updated models.

Depending on the location of the proposed new facilities, this project could result in the loss of some small areas of vegetation and possibly the construction of some minor new facilities; however, these project elements would be similar to the existing facilities and are not anticipated to result in a substantial change to the surrounding environment.

Additionally, work within sensitive areas would require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential long-term impacts affecting sensitive areas (Section 4.11.7, Mitigation Measures). These requirements would be developed once project-specific details were available.

#### Water Markets

Proposed Water Markets Project elements would result in increased flows in lower Icicle Creek, especially in years when mitigation water is not required for interruptible water

users. Over the long term, efficiencies gained would also result in increases in instream flows along lower Icicle Creek, mainly during late summer and early fall, compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. The potential long-term impacts associated with flow changes on Icicle Creek would result in similar types of impacts to those described as the result of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project in this section.

# 4.11.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would also be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation project would not. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses aesthetic views in general by enhancing Icicle Creek aquatic and riparian habitat. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. Potential impacts associated with other projects proposed under Alternative 2 are discussed under Alternative 1.

# 4.11.3.1 Short-term Impacts

### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

Construction of a new pump station under this project would require both in-water and riverbank work on the Wenatchee River. Such activities could result in many of the same construction-related short-term impacts on aesthetics described for the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project (4.11.2.1, Short-term Impacts), including clearing of vegetation along the bank of the Wenatchee River and along the delivery pipeline route.

# 4.11.3.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would result in the loss of a small area of riparian vegetation and the construction of a new pump exchange and associated intake facilities. Although the specific location is not yet determined, it is planned to be constructed along the banks of the Wenatchee River. A viewshed map is presented in Figure 4-55 with the areas from which it would be possible to see proposed project changes presented in orange and a representative view is shown in Figure 4-56. Representative photographs of what these facilities would likely look like are presented in Figures 4-49 and 4-50.

Figure 4-56 shows the view near the Highway 2 bridge at Dryden. This location includes views of an armored slope and willow trees and grasses in the foreground; the river, building debris, and a shoreline structure and upland vegetation in the midground; and the bend of the river and forested slope in the background.

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES



Figure 4-55. Wenatchee River Viewshed: Viewpoint 4

Figure 4-56. Wenatchee Viewpoint 4: Looking Southwest (July)



#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Sensitive viewers for this project could include recreationalists (e.g., walkers, kayakers) using public access points along the Wenatchee River during construction activities. Drivers along the Stevens Pass Scenic Byway could also be able to see the new facilities.

Representative photos of the pump station infrastructure are provided through the COIC Efficiencies Project (Figures 4-49 and 4-50). Viewers may notice a moderate level of contrast between the surrounding pastoral view and the new structure; however, the project site includes an existing degraded structure already affecting this view and the view from the Dryden bridge is accessed predominately by vehicular drivers limiting the amount of time this infrastructure could be noticed.

Over the long term, efficiencies gained would also result in increases in instream flows along lower Icicle Creek, mainly during late summer and early fall, compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. The potential impacts would be similar to those described as the result of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project (Section 4.11.2.2, Long-term Impacts).

# 4.11.4 Alternative 3

The potential impacts associated with Alternative 3 are similar to those discussed above with the exception that the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 would be implemented and the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would not.

# 4.11.4.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

No short-term aesthetic impacts are anticipated from this project because no construction would be required.

# 4.11.4.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

If the proposed Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority Project for Alternative 3 were enacted, there could be potential conflicts with instream flow allocations. Under the proposed changes, junior domestic water rights could be exercised even when the instream flow rule is not met, resulting in the potential for lower instream flows and associated aesthetic changes.

# 4.11.5 Alternative 4

The potential impacts associated with Alternative 4 are similar to those discussed for Alternative 1 with the exception that the Eightmile Lake Storage, Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage, and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects are included. The potential aesthetic impacts associated with these projects are described below.

## 4.11.5.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would involve demolishing the existing dam, installing new piping, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures that would allow for an increase in the accessible storage at Eightmile Lake to 3,500 acre-feet. The new dam structure would increase the normal high operating water surface elevation by 11 feet to 4,682 feet to allow for storage at a higher level than current or historical water storage levels and the project would also allow for additional draw down of the lake.

Construction activity would occur along the banks and within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lake has been drawn down. Short-term impacts on aesthetics would be limited because most of the work would occur within areas that are already disturbed and developed. However, a 100-foot-long spillway northeast of the dam face and a 75-foot-long spillway south of the existing dam would disturb natural vegetation.

As noted in Section 4.8, Vegetation, any potentially significant impacts related to the removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation types that constitute important habitat would be addressed prior to construction by compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits and approvals. This would include riparian vegetation, with potential mitigation requirements providing aesthetic benefits. With implementation of required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on aesthetics would be less than significant.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

Short-term impacts on aesthetics from this project would primarily be associated with construction activities required to provide a low-level outlet from Upper Klonaqua Lake to Lower Klonaqua Lake using one of the three conceptual connection options discussed in Chapter 2. Construction activity would occur between the lakes and along the banks within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lakes had been drawn down.

As noted in Section 4.8, Vegetation, any potentially significant impacts related to removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation types that constitute important habitat would be addressed prior to construction by compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits and approvals. This would include riparian vegetation, with potential mitigation requirements providing aesthetic benefits. With implementation of required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on aesthetics would be less than significant.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Short-term impacts on aesthetics from the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would be primarily related to construction activities, and the impacts are similar in type and mechanism to those discussed in Sections 4.11.5.1, Short-term Impacts, Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement and Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement. Specific construction activities that could result in impacts include the transportation of construction equipment and materials to the project site; draw down of the

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

lakes to isolate in-water work areas; demolition of the existing dams and water control structures; removal of vegetation, excavation, and fill placement to install new low-level outlet piping; and the placement of concrete and other materials to construct new dams.

As noted in Section 4.8, Vegetation, any potentially significant impacts related to removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation types that constitute important habitat would be addressed prior to construction by compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits and approvals. This would include riparian vegetation, with potential mitigation requirements providing aesthetic benefits. With implementation of required mitigation measures, the short-term impacts on aesthetics would be less than significant.

#### 4.11.5.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from Eightmile Lake. The greatest potential for impacts on aesthetics over the long term would occur as the result of permanent conversion of any natural areas, disturbance during maintenance, and any changes in operations with respect to how lake levels are managed.

The sensitive viewers for this project, representative viewpoints, and viewsheds are the same as under Alternative 2 Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration (Section 4.11.2.2).

Because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. However, this project would result in the ability to maintain the lake at higher than historical levels compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Under existing conditions, the maximum fill height of the lake is approximately 4,667 feet because the embankment portion of the dam has deteriorated. After the dam is restored, the lake would be able to fill to a new high water surface of 4,682 feet. Under this project, lake levels would be managed to rise beginning in the late fall and would continue to approximately 4,677 feet to the height of a notch in the proposed dam. The lake would remain at this height until stop logs are placed in the notch in the early summer. Placement of the stop logs would allow the lake level to continue to rise to the spillway elevation of 4,682 feet. The lake would stay at this level for less than a month in the early summer, after which time IPID would begin drawing down the lake by releasing water.

Compared with existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, this means that an additional area of shoreline would be under water. Shoreline areas up to 4,671 feet have been historically inundated, but areas above 4,671 feet to 4,682 feet have not been inundated. The additional area would be under water for a little less than a month each summer. This change in lake levels could result in some changes to the vegetative community at the water's edge but would otherwise represent limited changes to aesthetics from existing high water views.

The project would also allow for the lake to be drawn down below existing lake levels to an elevation of 4,620 feet, which is approximately 25 feet lower than the existing low. This change would result in the exposure of 13.6 acres of additional lake bed, mainly in the later summer month and early fall up to the point when the water would no longer be drawn down, generally around the end of September.

The dam infrastructure updates would have a temporary impact on views as a result of vegetation removal and impacts because of earthwork and clearing associated with construction of the primary and secondary spillways. The new dam facility would represent a moderate impact to aesthetics because the height of the dam would be increased, requiring additional earthwork (compared to Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration) and greater impact to surrounding vegetation. As with the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project, degraded elements of the area. Additionally, with time the surrounding vegetation and the weathering properties of the lake and weather would further integrate this feature into the surrounding landscape.

These draw down surface water-level changes represent moderate impacts to aesthetics through the change between existing and proposed views. However, the draw down conditions would still provide a natural view of the lake, but with a greater proportion of rock and sediment exposed compared to the existing view. The higher surface water changes represent a less than significant impact to aesthetics. The higher water would affect vegetation at portions of the shoreline; however, existing conditions include snags and ample large wood in the lake supplied by the forested slopes.

Simulations of the high water and dam infrastructure updates are provided below in Figures 4-57 and 4-58. Draw down conditions are similar to those shown in Alternative 2 Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration, but the lowest draw down level would include an additional 2 feet (Figure 4-59).



Figure 4-57. Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement: Dam, Existing and Simulated Views

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

# Figure 4-58. Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement: Higher Lake Level, Existing and Simulated Views



Figure 4-59. Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement: Low Lake Level, Existing and Proposed Conditions



Changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system and illustrated in Section 4.11.2.2, Long-term Impacts, IPID Irrigation Efficiencies. The main changes would be beneficial from increased flows during times when water levels would otherwise be low.

Any potentially significant impacts related to removal of riparian vegetation or other vegetation types that constitute important habitat would be addressed prior to construction by compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits and approvals. This would include riparian vegetation, with potential mitigation requirements providing aesthetic benefits. Additional mitigation measures may include stamping or facing infrastructure with natural materials, screening with vegetation, and generally incorporating facilities into the landscape to minimize contrast between project elements and the surrounding view (Section 4.11.7, Mitigation Measures).

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

The sensitive viewers for this project are predominately recreation users (e.g. hikers and campers) who would be visiting Upper Klonaqua Lake. Representative viewpoints where recreation users would see aesthetic changes are presented and described below. Figure 4-60 provides viewshed results with the locations of the representative viewpoint and the areas from which it would be possible to see proposed project changes presented in orange.



Figure 4-60. Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Viewshed

Potential long-term impacts to aesthetics would be similar to those described under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (Section 4.11.5.2, Long-term Impacts). Potential benefits would mainly occur in Icicle Creek and would include an increased ability to augment stream flow in the late summer or during drought years, with flow augmentation primarily benefitting the section of Icicle Creek between Upper Klonaqua Lake and the IPID diversion. Simulations of this project condition with the outlet structure are provided in Figure 4-61 below.

Figure 4-61. Viewpoint 2: Upper Klonaqua Lake Outlet Visible from Lower Klonaqua Lake, Existing and Proposed Conditions



#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The outlet structure and water flows would change the existing view as shown in the simulation; however, the view change would occur far from sensitive viewers who might be hiking on the surrounding trails and camping nearby. Additionally, the changes would largely look natural and would not introduce any new manmade elements into the viewshed that would conflict with the natural feel of the view. Further, changes to water levels would be limited to Upper Klonaqua Lake and would not be visible to sensitive viewers. Therefore, this project is not expected to result in significant aesthetic impacts in the long term at the lakes.

Over the long term, this project would also result in increases in instream flows along lower Icicle Creek, mainly during late summer and early fall, compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. The potential long-term impacts associated with flow changes on Icicle Creek would result in similar types of impacts to those described as the result of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project in this section.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

The Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would result in the construction of new facilities that would allow for an increase in the high-water storage levels at both Upper and Lower Snow Lakes by 5 feet compared with existing conditions. The project would also allow for Lower Snow Lake to be drawn down 3 feet below the current lake level, which would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed. The infrastructure changes for this project would not be visible to recreationalists at Upper and Lower Snow Lake as they would be located within a currently existing gatehouse. Changes in water pressure from the existing outlet would likewise be indistinguishable from existing conditions (Figure 4-13). Simulations of the water-level changes associated with the project are provided below in Figures 4-62 through 4-65.

# Figure 4-62. Viewpoint 1: Lower Snow Lake High Water, Existing and Proposed Conditions



Figure 4-63. Viewpoint 1: Lower Snow Lake Low Water, Existing and Proposed Conditions



Figure 4-64. Viewpoint 2: Upper Snow Lake High Water, Existing and Proposed Conditions



Figure 4-65. Viewpoint 2: Upper Snow Lake Low Water, Existing and Proposed Conditions



#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The draw down and high water levels would change the existing view during a portion of the peak recreation time period. More specifically, those accessing the lakes in late summer are more likely to experience lower lake levels (Figures 4-62 and 4-64); however, the view would largely remain intact and have the same natural character. This would be consistent with the surrounding landscape. Therefore, it is expected that this project would not result in significant aesthetic impacts over the long term.

Over the long term, this project would also result in increases in instream flows along lower Icicle Creek, mainly during late summer and early fall, compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. The potential long-term impacts associated with flow changes on Icicle Creek would result in similar types of impacts to those described as the result of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project in this section.

# 4.11.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of the same projects as Alternative 1 except instead of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies, the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would be included.

# 4.11.6.1 Short-term Impacts

#### IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project

This project would involve converting the IPID delivery systems to pressurized pipelines, removing the existing intakes on Icicle and Peshastin Creeks, and constructing three new pump stations and intakes on the Wenatchee River. Conversion of the IPID delivery systems and removal of the existing intakes would require the use of excavators, compactors, and other heavy equipment, such as dump trucks that would represent short-term changes to the aesthetic surroundings. However, construction activities would be occurring in areas that are already developed and in agricultural use. As a result, it is expected that there would be limited sensitivity of viewers to short-term changes and the potential impacts would not be significant.

Construction of the three new pump stations and associated facilities would require both in-water and riverbank work on the Wenatchee River. Such activities could result in many of the same construction-related short-term impacts on aesthetics described for the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies Project (4.11.2.1, Short-term Impacts), including clearing of vegetation along the bank of the Wenatchee River and along the delivery pipeline route. As noted previously, any vegetation removal would be mitigated through compliance with local, state, and federal requirements. If additional mitigation is required, it would be developed through project-level review as discussed in greater detail in Section 4.11.7, Mitigation Measures.

## 4.11.6.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project**

Conversion of the existing delivery systems would likely mean that canals and flumes would be abandoned in place or removed. New sections of pipelines would be buried. Therefore, it is expected that there would be limited sensitivity of viewers to long-term changes and the potential impacts would not be significant.

The Full IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would also result in the loss of a small area of riparian vegetation associated with the pump exchanges and intake facilities.

Potential impacts associated with one of the three pump stations would be the same as those described for the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project (Viewpoint 4) in Figure 4-56. The likely location of the two additional pump stations are shown in Figure 4-66 with representative views of the current conditions at those locations shown in Figure 4-67 and Figure 4-68.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Figure 4-66. Wenatchee River Viewshed: Viewpoints 5 and 6



# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES



Figure 4-67. Wenatchee Viewpoint 5: Looking Southwest

Figure 4-68. Wenatchee Viewpoint 6: Looking Southwest



### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Sensitive viewers at the two additional pump station locations (Viewpoints 5 and 6) could include recreationalists (e.g., walkers, kayakers) using public access points along the Wenatchee River. Drivers along the Stevens Pass Scenic Byway could also be able to see the new facilities near Viewpoint 5 but not at Viewpoint 6.

Viewers from these locations may notice a low to moderate level of contrast between the surrounding view and the new pump station or intake, depending on the specific location. Representative photographs of what these facilities would likely look like are presented in Figures 4-49 and 4-50. From Viewpoint 5, there is an existing degraded structure already affecting this view and the view from the Dryden bridge is accessed predominately by vehicular drivers limiting the amount of time this infrastructure could be noticed. Viewpoint 6 represent views from a private property where the surroundings include other manmade structures. Because the new facilities would represent less of a change to the aesthetics at that location and are not easily accessible to the public, changes to this location would represent less of an aesthetic change.

Over the long term, efficiencies gained through relocation intakes on Icicle and Peshastin Creeks would also result in increases in instream flows up to the new diversion points, mainly during late summer and early fall, compared to existing conditions and the Noaction Alternative. The potential long-term impacts associated with flow changes on Icicle Creek would result in similar types of impacts to those described as the result of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project in this section.

# 4.11.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes the BMPs that would be required and would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above.

## 4.11.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Short-term aesthetic impacts are often largely addressed through the implementation of BMPs that are typically required by local, state, and federal regulations and project-specific permits and approvals. Common BMPs include conducting work in a manner to minimize potential disturbance of native vegetation, minimizing dust, implementing thorough site cleanup activities, and possibly compensating for loss of any important habitat, which indirectly affects aesthetics.

If deemed necessary, specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting. Mitigation measures to address potential short-term impacts on aesthetics are expected to be the same as those described for vegetation and wetlands in Section 4.8.6, Mitigation Measures.

## 4.11.7.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts on aesthetics would be mitigated in part by complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal regulations and project-specific permits and approvals to restore or compensate for the loss of sensitive vegetative areas. However, specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting if needed. Implementation of the following additional measures would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

- Design and locate to the extent feasible permanent facilities outside of publicly accessible viewpoints and avoid or minimize to the extent possible the permanent removal of native vegetative communities.
- Minimize the aesthetic impacts of new facilities by designing them to visually fit into the surrounding landscape by:
  - Selecting materials to blend into surrounding views. Avoid the use of reflective coatings or paints.
  - Painting grouped infrastructure the same color to reduce contrast and visual complexity.
  - Siting infrastructure away from ridgelines such that views of the new facilities would not have high contrast against the sky.
  - Minimize the need for nighttime lighting. Use motion detectors to minimize the need for lights to be on continually.
  - Use natural topography and vegetation to screen infrastructure from publicly accessible vantage points where possible.

# 4.12 Air Quality

This section describes the potential short- and long-term impacts that could affect the resources identified in Section 3.12, Air Quality, from construction and operation related to the No-action Alternative and Program Alternatives.

# 4.12.1 No-action Alternative

# 4.12.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various entities and agencies would undertake individual actions that could result in short-term impacts on air quality in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area. construction of water diversion modifications, general habitat enhancement projects, LNFH improvements, required fish screening upgrades, modernization of infrastructure at the Alpine Lakes including the restoration of the Eightmile Lake Dam, and improvements to existing irrigation systems to support agricultural reliability.

Short-term impacts on air quality would primarily occur as the result of constructionrelated activities. Emissions would result from the transport of construction materials and the operation of construction equipment. In addition, fugitive dust as a result of the

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

exposure or transport of soil during construction may also contribute to short-term air quality impacts. In general, short-term construction emissions are expected to be less than significant because any emissions would be temporary and minimal. Further, the majority of construction activities would be anticipated to be minimal such that they would not trigger the need for a notice of construction permit from Ecology (WAC 173-400-110). In addition, incorporation of the standard BMPs outlined in Section 4.12.7, Mitigation Measures, would help to further reduce emissions.

#### 4.12.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, individual project implementation would result in increased air emissions compared to existing conditions. Emissions from any new stationary sources, (e.g., a diesel-powered backup generator for pumping), would have the potential to result in long-term air quality impacts if the emissions exceed the applicable regulatory standards described in Section 3.12, Air Quality. However, compliance with the applicable regulatory processes described in Section 5.2, Table 5-2, would ensure any new sources of emissions would remain within acceptable thresholds.

In general, small-scale water resources projects would most likely either not result in longer-term sources of emissions or would likely fall below WAC stationary source permit requirements (WAC 173-400-110); however, if permitting was required, individual projects would be required to incorporate additional emissions controls as described in Section 4.12.7, Mitigation Measures. Therefore, the No-action Alternative is not anticipated to result in significant long-term air quality impacts.

# 4.12.2 Alternative 1

Implementation of Alternative 1 has the potential to result in an increase in emissions compared with the No-action Alternative because there would be greater likelihood that certain projects would be implemented, and the scale of certain efforts would likely be greater.

#### 4.12.2.1 Short-term Impacts

This section addresses the potential for short-term impacts on air quality anticipated with implementation of individual projects under Alternative 1.

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Construction activities associated with this project would result in minor short-term increases in air emissions from transporting workers and equipment to the five lakes and possibly operating a generator to power hand tools. No heavy equipment would be used related to this project. Transportation would involve helicopter trips to and from the lakes and related construction activity over a brief (likely just a few days) period at each lake. No campfires are allowed at the lakes and no other burning activities are planned related to this project.

Although there would be some minor increases in air emissions during construction, anticipated levels would be considered minimal such that they would not trigger the need for a notice of construction permit from Ecology (WAC 173-400-110).

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Construction activities associated with the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project include the conversion of IPID canals to pipelines and lining of irrigation canals with concrete. These activities could require the use of excavators, compactors, and other heavy equipment, such as dump trucks. Although there would be some minor increases in air emissions in the short term, anticipated levels would be considered minimal such that they would not trigger the need for a notice of construction permit from Ecology (WAC 173-400-110).

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Construction activities associated with COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project would include piping canals and laterals and installation of a pump station and would also be considered exempt per WAC 173-400-110. Short-term impacts on air quality would not be significant.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Certain components of the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project, such as evaluating conservation-oriented rate structures and expanding conservation education, xeriscape, and rebate programs, would not result in air emissions; however, the construction-related activities associated with this project, such as replacing leaky water mains and residential meters, could result in some minor, short-term increases in air emissions related to the use of generators to power tools and operation of heavy equipment, including trucks, as needed. Although there would be some minor increases in air emissions during construction, anticipated levels would be minimal such that they would not trigger the need for a notice of construction permit from Ecology (WAC 173-400-110).

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Construction activities associated with the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would result in minor short-term increases in air emissions from transporting workers and equipment to Eightmile Lake and general construction activity, including operating an excavator and a generator to power hand tools and dewatering equipment. Transportation would involve periodic helicopter trips to and from the lake during the construction period, which is anticipated to last approximately 2 to 3 months. An excavator, which would be required for construction, may also be walked in along the Eightmile Lake Trail or transported by helicopter, which would also result in some short-term emissions.

Although there would be some minor increases in air emissions during construction, anticipated levels would be minimal such that they would not trigger the need for a notice of construction permit from Ecology (WAC 173-400-110). If burning activities are required, they would be conducted in compliance with the appropriate regulations or

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

permit conditions, as discussed in Section 4.12.7, Mitigation Measures, to ensure that potential impacts on air quality would remain minimal.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The focus of this project is to ensure that there would be no adverse effects on tribal fishing as a result of implementing other projects as part of the overall Icicle Strategy. The specifics of this project are not yet determined, but would likely involve the operation of construction equipment, resulting in some minor short-term emissions. At this stage, the primary options under consideration include the construction of facilities, such as a pipeline, bubble curtain, or sprayer, near the spillway in front of the LNFH to promote favorable fishing conditions. Most construction activities are expected to be minimal such that they would not trigger the need for a notice of construction permit from Ecology (WAC 173-400-110). Any new sources of emissions would be subjected to regulation as discussed in greater detail in Section 4.12.7, Mitigation Measures, which would ensure emissions would not exceed applicable thresholds.

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project could involve grading; planting and thinning vegetation; hauling and placing logs, rock, soil, and other materials; and some in-water work on lower Icicle Creek. These activities would require construction equipment, including trucks, excavators, and hand-held equipment, the use of which would result in minor air emissions. Most construction activities are expected to be minimal such that they would not trigger the need for a notice of construction permit from Ecology (WAC 173-400-110). Any new sources of emissions would be subjected to regulation as discussed in greater detail in Section 4.12.7, Mitigation Measures, which would ensure emissions would not exceed applicable thresholds.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

No short-term air quality impacts are anticipated from this project because no construction would be required.

# Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

This project includes various elements geared towards improving water quality and hatchery rearing conditions at the LNFH. In general, construction of these elements would result in some increase in short-term air emissions. Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by the USFWS, an evaluation of the potential air quality impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined. In general, while the magnitude of potential air quality impacts would depend on the scale of the proposed construction activities, it is anticipated that construction-related emissions for this project would be similar in nature to those described above and would be addressed through implementation of BMPs similar to those described in Section 4.12.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The Fish Passage Improvements Project would potentially involve modification of existing LNFH instream structures in Icicle Creek, as well as instream modifications to the Boulder Field near RM 5.6. This work would require the use of excavators, dump trucks, and possibly a crane. Although there would be some minor increases in air emissions during construction, anticipated levels would be minimal such that they would not trigger the need for a notice of construction permit from Ecology (WAC 173-400-110).

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

This project involves replacing fish screens at three different diversions on lower Icicle Creek: LNFH/COIC, the City of Leavenworth, and IPID. Under this project, screens and associated infrastructure would be improved to bring all three intakes up to compliance with state and federal laws. These activities would involve the use of excavators, dump trucks, compaction equipment, concrete mixers, and other equipment as needed to move earth and other equipment materials. Although there would be some minor increases in air emissions during construction, anticipated levels would be minimal such that they would not trigger the need for a notice of construction permit from Ecology (WAC 173-400-110)

#### Water Markets

No short-term air quality impacts are anticipated from the Water Markets Project because no construction would be required.

## 4.12.2.2 Long-term Impacts

This section addresses the potential for long-term impacts on air quality anticipated with implementation of individual projects under Alternative 1.

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Operation of the proposed facilities for this project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from the affected lakes. Because the facilities would be operated largely by desktop and would rely in part on solar energy, the greatest potential for impact to air emissions over the long term would occur as the result of maintenance trips to and from the lakes, which are anticipated to likely be less frequent than would occur under the No-action Alternative. For this reason, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term impacts on air quality.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

The IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project does not involve new emission-generating facilities or changes in operation of the existing facilities and therefore would not result in any significant long-term increases in air emissions.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

The long-term impacts of the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project on air quality would be similar to those described for the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Project with the exception of those associated with the new COIC pump station. As a new facility, the pump station would be required to comply with applicable regulations described in Section 3.12, Air Quality, which would ensure any new sources of emissions would remain within acceptable thresholds.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

No long-term impacts are anticipated from this project because no new emissions would be generated.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would result in the ability to store and withdraw additional water consistent with historical levels at Eightmile Lake. Because the facilities would be operated largely by desktop at the IPID offices and would rely in part on solar energy, the greatest potential for increased air emissions over the long term would occur as the result of maintenance trips to and from the lakes, which are anticipated to be less than would occur under the No-action Alternative. For this reason, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term impacts on air quality.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

No impacts on air quality are anticipated from this project over the long term because no new emissions-generating facilities are proposed.

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

No impacts on air quality are anticipated from this project over the long term because no new emissions-generating facilities are proposed.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

No impacts on air quality are anticipated from this project over the long term because no new emissions-generating facilities are proposed.

# Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

Operation of the LNFH over the long term has the potential to result in changes in air emissions compared to the No-action Alternative. The extent of the changes depends on the specifics of the proposed project; however, in general, it is anticipated that long-term impacts would be minor because any proposed facilities would be required to operate consistent with applicable local, state, and federal air quality regulations, as noted in Section 4.12.7, Mitigation Measures. Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential air quality impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

No impacts on air quality are anticipated from this project over the long term because no new emissions-generating facilities are proposed.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

No impacts on air quality are anticipated from this project over the long term because no new emissions-generating facilities are proposed.

#### Water Markets

No impacts on air quality are anticipated from this project over the long term because no new emissions-generating facilities are proposed.

# 4.12.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would not. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project compared to Alternative 1 and the Noaction Alternative.

# 4.12.3.1 Short-term Impacts

#### IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

Construction of the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would require the use of excavators, compactors, and other heavy equipment, such as dump trucks, which would result in short-term increases in air emissions. Construction is anticipated to last up to 3 months. Although there would be some minor increases in air emissions associated with this activity, anticipated levels would be considered minimal such that they would not trigger the need for a notice of construction permit from Ecology (WAC 173-400-110).

## 4.12.3.2 Long-term Impacts

#### IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

Long-term operation of the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would result in some increased emissions primarily associated with powering the pump. As a new facility, the pump exchange would be required to comply with the applicable regulatory processes described in Section 4.12.7, Mitigation Measures. This would ensure any new sources of emissions would remain within acceptable thresholds.

# 4.12.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 with the exception that the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project would be included while the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would not. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project.

# 4.12.4.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

No impacts on air quality are anticipated from this project in the short term because no new emissions-generating activities are proposed.

# 4.12.4.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

No impacts on air quality are anticipated from this project over the long term because no new emissions-generating activities are proposed.

# 4.12.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the Eightmile Lake, Upper Klonaqua Lake, and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Enhancement Projects would be included. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with these projects compared to Alternative 1 and the No-action Alternative.

# 4.12.5.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

Construction activities associated with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would result in minor short-term increases in air emissions from transporting workers and equipment to Eightmile Lake and general construction activity, including operating an excavator and a generator to power hand tools and dewatering equipment. Transportation would involve periodic helicopter trips to and from the lake during the construction period, which is anticipated to last approximately 2 to 3 months. An excavator may also be walked in along the Eightmile Lake Trail or transported by helicopter, which would also result in some short-term emissions.

Although there would be some minor increases in air emissions during construction, anticipated levels would be minimal such that they would not trigger the need for a notice of construction permit from Ecology (WAC 173-400-110). If burning activities are required, they would be conducted in compliance with the appropriate regulations or permit conditions, as discussed in Section 4.12.7, Mitigation Measures, to ensure that potential impacts on air quality would remain minimal.

#### Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

Construction activities associated with this project would result in minor short-term increases in air emissions from transporting workers and equipment to the lake and general construction activity, including operating an excavator and a generator to power hand tools and dewatering equipment. Transportation would involve periodic helicopter trips to and from the lake during the construction period.

Although there would be some minor increases in air emissions during construction, anticipated levels would be minimal such that they would not trigger the need for a notice of construction permit from Ecology (WAC 173-400-110). If burning activities are required, they would be conducted in compliance with the appropriate regulations or permit conditions, as discussed in Section 4.12.7, Mitigation Measures, to ensure that potential impacts on air quality would remain minimal.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Construction activities associated with this project would result in minor short-term increases in air emissions from transporting workers and equipment to the lake and general construction activity, including operating an excavator and a generator to power hand tools and dewatering equipment. Transportation would involve periodic helicopter trips to and from the lakes during the construction period.

Although there would be some minor increases in air emissions during construction, anticipated levels would be minimal such that they would not trigger the need for a notice of construction permit from Ecology (WAC 173-400-110). If burning activities are required, they would be conducted in compliance with the appropriate regulations or permit conditions, as discussed in Section 4.12.7, Mitigation Measures, to ensure that potential impacts on air quality would remain minimal.

## 4.12.5.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would result in the ability to store and withdraw additional water at Eightmile Lake. Because the facilities would be operated largely by desktop at the IPID offices and would rely in part on solar energy, the greatest potential for increased air emissions over the long term would occur as the result of maintenance trips to and from the lake, which are anticipated to be the same as or less than would occur under the No-action Alternative. For this reason, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term impacts on air quality.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would result in the ability to store and withdraw additional water at Klonaqua Lake. Because the facilities would be operated largely by desktop at the IPID offices and would rely in part on solar energy, the greatest potential for increased air emissions over the long term would occur as the result of any maintenance trips to and from the lake. Because these facilities would be new and require less maintenance, and because travel to and from the site would largely be done on foot, the potential long-term impacts are anticipated to be minimal. For this reason, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term impacts on air quality. PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would result in the ability to store and withdraw additional water from Upper and Lower Snow Lakes. The facilities would be operated remotely by USFWS personnel at the LNFH. Releases from the lakes would be automated, with electronic actuators that would rely on solar energy. The greatest potential for increased air emissions over the long term would occur as the result of maintenance trips to and from the lakes, which are anticipated to be the same as or less than would occur under the No-action Alternative. For this reason, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term impacts on air quality.

# 4.12.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of the same projects as Alternative 1 except instead of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies, the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project would be included.

# 4.12.6.1 Short-term Impacts

#### IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project

Construction of the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would require the use of excavators, compactors, and other heavy equipment, such as dump trucks, which would result in short-term increases in air emissions. Construction is anticipated to be phased over several years. Although there would be some minor increases in air emissions associated with this activity, anticipated levels would be considered minimal such that they would not trigger the need for a notice of construction permit from Ecology (WAC 173-400-110).

Construction activities specifically associated with installing the pressurized pump delivery system would also be considered exempt per WAC 173-400-110. Short-term impacts on air quality would not be significant.

# 4.12.6.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

Long-term operation of the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would result in some increased emissions primarily associated with powering the pumps. As new facilities, the pump stations would be required to comply with the applicable regulatory processes described in Section 4.12.7, Mitigation Measures. This would ensure any new sources of emissions would remain within acceptable thresholds.

# 4.12.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

## 4.12.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Air quality regulations are set forth in Chapter 173-400 WAC. Construction permits for activities that are not otherwise exempt per WAC 173-400-110 are required to comply with the standards set forth in Chapter 173-400 WAC to ensure that air quality levels do not exceed acceptable thresholds.

Even though the construction activities associated with the Program Alternatives are expected to be minimal and otherwise exempt from regulation, implementation of the following BMPs would ensure that emissions were further reduced.

- Ensure all equipment is in good repair to minimize potential emissions.
- Minimize unnecessary idling of emission-generating equipment.
- Cover any areas of bare stockpiled soil when not in use.
- Limit any burn piles to an area of 10 feet by 10 feet and follow any other applicable limitations set forth by Washington Department of Natural Resources, Chelan County, and Ecology.

## 4.12.7.2 Long-term Impacts

New sources of emissions are also required to comply with the requirements set forth in Chapter 173-400 WAC. Compliance with required permit conditions would ensure that any long-term air emissions do not exceed acceptable thresholds.

# 4.13 Climate Change

This section describes the potential short- and long-term impacts of climate change on the proposed projects. Additionally, it describes any possible effects of the projects on climate change. Effects on climate change are assumed to primarily occur during construction activities and are discussed in the short-term impacts section. The impacts are related to emissions from construction equipment. The amount of carbon emissions resulting from construction projects depend on the type, quantity, and duration of heavy equipment use. None of the projects' construction plans are developed enough to calculate carbon emissions. Ecology guidance suggests that increased carbon emissions of less than 25,000 metric tons per year are presumed not to be significant (Ecology, 2011).

Effects of climate change on projects are discussed in the long-term impacts sections. Many of the impacts of climate change on streamflow, as discussed in Section 3.13, are expected to be reduced if Program Alternatives are implemented. Table 4-3 indicates if the instream flow goal of 100 cfs is met by the various Program Alternatives under low, medium, and high climate change scenarios in 2080. These climate change scenarios are related to modeled changes based on the amount of future greenhouse gas releases. More

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

detail regarding the difference climate change scenarios is available in Changing Streamflow in Icicle, Peshastin, and Mission Creeks (UW CIG, 2017) in Appendix G.

	Present	Low Change	Medium Change	High Change
Alternative 0	No	No	No	No
Alternative 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Alternative 2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Alternative 3	Yes	No	No	No
Alternative 4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Alternative 5	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

# Table 4-3Ability to Maintain Minimum Flow Target of 100 cfsUnder 2080 Climate Change Conditions?

Note: If guiding principles could be met both in drought and non-drought years per climate change scenario, yes. If guiding principles are not expected to be met in either drought or non-drought years per climate change scenario, no. This table is based on flow charts developed with the estimated percent change (average output of CIG model work) and the average weekly stream flow as recorded at the USGS gaging station (1997-2016). Projected streamflow benefits were added to these data to estimate the performance of the alternatives for projects available in both drought and non-drought years under predicted climate change conditions. These flow charts are provided in Appendix G.

# 4.13.1 No-action Alternative

# 4.13.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various agencies and other entities would continue to undertake individual actions to restore and enhance fish and aquatic resources in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area, but those actions would not be part of a coordinated program implemented with the support of the IWG. Actions implemented by individual agencies and entities could include construction of diversion improvements, irrigation system upgrades, LNFH improvements, and fish passage work.

Short-term impacts to climate change would result from increased greenhouse gas emissions during the construction of ongoing projects. At this point in the planning process, it is not possible to calculate the greenhouse gas emissions resulting from projects built under the No-action Alternative. However, it is assumed that the No-action Alternative would result in the lowest level of greenhouse gas emissions because the fewer projects would be constructed compared to the Program Alternatives.

## 4.13.1.2 Long-term Impacts

As discussed in Section 3.13, climate change is expected to have significant impacts on the timing of the hydrograph, with peak flows occurring earlier in the season and having a lower magnitude as well as lower summer and early fall flows. These changes in the

hydrograph would likely have significant negative consequences for aquatic species and water availability for out-of-stream uses. Without an integrated water resource management strategy, individual project efficacy could reduce the potential to address these issues.

Several projects will likely proceed under the No-action Alternative that will help secure supplies of out-of-stream use. These include improvements at points of diversions, efficiency/conservation upgrades, and continued maintenance and operation of storage facilities. While these projects might continue under the No-action Alternative, the focus of these projects would likely be focused on out-of-stream beneficiaries and not on streamflow.

Long-term impacts to climate change resulting from this project that would have increased energy demands, such as the COIC pump station, could include increases in greenhouse gas emissions. However, Chelan PUD, which generates power primarily through hydroelectric projects, will provide the electricity for this project, so greenhouse gas emissions are expected to be relatively low. Significant increases in greenhouse gas emissions are not expected to result from implementation of the No-action Alternative.

# 4.13.2 Alternative 1

As discussed in Section 3.13, research on climate change indicates there will likely be significant changes in the magnitude and timing of the hydrograph in Icicle Creek over time. Implementation of Alternative 1 has the potential partially to offset the impacts associated with increased variability in water flows and increase adaptable water management strategies in response to changing climatic conditions. Appendix G provides graphs of modeled streamflow under low, medium, and high climate change scenarios, with additional flows provided by Alternative 1 augmenting the climate change base flow. These models were built from data available in the University of Washington Climate Impacts Group report on Icicle Creek streamflow under various greenhouse gas scenarios and climate change models (CIG, 2017). These graphs use an average of models to predict stream flow based on low greenhouse gas release scenarios. Based on these analyses, Alternative 1 would meet the instream flow targets established in the Guiding Principles in 2080 under the low, medium and high climate change scenarios.

There is also the potential for greenhouse gas releases in association with construction activities.

## 4.13.2.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Construction activities associated with the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would involve replacing existing gates and installing solar panels, actuators, flow monitoring equipment, and other new equipment. Some of these

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

activities could require the use of gasoline/diesel powered equipment, which could be flown in via helicopter during normal maintenance trips. The use of heavy equipment for construction would likely be limited for this project. As discussed in Section 4.12.2.1 emissions from construction equipment would be considered minimal. Greenhouse gas emissions would be limited to the construction window and are not expected to cause appreciable impacts on climate change.

## **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Construction activities associated with the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project include the conversion of irrigation canals to pipelines, lining of irrigation canals with concrete, and installation of on-farm efficiency upgrades. These construction activities would require the use of gasoline/diesel powered heavy equipment. As discussed in Section 4.12.2.1 emissions from construction equipment would be considered minimal. Greenhouse gas emissions would be limited to the construction window and are not expected to cause appreciable impacts on climate change.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Construction activities associated with the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project include the conversion of irrigation canals and laterals to pipelines and construction of a new surface water intake and pump station on the Wenatchee River. These construction activities would require the use of gasoline/diesel powered heavy equipment. As discussed in Section 4.12.2.1 emissions from construction equipment would be minimal. Greenhouse gas emissions would be limited to the construction window and are not expected to cause appreciable impacts on climate change.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Construction activities under the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project would likely be associated with upgrading leaky infrastructure, such as replacing watermains and installing meters. These construction activities would require the use of gasoline/diesel powered heavy equipment, but as discussed in Section 4.12.2.1 emissions from construction equipment would be considered minimal. Greenhouse gas emissions would be limited to the construction window and are not expected to cause appreciable impacts on climate change.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would involve demolishing the existing dam, installing a new low-level outlet pipeline, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures. These construction activities would likely require the use of gasoline/diesel powered heavy equipment, but as discussed in Section 4.12.2.1 emissions from construction equipment would be considered minimal. Greenhouse gas emissions would be limited to the construction window and are not expected to cause appreciable impacts on climate change.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The focus of this project is to ensure that there would be no adverse effects on tribal fishing as a result of implementing other projects as part of the overall Icicle Strategy. At this stage, the primary options under consideration include the construction of facilities, such as plumbing to create a bubble curtain, a sprayer, or other minor modifications to the Hatchery Channel spillway at LNFH to promote favorable fishing conditions in the pool at the bottom of the spillway. These construction activities would require the use of gasoline/diesel powered equipment, but as discussed in Section 4.12.2.1 emissions from construction equipment would be considered minimal. Greenhouse gas emissions would be limited to the construction window and are not expected to cause appreciable impacts on climate change.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

The Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project includes planting vegetation, grading, and installing logs, rocks, and other materials. These construction activities would require the use of gasoline/diesel powered equipment, but as discussed in Section 4.12.2.1 emissions from construction equipment would be considered minimal. Greenhouse gas emissions would be limited to the construction window and are not expected to cause appreciable impacts on climate change.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

There are no construction activities associated with this project, and no potential for greenhouse gas emissions.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

This project includes various elements that would require the use of gasoline/diesel powered equipment during construction, including the installation of circular tanks, implementation of effluent pump-back, and groundwater augmentation. These construction activities would result in some increase in short-term greenhouse gas emissions. Because this facility is owned by the Reclamation and operated by the USFWS, an evaluation of the potential air quality impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined. In general, while the magnitude of potential greenhouse gas emissions would depend on the scale of the proposed construction activities, it is anticipated that construction-related emissions for this project would be similar in nature to other projects described in this section.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The Fish Passage Improvements Project would involve modification of existing LNFH instream structures in Icicle Creek as well as instream modifications to the Boulder Field near RM 5.6. These construction activities would require the use of gasoline/diesel powered heavy equipment, but as discussed in Section 4.12.2.1 emissions from construction equipment would be considered minimal. Greenhouse gas emissions would

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

be limited to the construction window and are not expected to cause appreciable impacts on climate change.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project involves installing fish screens at three different diversions on Icicle Creek. These construction activities would require the use of gasoline/diesel powered equipment, but as discussed in Section 4.12.2.1 emissions from construction equipment would be considered minimal. Greenhouse gas emissions would be limited to the construction window and are not expected to cause appreciable impacts on climate change.

#### Water Markets

There are no construction activities associated with this project, and no potential for greenhouse gas emissions.

### 4.13.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

As discussed in Section 3.13, climate change is predicated to impact the timing of the hydrograph, leading to increased streamflow in the winter and decreased streamflow in the summer, over time. The Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project is designed to release up to 30 cfs to augment low flows in Icicle Creek. This project would be expected to help offset the impacts of climate change and provide the flexibility for adaptive management of water resources within the basin, reducing impacts on fish and out-of-stream users.

Under climate change scenarios, the likelihood that lakes will still be able to fully recharge remains relatively unchanged or improves in 2030 across model types. However, the timing of when runoff from rain or snowmelt occurs changes, which leads to increased recharge in the winter and spring, and decreased runoff to the lakes during the summer months (CIG, 2017).

Long-term impacts to climate change resulting from greenhouse gas emission is not expected from this project. The project would be operated via solar power and gravity works.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

The IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project would reduce IPID's diversion on Icicle Creek by approximately 10 cfs in summer months through canal piping and lining, and on-farm efficiency upgrades. This would have positive effects on stream flow, which climate change models indicate would decrease in the summer months. These decreased flows are not anticipated to have impacts on the project's operation or viability. Long-term demand forecasting predicts that agriculture demand could decrease overall in the Wenatchee River Watershed, with peak use shifting to earlier in the season (WSU, 2016), meaning climate change may not have long-term impacts on the efficacy of this project. This change in demand is based on changes in crop type.

The IPID diversion and canal is a gravity system. This project is not anticipated to contribute to greenhouse gas emission through its operation. Long-term changes in greenhouse gas emissions are not expected to result from this project.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

The COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project involves piping the system and replacing the gravity feed point of diversion on Icicle Creek with a pump station on the Wenatchee River. This project is anticipated to provide 8.0 to 11.9 cfs in Icicle Creek during summer months when climate change models predict lower flows. These decreased flows are not anticipated to have impacts on the project's operation or viability. Long-term demand forecasting predicts that agricultural demand may decrease overall in the Wenatchee River Watershed, with peak use shifting to earlier in the season (WSU, 2016), meaning climate change may not have long-term impacts on the efficacy of this project. This change in demand is based on changes in crop type.

Long-term impacts to climate change resulting from this project could include increases in greenhouse gas emissions. However, Chelan PUD, which generates power primarily through hydroelectric projects, will provide the electricity for this project, so greenhouse gas emissions are expected to be relatively low. Long-term changes in greenhouse gas emissions are not expected to result from this project. This project is currently undergoing pre-design and feasibility, which will help inform how many tons of carbon per year may result from this project.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

The Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project involves upgrading meters, increased leak detection, replacing leaking infrastructure, and providing incentives to reduce water use such as conservation education, conservation rebate programs, and conservationoriented rate structures. It is not anticipated that climate change would impact the project's operation, viability, or efficacy. Additionally, this project is not anticipated to increase greenhouse gas emissions.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project is designed to release up to 12.6 cfs and 900 acre-feet of additional storage (2,500 acre-feet total). This additional water would go to instream flows and improved domestic supply, but if the City of Leavenworth is able to withdraw the additional water from the Wenatchee River well field, the project would provide an additional 12.6 cfs to Icicle Creek in all reaches of the creek. This project would be expected to help ameliorate the impacts of climate change and provide the flexibility for adaptive management of water resources within the basin, reducing impacts on fish and out-of-stream users.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Under low, medium, and high climate change scenarios, the likelihood for lake recharge remains relatively unchanged or increases. However, the timing of runoff changes, which leads to increased recharge in the winter and spring, and decreased inflow during the summer months (Aspect, 2015).

Long-term impacts to climate change resulting from this project could include increases in greenhouse gas emissions. However, Chelan PUD, which generates power primarily through hydroelectric projects, will provide the electricity for the municipal/domestic component of this project, via increased pumping from City wells, so greenhouse gas emissions are expected to be relatively low.

Gate operations at the dam would be powered by solar panels, allowing for the automated releases of water for increased instream flows. Long-term changes in greenhouse gas emissions are not expected to result from this project.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

This project would include measures to minimize the impacts of other projects implemented through the Icicle Strategy on tribal, as well as non-tribal, fisheries. It is expected that climate change will result in increased variability of water flows and temperatures, which can make water use reliability more tenuous and fish habitat lower quality. This project, by definition will help address potential adverse impacts of the Program on fisheries, which will in part offset adverse climate change impacts. As flow conditions change in response to climate change, the effectiveness of project elements may change. The efficacy of projects would require long-term monitoring based on changing flow conditions.

A long-term increase in greenhouse gas emissions from project operations is not anticipated.

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project includes riparian plantings, installation of woody debris and rocks, reconnection and protection of the flood plain, and conserving upland forested habitat. While climate change may impact riparian areas and vegetation dynamics, it is believed this project would still be viable and effective.

The project has the potential to reduce the carbon in the atmosphere by conserving forest lands and planting riparian vegetation. There would be no long-term greenhouse gas emissions resulting from this project.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

This project involves amending the Instream Flow Rule. Climate change is predicted to create even more variabilities in flows and increase periods when the instream flow rule is not met. Increasing the reserve has the potential to exacerbate this issue. However, as noted in Section 4.7.2, Fish, other flow and habitat restoration project under Alterative 1 are meant to collectively address this problem.
This project could result in additional greenhouse gas emissions resulting from increased pumping. However, the power source for any additional pumping from the City's well field would likely be provided by Chelan PUD, which supplies hydropower throughout Chelan County. Long-term changes in greenhouse gas emissions are not expected to result from this project.

### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

Operation of the LNFH over the long-term has the potential to result in changes in greenhouse gas emissions. The extent of the changes depends on the specifics of the proposed project; however, in general, it is anticipated that long-term impacts would be minor because any proposed facilities would be required to operate consistent with applicable local, state, and federal air quality regulations. Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential greenhouse gas emissions under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The Fish Passage Improvements Project involves improving fish passage in Icicle Creek. There are no long-term greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project. Reduced summer flows resulting from climate change could impact the efficacy of this project. However, with the instream flow improvements proposed under Alternative 1, these impacts to efficacy are unlikely. Long-term changes in greenhouse gas emissions are not expected to result from this project.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project involves upgrading the IPID, City of Leavenworth, and the LNFH/COIC fish screens. The operation of this project is not expected to result in long-term increases of greenhouse gas emissions. The efficacy of this project is not expected to be impacted by climate change. Long-term changes in greenhouse gas emissions are not expected to result from this project.

#### Water Markets

The Water Markets Project would provide mitigation to interruptible water users. This project is expected to provide instream flow benefit in several Icicle Creek and Wenatchee River reaches in drought years and benefit in all reaches in non-drought years. The instream flow benefit would be 3.4 cfs during the summer months when stream flow is expected to be at its lowest. Long-term demand forecasting predicts that agricultural demand could decrease overall in the Wenatchee River Watershed, with peak use shifting to earlier in the season (WSU, 2016), meaning climate change may not have long-term impacts on the efficacy of this project.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Long-term changes in greenhouse gas emissions are not expected to result from this project.

# 4.13.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would also be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would not. Implementation of Alternative 2 has the potential to offset some of the impacts of climate change on stream flow and increase adaptable water management strategies in response to changing conditions. Appendix G provides graphs of modeled streamflow under low, medium, and high climate change scenarios, with additional flows provided by Alternative 2 augmenting the climate change base flow. Based on this analysis, Alternative 2 would meet the instream flow targets established in the Guiding Principles in 2080 under the low and medium climate change scenario, but not under the high climate change scenario.

## 4.13.3.1 Short-term Impacts

### IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

Construction activities associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project includes construction of a new surface water intake and pump station on the Wenatchee River. These construction activities would require the use of gasoline/diesel powered equipment. However, greenhouse gas emissions would be limited to the construction window and are not expected to cause appreciable impacts on climate change.

## 4.13.3.2 Long-term Impacts

### IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project involves piping the system and replacing the gravity feed point of diversion on Icicle Creek with a pump station on the Wenatchee River. This project is anticipated to provide 8.0 to 11.9 cfs in Icicle Creek during summer months when climate change models predict lower flows. These decreased flows are not anticipated to have impacts on the project's operation or viability. Long-term demand forecasting predicts that agricultural demand could decrease overall in the Wenatchee River Watershed, with peak use shifting to earlier in the season (WSU, 2016), meaning climate change may not have long-term impacts on the efficacy of this project. This change in demand is based on changes in crop type.

Long-term impacts to climate change resulting from this project could include increases in greenhouse gas emissions. However, Chelan PUD, which generates power primarily through hydroelectric projects, will provide the electricity for this project, so greenhouse gas emissions are expected to be relatively low. This project is currently undergoing predesign and feasibility, which will help inform how many tons of carbon per year may result from this project. However, it is not anticipated to have significant impacts on climate change.

## 4.13.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 2 with the exception that the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project would also be included while the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would not. Implementation of Alternative 3 has the potential to offset some of the impacts of climate change on streamflow and water resource management and increase adaptable water management strategies in response to changing conditions. However, under Alternative 3, the flow targets established in the Guiding Principles would not be obtainable in 2080 under low, medium, and high climate change scenarios. Appendix G provides graphs of modeled streamflow under low, medium, and high climate change scenarios, with additional flows provided by Alternative 3 augmenting the climate change base flow.

## 4.13.4.1 Short-term Impacts

### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

There are no construction activities associated with this project, and no potential for greenhouse gas emissions. This project will not have significate short-term climate change impacts.

### 4.13.4.2 Long-term Impacts

### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

This project involves a legislative change to provide for domestic water use when the Instream Flow Rule is not met. This is because the timing of instream flow improvement projects may not be timed perfectly to match domestic demand, making it difficult to provide in-time mitigation to impacts on the Instream Flow Rule. This project could result in additional greenhouse gas emissions resulting from increased pumping. Calculating these impacts is not possible at this time. However, the power source will likely be hydropower provided by Chelan PUD, which would minimize greenhouse gas emissions. This project is not anticipated to have significate long-term climate change impacts.

## 4.13.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1. The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would be replaced with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project, and the Upper Klonaqua Lake and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would be included. Implementation of Alternative 4 has the potential to offset some of the impacts of climate change on stream flow and increase adaptable water management strategies in response to changing conditions. Appendix G provides graphs of modeled streamflow under low,

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

medium, and high climate change scenarios, with additional flows provided by Alternative 4 augmenting the climate change base flow. Based on this analysis, Alternative 4 would meet the instream flow targets established in the Guiding Principles in 2080 under the low, medium, and high climate change scenarios.

### 4.13.5.1 Short-term Impacts

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would involve demolishing the existing dam, installing a new low-level outlet pipeline, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures that would allow for an increase in the accessible storage at Eightmile Lake. These construction activities would require the use of gasoline/diesel powered equipment. Greenhouse gas emissions would be limited to the construction window and are not expected to cause appreciable impacts on climate change. Overall, the project is a not anticipated to result in significant short-term climate change impacts.

### Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

The Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would involve installing a conveyance system between Upper Klonaqua Lake and Lower Klonaqua Lake to allow draw down of Upper Klonaqua Lake. Construction activities have not been determined but would require the use of gasoline/diesel powered equipment. Greenhouse gas emissions would be limited to the construction period and are not expected to cause appreciable impacts to climate change. Overall, the project is a not anticipated to result in significant short-term climate change impacts.

### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

The Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would require altering the dam at Snow Lake and the outlet structure to increase accessible storage. Construction activities have not been determined but would require the use of gasoline/diesel powered equipment. Greenhouse gas emissions would be limited to the construction period and are not expected to cause appreciable impacts to climate change. Overall, the project is a not anticipated to result in significant short-term climate change impacts.

### 4.13.5.2 Long-term Impacts

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project is designed to release up to 17.9 cfs and 1,000 acre-feet of additional storage (2,500 acre-feet total). This additional water would go to instream flows and improved domestic supply, but if the City of Leavenworth is able to withdraw the additional water from the Wenatchee River well field, the project would provide an additional 17.9 cfs to Icicle Creek in all reaches of the creek. This project would be expected to help ameliorate the impacts of climate change and provide the flexibility for adaptive management of water resources within the basin, reducing impacts on fish and out-of-stream users.

Long-term greenhouse gas emissions from project operations could occur if the additional domestic supply is provided via the Wenatchee River well field rather than the Icicle Creek diversion, because power use would increase. These increased emissions are discussed under the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration project. Gate operations at the dam would be powered by solar panels. Overall, the project is a not anticipated to result in significant long-term climate change impacts.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project is designed to release up to 20 cfs and 2,448 acre-feet of additional storage. This additional water would go to instream flows and improved domestic supply. This project would be expected to help ameliorate the impacts of climate change and provide the flexibility for adaptive management of water resources within the basin, reducing impacts on fish and out-of-stream users.

Gate operations at the dam would be powered by solar panels. Overall, the project is a not anticipated to result in significant long-term climate change impacts.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

The Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project is designed to release up to 18 cfs and 1,079 acre-feet. This additional water would go to instream flows and improved domestic supply. This project would be expected to help ameliorate the impacts of climate change and provide the flexibility for adaptive management of water resources within the basin, reducing impacts on fish and out-of-stream users.

Gate operations at the dam would be powered by solar panels. Overall, the project is a not anticipated to result in significant long-term climate change impacts.

## 4.13.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would replace the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project. Implementation of Alternative 5 has the potential to offset some of the impacts of climate change on stream flow and increase adaptable water management strategies in response to changing conditions. Appendix G provides graphs of modeled streamflow under low, medium, and high climate change scenarios, with additional flows provided by Alternative 5 augmenting the climate change base flow. Based on this analysis, Alternative 5 would meet the instream flow targets established in the Guiding Principles in 2080 under the low, medium, and high climate change scenario.

### 4.13.6.1 Short-term Impacts

### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

Construction activities associated with the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project includes construction of a new surface water intakes and pump stations on the Wenatchee River. These construction activities would require the use of gasoline/diesel powered equipment. However, greenhouse gas emissions would be limited to the construction window and are not expected to cause appreciable impacts on climate change. Overall, the project is a not anticipated to result in significant short-term climate change impacts.

### 4.13.6.2 Long-term Impacts

### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project involves piping the system and replacing the gravity feed point of diversion on Icicle Creek with three pump stations on the Wenatchee River. This project is anticipated to provide up to 117 cfs in Icicle Creek during summer months when climate change models predict lower flows. These decreased flows are not anticipated to have impacts on the project's operation or viability. Long-term demand forecasting predicts that agricultural demand could decrease overall in the Wenatchee River Watershed, with peak use shifting to earlier in the season (WSU, 2016), meaning climate change may not have long-term impacts on the efficacy of this project. This predicted change in demand is based on anticipated changes in crop type.

Long-term impacts to climate change resulting from this project could include increases in greenhouse gas emissions. However, the primary power supply for the pump stations would be Chelan PUD, which generates power primarily through hydroelectric projects, so greenhouse gas emissions are expected to be relatively low. This project is currently undergoing pre-design and feasibility, which will help inform how many tons of carbon per year may result from this project. Overall, the project is a not anticipated to result in significant long-term climate change impacts.

## 4.13.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes mitigation measures to minimize the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

### 4.13.7.1 Short-term Impacts

While construction activities are not expected to have a significant effect on global climate change, construction-related greenhouse gas emissions should be reduced by the following BMPs.

- Ensure all equipment is in good repair to minimize potential emissions.
- Minimize unnecessary idling of emission-generating equipment.

• Minimize the number of trips to/from construction sites and use local materials when possible.

### 4.13.7.2 Long-term Impacts

As discussed in Section 3.13, climate change is anticipated to impact stream flow and, consequently, water resource management in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. There may be increases in greenhouse gas emissions associated with the implementation of some projects, which BMPs relating to equipment maintenance can help minimize. The expected increase in greenhouse gas emissions is considered less than significant.

# 4.14 Noise

This section describes potential short- and long-term impacts that could affect the resources identified in Section 3.14, Noise, from construction and operations related to the No-action Alternative and the Program Alternatives.

## 4.14.1 No-action Alternative

### 4.14.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various entities and agencies would undertake individual actions that could result in short-term noise impacts in short-term impacts in the ALWA and in riparian areas along Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. Short-term noise impacts would largely result from operating mechanized construction equipment but may also include blasting related to maintenance activities at the existing irrigation structures at the Alpine Lakes. Table 4-4 presents noise levels associated with typical mechanized construction activities. The magnitude of short-term construction impacts in each case would depend on specific types of equipment used, the distance between construction activities and the nearest noise-sensitive receptor, and existing background noise levels.

Construction Activity	Equipment	Maximum Noise Level (dBA) <sup>1</sup>
Construction Preparation	Air compressors, power plants, pickup trucks, tractor trailers	55 to 85
Clearing and Grading	Air compressors, backhoe, blasting, dozer, excavator, forklifts, dump trucks, frontend loader, pumps, power plants, pickup trucks, rock drill, tractor trailers	55 to 94

Table 4-4 Typical Construction Noise Levels

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Construction Activity	Equipment	Maximum Noise Level (dBA) <sup>1</sup>
Structure Construction	Air compressors, auger drill rig, backhoe, crane, excavator, forklifts, dump trucks, frontend loader, pumps, power plants, pickup trucks, tractor trailers, vibratory pile driver	55 to 95
Planting/Revegetation	Backhoe, dump trucks, frontend loader, pickup trucks, tractor trailers	55 to 84
Demobilization	Air compressors, backhoe, excavator, forklifts, dump trucks, loader, pumps, power plants, pickup trucks, tractor trailers	55 to 85

Source: Federal Highway Administration Construction Noise Handbook (FHWA 2006)

1) Noise is measured as A-weighted decibels (dBA) at 50 feet from the source.

In general, construction noise limited activities occurring between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. (daytime hours) are exempt from regulations per WAC 173-60-050 and Chelan County Code Title 7. Any construction activities that may occur at the Alpine Lakes associated with upgrading the existing irrigation infrastructure are considered allowable uses consistent with the Wilderness Act as discussed further in Section 4.17.

### 4.14.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, most of the anticipated projects would not result in the creation of facilities that would generate ongoing sources of noise; however, any projects involving ongoing use of equipment, such as pumps or compressors would result in potential increases in long-term noise.

As discussed further in Section 4.14.7, Mitigation Measures, the state imposes limits on the allowable environmental noise levels from a variety of sources as described in Chapter 173-60 WAC. If permitting is required, individual projects would be required to incorporate additional controls consistent with those regulations. Therefore, the No-action Alternative is not anticipated to result in significant long-term noise impacts.

## 4.14.2 Alternative 1

Implementation of Alternative 1 has the potential to result in greater noise impacts compared with the No-action Alternative because there would be a higher likelihood that certain projects would be implemented, and the scale of certain efforts would likely be greater. The following sections describe the short- and long-term impacts that would occur under Alternative 1.

### 4.14.2.1 Short-term Impacts

This section describes the potential for short-term increases in noise anticipated with implementation of Alternative 1.

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Construction activities associated with this project would result in less than significant short-term increases in noise from transporting workers and equipment to the five lakes and from general construction activity, including operation of a generator to power hand tools. No heavy equipment would be used related to this project. Transportation would involve helicopter trips to and from the lakes over a brief period (likely a few days to a couple of weeks) at each lake. Noise levels associated with typical construction activities at 50 feet from the source are presented in Table 4-4.

Background noise levels at the project sites are generally quiet and mainly include sounds associated with the natural environment. Although there are no permanently occupied residences, recreationalists are granted access to camp and hike within and around the project sites based on a lottery system managed by the USFS. For additional information about recreational use, refer to Section 3.15, Recreation.

Depending on the location of recreationalists relative to construction activity, they could be exposed to increased noise similar to the levels shown in Table 4-4. Although most camping sites are located farther than 50 feet from the proposed construction activities, anticipated noise levels could be a nuisance to recreationalists in the general vicinity. However, the increases in noise would not represent a permanent increase. Rather, nuisance noise would occur intermittently over a period of 2 to 4 weeks at each lake. In addition, construction activity occurring between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. is exempt from local regulation. As discussed in Section 4.17, the proposed project is an allowed use consistent with the Wilderness Act. Therefore, increased noise from construction is not anticipated to be significant.

### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Construction activities associated with the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project include the conversion of IPID canals to pipelines and lining of irrigation canals with concrete. These activities could require the use of excavators, compactors, and other heavy equipment, such as dump trucks. Noise levels associated with typical construction activities at 50 feet from the source are presented in Table 4-4.

Construction activities are anticipated to occur within rural agricultural areas but could also occur in more developed urban settings. Background noise levels would vary but are generally anticipated to be representative of noise levels associated with agricultural and urban development. Sensitive noise receptors that could be affected by these activities are likely to include agricultural workers, residents, and other workers or individuals present at the time of construction.

Depending on the location of noise-sensitive receptors relative to construction activity, they could be exposed to increased noise similar to the levels shown in Table 4-4. Anticipated noise levels could be a nuisance but would not represent a permanent increase. Rather, nuisance noise would occur intermittently during construction activities. In addition, construction activity occurring between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

is exempt from local regulation. Therefore, increased noise from construction is not anticipated to be significant.

### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Construction activities associated with COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project would be similar to those described above for the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project and are not anticipated to be significant.

### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Certain components of the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project, such as evaluating conservation-oriented rate structures and expanding conservation education, xeriscape, and rebate programs, would not result in increased noise; however, construction-related activities associated with this project, such as replacing leaky water mains and residential meters, could result in some minor, short-term increases in noise. These activities include the use of generators to power tools and operation of heavy equipment, including trucks, as needed.

Construction activities are anticipated to occur within already developed residential settings. Background noise levels would vary but are generally anticipated to be representative of noise levels associated with urban development and general residential activity. Sensitive noise receptors that could be affected are likely to include residents or workers present at the time of construction.

Depending on the location of noise-sensitive receptors relative to construction activity, they could be exposed to increased noise similar to the levels shown in Table 4-4. Anticipated noise levels could be a nuisance but would not represent a permanent increase. Rather, nuisance noise would occur intermittently during construction activities. In addition, construction activity occurring between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. is exempt from local regulation. Therefore, increased noise from construction is not anticipated to be significant.

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Construction activities associated with the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would result in increases in noise from transporting workers and equipment to Eightmile Lake and general construction activity, including operating an excavator and a generator to power hand tools. Transportation would involve periodic helicopter trips to and from the lakes during the construction period, which is anticipated to last approximately 2 to 3 months. An excavator could also be walked in along the Eightmile Lake Trail, which would also result in brief activity and associated noise along the trail.

Noise levels associated with typical construction activities at 50 feet from the source are presented in Table 4-4. In addition, some blasting could be required to break up rock at the site. Prior to any blasting, IPID would develop a blasting plan, as described in Section 4.14.7, Mitigation Measures, and in conjunction with USFS, which would establish notification procedures so the public is informed that blasting might occur.

Background noise levels at the project site are generally quiet and mainly include sounds associated with the natural environment. Although there are no permanently occupied residences, recreationalists are granted access to camp and hike within and around the project site based on a lottery system managed by the USFS. For additional information about recreational use, refer to Section 3.15, Recreation.

Depending on the location of recreationalists relative to construction activity, they could be exposed to increased noise similar to the levels shown in Table 4-4 related to the majority of construction activity. Although most camping sites are located farther than 50 feet from the proposed construction activities, anticipated noise levels could be a nuisance to recreationalists in the general vicinity, particularly if any blasting were to occur. Implementation of the blasting plan described in Section 4.14.7, Mitigation Measures, would help to minimize these impacts.

Increases in noise would not be permanent. Rather, nuisance noise would occur intermittently over a period of 2 to 4 weeks at the lake. In addition, construction activity occurring between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. is exempt from local regulation. As discussed in Section 4.17, the proposed project is an allowed uses consistent with the Wilderness Act. Therefore, with incorporation of the measures identified in Section 4.14.7, Mitigation Measures, increased noise from construction is not anticipated to be significant.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The focus of this project is to ensure that there would be no adverse effects on tribal fishing as a result of implementing other projects as part of the overall Icicle Strategy. The specifics of this project are not yet determined but would involve elements of restoration along lower Icicle Creek that could result in localized construction-related noise. At this stage, the primary options under consideration include the construction of facilities such as a bubble curtain, sprayer, or other minor modifications near the spillway in front of the LNFH to promote favorable fishing conditions.

Construction activities are anticipated to occur along the lower Icicle Creek. Background noise levels would vary but are generally anticipated to be representative of noise levels associated with natural sounds near the creek edge and some urban development. Sensitive noise receptors that could be affected are likely to include any residents who may live nearby, workers, or other individuals, including recreationalists, present at the time of construction.

Depending on the location of noise-sensitive receptors relative to construction activity, they could be exposed to increased noise similar to the levels shown in Table 4-4. Anticipated noise levels could be a nuisance but would not represent a permanent increase. Rather, nuisance noise would occur intermittently during construction activities. In addition, construction activity occurring between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. is exempt from local regulation. Therefore, increased noise from construction is not anticipated to be significant.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project could involve grading; planting and thinning vegetation; hauling and placing logs, rock, soil, and other materials; and some in-water work on lower Icicle Creek. These activities would require construction equipment, including trucks, excavators, and hand-held equipment, the use of which would result in increased noise. Construction activities are anticipated to occur along the lower Icicle Creek. Background noise levels would vary but are generally anticipated to be representative of levels associated with natural sounds near the creek edge and some urban development. Sensitive noise receptors that could be affected are likely to include any residents that may live nearby, workers, or other individuals, including recreationalists, present at the time of construction.

Depending on the location of noise-sensitive receptors relative to construction activity, they could be exposed to increased noise similar to the levels shown in Table 4-4. Anticipated noise levels could be a nuisance but would not represent a permanent increase. Rather, nuisance noise would occur intermittently during construction activities. In addition, construction activity occurring between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. is exempt from local regulation. Therefore, increased noise from construction is not anticipated to be significant.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

No short-term noise impacts are anticipated from this project because no construction would be required.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

This project includes various elements geared toward improving water quality and hatchery rearing conditions at the LNFH. In general, construction of these elements would result in some increase in short-term noise. Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential short-term noise impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined.

Background noise levels are generally representative of levels associated with natural sounds near the creek edge and some urban development. Sensitive noise receptors that could be affected are likely to include workers or other individuals, including recreationalists, present at the time of construction.

Depending on the location of noise-sensitive receptors relative to construction activity, they could be exposed to increased noise similar to the levels shown in Table 4-4. Anticipated noise levels could be a nuisance but would not represent a permanent increase. Rather, nuisance noise would occur intermittently during construction activities. In addition, construction activity occurring between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. is exempt from local regulation. Therefore, increased noise from construction is not anticipated to be significant.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The Fish Passage Improvements Project would potentially involve modification of existing LNFH instream structures in Icicle Creek as well as instream modifications to the Boulder Field near RM 5.6. This work would require the use of excavators, dump trucks, and possibly a crane.

Background noise levels are generally representative of levels associated with natural sounds near the creek edge and some urban development. Sensitive noise receptors that could be affected are likely to include workers or other individuals, including recreationalists, present at the time of construction.

Depending on the location of noise-sensitive receptors relative to construction activity, they could be exposed to increased noise similar to the levels shown in Table 4-4. Anticipated noise levels could be a nuisance but would not represent a permanent increase. Rather, nuisance noise would occur intermittently during construction activities. In addition, construction activity occurring between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. is exempt from local regulation. Therefore, increased noise from construction is not anticipated to be significant.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project involves replacing fish screens at three different diversions on lower Icicle Creek: LNFH/COIC, the City of Leavenworth, and IPID. Under this project, screens and associated infrastructure would be improved to bring all three intakes up to compliance with state and federal laws. These activities would involve the use of excavators, dump trucks, compaction equipment, concrete mixers, and other equipment as needed to move earth and other equipment materials.

Background noise levels are generally representative of levels associated with natural sounds near the creek edge and some urban development. Sensitive noise receptors that could be affected are likely to include workers or other individuals, including recreationalists, present at the time of construction.

Depending on the location of noise-sensitive receptors relative to construction activity, they could be exposed to increased noise similar to the levels shown in Table 4-4. Anticipated noise levels could be a nuisance but would not represent a permanent increase. Rather, nuisance noise would occur intermittently during construction activities. In addition, construction activity occurring between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. is exempt from local regulation. Therefore, increased noise from construction is not anticipated to be significant.

#### Water Markets

No short-term noise impacts are anticipated from this project because no construction would be required.

### 4.14.2.2 Long-term Impacts

This section addresses the potential for long-term noise impacts anticipated with implementation of individual projects under Alternative 1.

### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Operation of the proposed facilities for this project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from the affected lakes. Because the facilities would be largely operated remotely by IPID and would rely in part on solar energy, the greatest potential for increased noise over the long term would occur as the result of maintenance trips to and from the lakes. For this reason, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term noise impacts.

### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

The IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project does not involve new emission-generating facilities or changes in operation of the existing facilities and would therefore, not result in any significant long-term increases in noise.

### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Under the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project, the long-term impacts from noise would be similar to those described above for the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project with the exception of the new COIC pump station. Because the pump station would generate additional noise over the long-term, the design would incorporate features to reduce noise, including the use of variable frequency drives, which reduce the mechanical noise of the pumps, and placement within an insulated building.

In addition, as discussed in Section 3.14.7, Noise, the state imposes limits on the allowable environmental noise levels from a variety of sources consistent with Chapter 173-60 WAC. As such, individual projects, including the COIC pump station, would be required to incorporate additional controls consistent with those regulations. Therefore, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term noise impacts.

### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

No long-term noise impacts are anticipated from this project because no new noisegenerating facilities or activities would occur.

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would result in the ability to store and withdraw additional water consistent with historical levels at Eightmile Lake. Because the facilities would be largely operated remotely by IPID and would rely in part on solar energy, there would be potential for an overall reduction in noise impacts over the long term that would occur as the result of maintenance trips to and from the lakes, which are anticipated to be less than would occur under the No-action Alternative. For this reason, this project is not anticipated to result in significant noise impacts.

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The only potential noise impact that may occur as part of this project could be some minor from a bubbler or other equipment designed to create conditions that attract and keep fish in the pool near the hatchery spillway. No other long-term noise impacts are anticipated from this project because no new noise-generating facilities or activities would occur.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

No long-term noise impacts are anticipated from this project because no new noisegenerating facilities or activities would occur.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

No long-term noise impacts are anticipated from this project because no new noisegenerating facilities or activities would occur.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

Operation of the LNFH over the long term has the potential to result in changes in noise levels compared to the No-action Alternative. The extent of the changes depends on the specifics of the proposed project; however, in general, it is anticipated that long-term impacts would be less than significant because any proposed facilities would be required to operate consistent with applicable local, state, and federal noise regulations, as described in Section 3.14, Noise. Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential noise impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

No long-term noise impacts are anticipated from this project over the long term because no noise-generating facilities or activities would occur.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

No long-term noise impacts are anticipated from this project over the long term because no new noise-generating facilities or activities would occur.

#### Water Markets

No long-term noise impacts are anticipated from this project over the long term because no new noise-generating facilities or activities would occur.

### 4.14.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation project would not. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. Impacts associated with other projects proposed under Alternative 2 are discussed under Alternative 1.

## 4.14.3.1 Short-term Impacts

### IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

Construction of the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would require the use of excavators, compactors, and other heavy equipment, such as dump trucks, which would result in short-term increases in noise. Construction is anticipated to last up to 3 months.

Construction activities would occur along the bank of the Wenatchee River. Background noise levels would vary but are generally anticipated to be representative of levels associated with natural sounds near the creek edge and some urban development. Sensitive noise receptors that could be affected by these activities are likely to include agricultural workers, residents, and other workers or individuals, including recreationalists, present at the time of construction.

Depending on the location of noise-sensitive receptors relative to construction activity, they could be exposed to increased noise similar to the levels shown in Table 4-4. Anticipated noise levels could be a nuisance but would not represent a permanent increase. Rather, nuisance noise would occur intermittently during construction activities. In addition, construction activity occurring between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. is exempt from local regulation. Therefore, increased noise from construction is not anticipated to be significant.

## 4.14.3.2 Long-term Impacts

### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

Under the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project, the operation of a new IPID pump station could result in increased noise emissions compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. Increased noise would occur as the result of operating the pump station during the irrigation season. The pumps would operate with variable frequency drives, which would reduce the mechanical noise from the pumps. The pumps would also be enclosed in an insulated structure, which would help to further reduce noise, resulting in levels anticipated to be similar to other urban utility pump stations in the Icicle Creek area.

In addition, as discussed further in Section 4.14.7, Mitigation Measures, the state imposes limits on the allowable environmental noise levels from a variety of sources as described in Chapter 173-60 WAC. As such, individual projects, including the pump station, would be required to incorporate additional controls consistent with those regulations. Therefore, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term noise impacts.

## 4.14.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 2 with the exception that the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project would also be included while the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would not. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project. Impacts associated with other projects proposed under Alternative 3 are discussed under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

### 4.14.4.1 Short-term Impacts

### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

No noise impacts are anticipated from this project in the short-term because no new noise-generating facilities or activities would occur.

### 4.14.4.2 Long-term Impacts

### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

No noise impacts are anticipated from this project in the long-term because no new noisegenerating facilities or activities would occur.

## 4.14.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1. The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would be replaced with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project, and the Upper Klonaqua Lake and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would be included. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with these projects compared to Alternative 1 and the No-action Alternative.

### 4.14.5.1 Short-term Impacts

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

Construction activities associated with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would result in less than significant short-term increases in noise from transporting workers and equipment to Eightmile Lake and from general construction activity, including operating an excavator and a generator to power hand tools. Transportation would involve periodic helicopter trips to and from the lake during the construction period, which is anticipated to last approximately 2 to 3 months. An excavator may also be walked in along the Eightmile Lake Trail, which would also result in some increased activity and associated noise along the Eightmile Trail.

Noise levels associated with typical construction activities at 50 feet from the source are presented in Table 4-4. In addition, some blasting may be required to break up rock at the site. Prior to any blasting, IPID would develop a blasting plan, as described in Section 4.14.6, Mitigation Measures, and in conjunction with the USFS, which would establish notification procedures so the public is informed that blasting might occur.

Background noise levels at the project site are generally quiet and mainly include sounds associated with the natural environment. Although there are no permanently occupied residences, recreationalists are granted access to camp and hike within and around the

### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

project site based on a lottery system managed by the USFS. For additional information about recreational use, refer to Section 3.15, Recreation.

Depending on the location of recreationalists relative to construction activity, they could be exposed to increased noise similar to the levels shown in Table 4-4 related to the majority of construction activity. Although most camping sites are located farther than 50 feet from the proposed construction activities, anticipated noise levels could be a nuisance to recreationalists in the general vicinity, particularly if any blasting were to occur. Implementation of the blasting plan described in Section 4.14.6, Mitigation Measures, would help to minimize these impacts.

Increases in noise would not be permanent. Rather, nuisance noise would occur intermittently during construction. In addition, construction activity occurring between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. is exempt from local regulation. Therefore, with incorporation of the measures identified in Section 4.14.7, Mitigation Measures, increased noise from construction is not anticipated to be significant.

### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

Construction activities associated with the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would result in less than significant short-term increases in noise from transporting workers and equipment to the project site and operating an excavator and a generator to power hand tools. Transportation would involve periodic helicopter trips to and from the lake during the construction period.

Noise levels associated with typical construction activities at 50 feet from the source are presented in Table 4-4. In addition, some blasting may be required to break up rock at the site. Prior to any blasting, IPID would develop a blasting plan, as described in Section 4.14.7, Mitigation Measures, and in conjunction with USFS, which would establish notification procedures so the public is informed that blasting might occur.

Background noise levels at the project site are generally quiet and mainly include sounds associated with the natural environment. Although there are no permanently occupied residences, recreationalists are granted access to camp and hike within and around the project site based on a lottery system managed by the USFS. For additional information about recreational use, refer to Section 3.15, Recreation.

Depending on the location of recreationalists relative to construction activity, they could be exposed to increased noise similar to the levels shown in Table 4-4 related to the majority of construction activity. Although most camping sites are located farther than 50 feet from the proposed construction activities, anticipated noise levels could be a nuisance to recreationalists in the general vicinity, particularly if any blasting were to occur. Implementation of the blasting plan described in Section 4.14.7, Mitigation Measures, would help to minimize these impacts.

Increases in noise would not be permanent. Rather, nuisance noise would occur intermittently during construction. In addition, construction activity occurring between the

hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. is exempt from local regulation. Therefore, with incorporation of the measures identified in Section 4.14.7, Mitigation Measures, increased noise from construction is not anticipated to be significant.

### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Construction activities associated with the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would result in less than significant short-term increases in noise from transporting workers and equipment to the lakes and general construction activity, including operating an excavator and a generator to power hand tools. Transportation would involve periodic helicopter trips to and from the lakes during the construction period.

Noise levels associated with typical construction activities at 50 feet from the source are presented in Table 4-4. In addition, some blasting may be required to break up rock at the site. Prior to any blasting, USFWS would develop a blasting plan, as described in Section 4.14.7, Mitigation Measures, and in conjunction with USFS, which would establish notification procedures so the public is informed that blasting might occur.

Background noise levels at the project site are generally quiet and mainly include sounds associated with the natural environment. Although there are no permanently occupied residences, recreationalists are granted access to camp and hike within and around the project site based on a lottery system managed by the USFS. For additional information about recreational use, refer to Section 3.15, Recreation.

Depending on the location of recreationalists relative to construction activity, they could be exposed to increased noise similar to the levels shown in Table 4-4 related to the majority of construction activity. Although most camping sites are located farther than 50 feet from the proposed construction activities, anticipated noise levels could be a nuisance to recreationalists in the general vicinity, particularly if any blasting were to occur. Implementation of the blasting plan described in Section 4.14.6, Mitigation Measures, would help to minimize these impacts.

Increases in noise would not be permanent. Rather, nuisance noise would occur intermittently during construction. In addition, construction activity occurring between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. is exempt from local regulation. Therefore, with incorporation of the measures identified in Section 4.14.7, Mitigation Measures, increased noise from construction is not anticipated to be significant.

### 4.14.5.2 Long-term Impacts

### Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would result in the ability to store and withdraw additional water at the lake. Because the facilities would be largely operated remotely by IPID and would rely in part on solar energy, the greatest potential for increased noise over the long term would occur as the result of maintenance trips to and from the lakes, which are anticipated to be less than would occur

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

under the No-action Alternative. For this reason, this project is not anticipated to result in significant noise impacts.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would result in the ability to store and withdraw additional water at the lake. Because the facilities would be largely operated remotely by IPID and would rely in part on solar energy, the greatest potential for increased noise over the long term would occur as the result of maintenance trips to and from the lakes. Because these facilities would be new, requiring less maintenance, and because travel to and from the site would largely be done on foot, the potential long-term impacts are anticipated to be minimal. For this reason, this project is not anticipated to result in significant noise impacts.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would result in the ability to store and withdraw additional water from Upper and Lower Snow Lakes. The facilities would be operated remotely by USFWS personnel at LNFH. Releases from the lakes would be automated, with electronic actuators that would rely on solar energy. The greatest potential for increased noise over the long term would occur as the result of maintenance trips to and from the lakes, which are anticipated to be less than would occur under the No-action Alternative. For this reason, this project is not anticipated to result in significant noise impacts.

## 4.14.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of the same projects as Alternative 1 except instead of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies, the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project would be included.

### 4.14.6.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project**

Construction of the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would require the use of excavators, compactors, and other heavy equipment, such as dump trucks, which would result in short-term increases in noise. Construction is anticipated to be completed in phases over several years.

Construction activities would occur throughout the IPID service area for piping the entire conveyance system and at specific locations on Icicle and Peshastin Creeks and the Wenatchee River. Background noise levels would vary but are generally anticipated to be representative of levels associated with natural sounds near the creek edge and some urban development. Sensitive noise receptors that could be affected by these activities are likely to include agricultural workers, residents, and other workers or individuals, including recreationalists, present at the time of construction.

Depending on the location of noise-sensitive receptors relative to construction activity, they could be exposed to increased noise similar to the levels shown in Table 4-4. Anticipated noise levels could be a nuisance but would not represent a permanent increase. Rather, nuisance noise would occur intermittently during construction activities. In addition, construction activity occurring between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. is exempt from local regulation. Therefore, increased noise from construction is not anticipated to be significant.

### 4.14.6.2 Long-term Impacts

### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project**

Under the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project, the operation of three new IPID pump stations could result in increased noise emissions compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. Increased noise would occur as the result of operating the pump stations during the irrigation season. The pumps would operate with variable frequency drives, which would reduce the mechanical noise from the pumps. The pumps would also be enclosed in an insulated structure, which would help to further reduce noise, resulting in levels anticipated to be similar to other urban utility pump stations in the Icicle Creek area.

In addition, as discussed further in Section 4.14.7, Mitigation Measures, the state imposes limits on the allowable environmental noise levels from a variety of sources as described in Chapter 173-60 WAC. As such, individual projects, including the pump station, would be required to incorporate additional controls consistent with those regulations. Therefore, this project is not anticipated to result in significant long-term noise impacts.

## 4.14.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

### 4.14.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Noise regulations are set forth in Chapter 173-60 WAC and rules applicable to blasting are set forth in Chapter 296-52 WAC. Construction activities are generally exempt but otherwise are required to comply with the standards set forth in this chapter of the WAC to ensure noise levels do not exceed acceptable thresholds.

Even though the majority of construction activities associated with the Program Alternatives are expected to be minimal and otherwise exempt from regulation, implementation of the following BMPs would ensure that noise levels were further reduced.

- Ensure all equipment is in good repair to minimize noise.
- Minimize unnecessary idling of emission-generating equipment.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

In addition, compliance with applicable state and federal blasting regulations would ensure blasting was completed in a manner to reduce potential impacts. Implementation of the following measure would help to further reduce the potential noise impacts.

• Develop a blasting plan in coordination with USFS to ensure that recreationalists within affected areas are informed of the potential for blasting.

### 4.14.7.2 Long-term Impacts

New noise sources are also required to comply with the requirements set forth in Chapter 173-60 WAC. Compliance with required permit conditions would ensure that any long-term noise levels do not exceed acceptable thresholds.

- Insulated pump houses.
- Use of solar panels in the Wilderness Areas.
- Use of lower noise producing pumps (i.e. variable speed pumps).

# 4.15 Recreation

The recreational activities most likely to be affected by the projects in the Program Alternatives are those that are water-dependent. Alterations to lake levels in the four IPID-managed Alpine Lakes and the USFWS-managed Snow Lakes system, and to instream flows in Icicle Creek and the mainstem Wenatchee River, could affect fishing, rafting, kayaking, and other water-based recreation. Additionally, portions of existing trails and campsites surrounding Eightmile Lake, Upper Klonaqua Lake, and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes could be affected by inundation.

Short-term recreation impacts are those things that could temporarily alter the ability to use the recreational resource. For example, if construction activities block access to a trailhead, this would be considered a short-term impact until access is restored. Long-term recreation impacts are those things that could permanently alter the ability to use the recreational resource. For example, if water level of a lake is raised such that an existing campsite is permanently inundated, that would be considered a long-term impact.

## 4.15.1 No-action Alternative

### 4.15.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various agencies and other entities would continue to undertake individual actions to restore and enhance fish and aquatic resources in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area, but those actions would not be part of a coordinated program implemented with the support of the IWG. Actions implemented by individual agencies and entities could include construction of diversion improvements, irrigation system upgrades, LNFH improvements, and fish passage work. Short-term impacts to recreational opportunities would result from construction related activities, including maintenance at the alpine lakes, reconstruction of Eightmile Lake Dam, irrigation efficiency and domestic conservation work, upgrades at LNFH, and implementing improvements at points of diversions.

Construction-related activity in the Alpine Lakes area could result in short-term disruption to recreational users near the individual lakes outlets while work is ongoing.

Any in- or near-water projects would have associated construction-related activities could disrupt water based recreation. Staging of heavy equipment and supplies near access points to Icicle Creek could result in temporary disruption to water-dependent recreational activities such as recreational fishing, kayaking, and tubing. Many instream construction projects would occur at low flow, which would minimize impacts on some of these activities.

### 4.15.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, long-term impacts to recreation could result from implementation of certain projects.

If IPID restored Eightmile Lake Dam to its original height, existing trails, campsites, and lakeshore access routes would largely remain unchanged as a result of this project. Long-term operational impacts could change the timing and duration of water releases from the lake, with increased draw down levels. No significant long-term impacts to existing recreational opportunities in or around Eightmile Lake, such as hiking, horseback riding, and overnight camping, are expected.

Improvements at LNFH that would likely occur under the No-action Alternative could have minor long-term impacts on recreation. Installation of wells and an infiltration gallery on Hatchery Island could have impacts on current hiking and skiing trails. Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential recreation impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined.

## 4.15.2 Alternative 1

The expected impacts of implementing Alternative 1 involve short-term constructionrelated impacts that are generally temporary, and long-term impacts resulting from the operation of proposed projects. Potential short-term impacts include temporary limited access to trails based on construction activities and impacts to water-based recreation resulting from in-stream work. The long-term impacts of implementing Alternative 1 are associated with stream flow increases, which are expected to improve water-based recreation in Icicle Creek.

## 4.15.2.1 Short-term Impacts

### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Construction-related activity to upgrade existing outlet infrastructure may result in shortterm, temporary limited access at the construction sites at each lake. Construction activity at each outlet could result in short-term disruption to recreational users near the individual lakes outlets while work is ongoing. Recreational use in the vicinity of construction sites includes day use (e.g., hiking, horseback riding, and recreational fishing) and overnight camping.

IPID currently performs regular maintenance activities on the outlet structures at each of the four managed reservoir lakes and these activities have some related equipment and helicopter traffic. New delivery of construction-related supplies and equipment by helicopter would be consistent with existing operations. Helicopter trips would utilize existing landing areas and are not expected to result in obstruction of trails or camping sites. As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Under IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project, IPID would update its Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan to control the volume, frequency, and rate of water for efficient irrigation. This plan update is currently underway. This is an administrative action that would have no short-term impacts to existing recreational opportunities.

Conservation projects with construction-related activities could include some canal to pipeline conversion, canal lining, and on-farm efficiencies. These actions would all occur in upland areas on private lands and easements. Any temporary disturbance within these areas would not affect existing recreational opportunities or access to public lands. As noted in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

COIC is considering relocating their point of diversion from Icicle Creek to a location on the Wenatchee River. Construction-related activities would include installing a new diversionary structure near or on the Wenatchee River, installing conveyance piping, and decommissioning COIC-specific diversionary works on Icicle Creek. Most of this work would occur in upland areas on private lands and easements, and any temporary disturbance within these areas would not affect existing recreational opportunities. It is expected that any in- or near-water construction would occur within a small physical footprint required for pumps and conveyance infrastructure. Construction would likely occur during the late summer and fall when water levels are low and less recreational use is occurring. A cofferdam would also be installed during construction of intake facilities to separate the river and the work area.

Water-dependent activities that may be temporarily affected by construction activities along the shoreline of the Wenatchee River or Icicle Creek, which could include recreational fishing, kayaking, rafting, and tubing. Based upon the small footprint of these projects and the temporary nature of the disturbance, meaningful impacts to existing waterdependent recreational activities are unlikely.

As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Under the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project, the City of Leavenworth and rural areas of the Icicle Creek Watershed would upgrade conveyance infrastructure and promote water-use conservation practices among municipal and domestic users. This work would be limited primarily to administrative and maintenance actions and could include limited installation or replacement of pipes and meters. This work would all occur within existing easements and rights-of-way and would not result in short-term impacts to existing recreational opportunities.

As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Under the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project, construction-related activity to replace Eightmile Lake Dam would result in short-term, temporary limited access at the construction sites at the lake. Construction activity at the lake outlet could result in short-term disruption to recreational users near the lake outlet while work is ongoing. The lake will likely be drawn down for construction and a temporary cofferdam may be used to separate the lake from the work area. Recreational use in the vicinity of construction sites includes day use (e.g., hiking and horseback riding) and overnight camping.

IPID currently performs regular maintenance activities at Eightmile Lake and these activities have some related equipment and helicopter traffic. Delivery of construction-related supplies and equipment by helicopter would be consistent with existing operations. Helicopter trips would utilize an existing landing area and are not expected to result in obstruction of trails or camping sites. As noted in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and

### 

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

Under the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project, the IWG would evaluate actions to preserve and enhance tribal treaty harvest rights and recreational fishing on Icicle Creek. Some construction activities near the plunge pool may occur, such as installation of a sprayer. However, construction activities are likely to occur outside the prime fishing window. Specific impacts to recreational use will be identified in environmental review and permitting once project details are known but are expected to be related to on-water recreation, such as tubing.

While no specific improvements are suggested for the recreational fishery, protecting the recreational fishery is one of the IWG's Guiding Principles. Mitigation measures, including construction when the recreational fishery is closed, would be employed to minimize any potential impact to the recreational fishery.

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

Under the Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project, the IWG is working with Chelan County and the USFWS to implement recommended habitat improvement actions and land acquisition projects throughout Icicle Creek. All habitat enhancement projects are located along lower Icicle Creek, between RM 0.0 and 4.3.

Construction-related activities associated with habitat protection and enhancement could result in temporary restrictions to public access and passage through lower Icicle Creek as a result of staging of heavy equipment and supplies or active in-water work. Depending upon the timing and duration of the individual projects, construction could result in short-term effects to tubing or stand-up paddle boarding (SUP); construction would be timed not to conflict with recreational fishing.

As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

Amending the Wenatchee Instream Flow Rule is an administrative action that would have no short-term impacts to existing recreational opportunities.

### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

The IWG has identified several high-priority water-quality and conservation improvement projects for LNFH that would be implemented over the next 10 years. Many of these projects are limited in scope to upgrading existing fish-rearing systems within the hatchery itself (e.g., water-quality treatment, circular tanks) and would have no effect on existing recreational opportunities. Actions with associated construction-related activities may include installation of new wells and conveyance piping. This work would occur in upland areas within and adjacent to the existing LNFH complex and may result in short-term disruption to recreational opportunities in the immediate vicinity of LNFH, such as wildlife viewing, walking trails, tubing, recreational fishing, and SUP activities. Impacts on Nordic skiing, which is a popular winter activity in the area, are not expected because of the timing of construction. Construction would also be timed not to conflict with recreational fishing. Other specific recreational impacts will be identified during the NEPA process when project details are known.

#### Fish Passage Improvements

Fish passage improvements are proposed at LNFH and in upper Icicle Creek to include improving or replacing Structure 2 and improving passage through the Boulder Field. These projects would include in- and near-water construction.

Improvements to Structure 2 would occur completely within the LNFH complex and are not expected to conflict with existing recreational opportunities, although staging of heavy equipment and supplies could temporarily block access for wildlife viewing and walking trails. Passage improvement activities in the Boulder Field could result in shortterm impacts with fishing, although mitigation measures such as construction timing will be utilized to minimize any potential impacts on recreational fishing; this area is generally not utilized by kayakers and is above/upstream of the area suitable for tubing and SUP activities.

As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

### **Fish Screen Compliance**

Upgrading fish screens to meet current requirements is planned for three existing diversions on Icicle Creek. These actions are expected to occur within the existing physical footprint of the structure. Construction-related activity is not expected to alter or impact adjacent areas utilized for water-dependent recreational activities such as fishing, and to a lesser extent, kayaking.

As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

#### Water Markets

Creation of a voluntary Icicle Water Market is an administrative action that would have no short-term impacts to existing recreational opportunities.

### 4.15.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Upgrades to existing infrastructure at Colchuck, Eightmile, Square, and Klonaqua Lakes would not alter lake levels. Existing trails, campsites, and lakeshore access routes would remain unchanged as a result of this project. Long-term operational impacts could change the timing and duration of water releases from each lake but would not change the range of water levels that currently occurs. Hiking, horseback riding, overnight camping, and other recreational uses would still be possible under modified release scenarios. Therefore, no significant long-term impacts to existing recreational opportunities in and around the Alpine Lakes are expected.

Improved water management of the Alpine Lakes reservoir lakes is expected to increase stream flow in Icicle Creek, especially during the late season. In comparison to existing conditions, this is expected to result in benefits to kayaking, tubing and SUP activities, and fishing in Icicle Creek by increasing the length of time during which flows for those respective activities are suitable.

### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Improved water management through on-farm practices and conveyance infrastructure is expected to increase stream flow in Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. In comparison to existing conditions, this is expected to result in benefits to kayaking, rafting, tubing and SUP activities, and fishing in both water bodies by increasing the length of time during which flows for those respective activities are suitable.

### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Under the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange project, relocating the COIC point of diversion would increase streamflow in Icicle Creek. In comparison to existing conditions, this is expected to result in benefits to late-season water-dependent activities such as tubing and SUP by increasing the length of time during which flows for those respective activities are suitable. This project may also benefit the recreational fishery.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Improved water management through domestic and municipal upgrades and practices is expected to have no impact on recreation in Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River, with water saving going towards expanded domestic use. No long-term impacts are anticipated.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Under the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project, upgrades to existing infrastructure at Eightmile Lake would restore lake levels to authorized, historical levels. Existing trails, campsites, and lakeshore access routes would largely remain unchanged as a result of this project. Long-term operational impacts could change the timing and duration of water releases from the lake, with increased draw down levels. No significant long-term impacts to existing recreational opportunities in or around Eightmile Lake, such as hiking, horseback riding, and overnight camping, are expected. To the extent possible, new infrastructure improvements would be designed to fit into the surrounding landscape and minimize impacts to recreational users' visual experience.

Improved water management of the Eightmile Lake reservoir is expected to increase stream flow in Icicle Creek, especially during the late season. In comparison to existing conditions, this is expected to result in benefits to kayaking, tubing and SUP activities, and fishing in Icicle Creek by increasing the length of time during which flows for those respective activities are suitable.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

Promoting tribal fishery preservation and enhancement is expected to improve long-term fishing opportunities in Icicle Creek. Long-term operation of this project is not expected to limit access for recreational opportunities. No significant impacts are expected to result from this project.

While no specific improvements are suggested for the recreational fishery, protecting the recreational fishery is one of the IWG's Guiding Principles. No significant impacts are expected to result from this project.

### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

Improvements to instream and floodplain habitat is expected to improve the overall ecological value of Icicle Creek. In comparison to existing conditions, this is expected to result in benefits to the quality of recreational fishing and wildlife viewing activities, and to the aesthetic experience for those participating in tubing and SUP activities.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

Amending the Instream Flow Rule to increase the Icicle Creek reserve would have small impacts on stream flow (approximately 0.4 cfs). However, it is not anticipated that this process would significantly impact water recreation in Icicle Creek. Additionally, stream flow impacts would be offset by instream flow benefits from other projects.

# Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

Improved water quality and conservation at LNFH is expected to improve the instream habitat and ecological value of Icicle Creek. In comparison to existing conditions, this is expected to result in benefits to fishing in both Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River, and would improve wildlife viewing and the aesthetic experience for those participating in

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

tubing and SUP activities. However, the installation of wells and an infiltration gallery could have impacts on current hiking and skiing trails located on hatchery island. Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential recreation impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined.

### Fish Passage Improvements

Improved fish passage in lower and upper Icicle Creek would promote long-term health and recovery of multiple fisheries. In comparison to existing conditions, this is expected to result in long-term benefits to fishing in both Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River through improved quality and duration of sport/recreational fishing opportunities and reduced limitations/regulations.

### Fish Screen Compliance

Improved fish screens would improve the ecological health of juvenile fish in Icicle Creek. In comparison to existing conditions, this is expected to result in long-term benefits to fishing in both Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River through improved quality and duration of sport fishing opportunities and reduced limitations/regulations.

### Water Markets

Improved water management through use of water markets is expected to increase stream flow in Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. In comparison to existing conditions, this is expected to result in benefits to kayaking, rafting, tubing and SUP activities, and fishing in both water bodies by increasing the length of time during which flows for those respective activities are suitable.

## 4.15.3 Alternative 2

The expected impacts of implementing Alternative 2 are similar to those identified for Alternative 1 because of the commonality of project, with the exception of the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange and the removal of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation project. Potential short-term impacts include impacts to land use related to access during construction. There are no anticipated long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project.

### 4.15.3.1 Short-term Impacts

### IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

IPID is considering locating a pump station on the right bank of the Wenatchee River near Dryden as an alternative to the existing IPID diversion on Peshastin Creek. Relocating their point of diversion would involve construction of a new pump station and installation of new pipeline and associated conveyance infrastructure. Most of this work would occur in upland areas on private lands and easements, and any temporary disturbance within these areas would not affect existing recreational opportunities. It is expected that any in- or near-water construction would occur within a small physical footprint required for pumps and conveyance infrastructure.

Water-dependent activities that could be temporarily affected by construction activities along the shoreline of the Wenatchee River could include fishing, kayaking, and rafting. Based upon the small footprint of the project and the temporary nature of the disturbance, meaningful impacts to existing water-dependent recreational activities are unlikely.

As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

### 4.15.3.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

Relocating the IPID point of diversion to the Wenatchee River would increase streamflow in Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. In comparison to existing conditions, this is expected to result in benefits to late-season water-dependent activities such as tubing and SUP by increasing the length of time during which flows for those respective activities are suitable. There would also be instream flow benefit in Peshastin Creek resulting from this project.

## 4.15.4 Alternative 3

This alternative includes the same project actions as Alternative 2, with the exception that the Eightmile Lake Restoration project actions are removed and the OCPI Legislative Change project action is added. The discussion of short- and long-term impacts focuses on impacts associated with changes from Alternatives 1 and 2.

### 4.15.4.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

Amending the OCPI determination is an administrative action that would have no short-term impacts to existing recreational opportunities.

### 4.15.4.2 Long-term Impacts

### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

Legislative change to OCPI to allow the Instream Flow Rule to be impaired by domestic use when instream flow targets adopted in Chapter 173-545 WAC are not met would lead to decreased stream flow during low flow periods. This has the potential to impact water-based recreation, such as kayaking, rafting, tubing and SUP activities, and fishing in Icicle Creek. However, impacts are expected to be very minor when considering the flow and habitat improvements proposed under Alternative 3.

# 4.15.5 Alternative 4

This alternative includes all the project actions of Alternative 1 but calls for increasing storage at Eightmile Lake to above the historic high water mark and enhancing storage and release at Upper Klonaqua and Upper Snow Lakes. The discussion of short- and long-term impacts focuses on impacts associated with these changes similar to those listed in Alternative 1.

### 4.15.5.1 Short-term Impacts

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

Under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project, storage capacity in Eightmile Lake would be increased by increasing both the height of the existing dam and draw down level. This would be accomplished by rebuilding the existing dam to a higher overflow elevation and installing a low-level siphon.

Construction-related activity to upgrade and replace existing outlet infrastructure at Eightmile Lake could result in short-term, temporary limited access at the construction sites at the lake. Construction activity at the lake outlet could result in short-term disruption to recreational users near the lake outlet while work is ongoing. The lake will likely be drawn down for construction and a temporary cofferdam may be used to separate the lake from the work area. Recreational use in the vicinity of construction sites includes day use (e.g., hiking, fishing, and horseback riding) and overnight camping.

IPID currently performs regular maintenance activities at Eightmile Lake and these activities have some related equipment and helicopter traffic. Delivery of construction-related supplies and equipment by helicopter would be consistent with existing operations. Helicopter trips would utilize an existing landing area and are not expected to result in obstruction of trails or camping sites. As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

### Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

Upper Klonaqua Lake is currently used by IPID to augment water supply. The Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would increase the ability to draw down Upper Klonaqua Lake by installing new conveyance infrastructure to siphon, pump, or drain water into Lower Klonaqua Lake.

Construction-related activity to release more water from Upper Klonaqua Lake could result in short-term, temporary limited access to the construction site on the lake. Construction activities at the lake outlet could result in short-term disruption to recreational users near the lake outlet while work is ongoing. Upper Klonaqua Lake is not believed to be a popular recreational use location. However, types of uses that may occur at Upper Klonaqua Lake are hiking and overnight camping.

As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Under this project, existing infrastructure at Upper and Lower Snow Lakes would be improved to provide additional storage capacity. This would be accomplished by rebuilding the two existing Snow Lakes dams and installing new, lower-level outlets and gates at each structure.

Construction-related activity to upgrade and replace existing outlet infrastructure at Upper and Lower Snow Lakes could result in short-term, temporary limited access at the construction sites at the lakes. Construction activity at the lake outlet could result in shortterm disruption to recreational users near the lake outlet while work is ongoing. Recreational use in the vicinity of construction sites includes hiking and overnight camping.

USFWS currently performs regular maintenance activities at Upper and Lower Snow Lake and these activities have some related equipment and helicopter traffic. New delivery of construction-related supplies and equipment by helicopter would be consistent with existing operations. Helicopter trips would utilize an existing landing area and are not expected to result in obstruction of trails or camping sites. As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

### 4.15.5.2 Long-term Impacts

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

Upgrades to existing infrastructure at Eightmile Lake would increase lake levels above historical levels. Existing trails, campsites, and lakeshore access routes could experience some limited seasonal inundation as a result of this project. In comparison to existing conditions, long-term operational impacts could change the timing and duration of water releases from the lake and would result in an increased range of water levels. Therefore, some long-term impacts to existing recreational opportunities in and around Eightmile Lake are expected. To the extent possible, new infrastructure improvements would be designed to fit into the surrounding landscape and minimize impacts to recreational users' visual experience.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Improved water management of the Eightmile Lake reservoir is expected to increase stream flow in Icicle Creek, especially during the late season. In comparison to existing conditions, this is expected to result in benefits to kayaking, tubing and SUP activities, and fishing in Icicle Creek by increasing the length of time during which flows for those respective activities are suitable.

### Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

Upgrades to existing infrastructure at Upper Klonaqua Lake would draw lake levels down below historical levels. Additionally, changes to storage capacity could result in some limited seasonal inundation of existing trails, campsites, and lakeshore access routes when storage is at maximum capacity. In comparison to existing conditions, long-term operational impacts could change the timing and duration of water releases from the lake and would result in an increased range of water levels. Therefore, some long-term impacts to existing recreational opportunities in and around Upper Klonaqua Lake are expected.

Improved water management of Upper Klonaqua Lake is expected to increase stream flow in Icicle Creek, especially during the late season. In comparison to existing conditions, this is expected to result in benefits to kayaking, tubing and SUP activities, and fishing in Icicle Creek by increasing the length of time during which flows for those respective activities are suitable.

### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Upgrades to existing infrastructure at Upper and Lower Snows Lakes would draw lake levels down below historical levels. Additionally, changes to storage capacity could result in some limited seasonal inundation of existing trails, campsites, and lakeshore access routes when storage is at maximum capacity. In comparison to existing conditions, long-term operational impacts could change the timing and duration of water releases from the lake and would result in an increased range of water levels. Therefore, some long-term impacts to existing recreational opportunities in and around Upper and Lower Snow Lakes are expected.

Improved water management of Upper and Lower Snows lakes is expected to increase stream flow in Icicle Creek, especially during the late season. In comparison to existing conditions, this is expected to result in benefits to kayaking, tubing and SUP activities, and fishing in Icicle Creek by increasing the length of time during which flows for those respective activities are suitable.

## 4.15.6 Alternative 5

The expected impacts of implementing Alternative 5 are similar to those identified for Alternative 1 because of the commonality of project, with the exception that IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange would replace the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies project. Potential short-term impacts include impacts to land use related to access during construction. There are no anticipated long-term impacts associated with the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project.

### 4.15.6.1 Short-term Impacts

### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

This project would involve replacing the IPID diversion on Icicle and Peshastin Creeks with three pump stations located on the Wenatchee River near Leavenworth, Dryden, and Cashmere. Relocating their point of diversion would involve construction of a new pump station and installation of new pipeline and associated conveyance infrastructure. Most of this work would occur in upland areas on private lands and easements, and any temporary disturbance within these areas would not affect existing recreational opportunities. It is expected that any in- or near-water construction would occur within a small physical footprint required for pumps and conveyance infrastructure.

Water-dependent activities that could be temporarily affected by construction activities along the shoreline of the Wenatchee River could include fishing, kayaking, and rafting. Based upon the small footprint of the project and the temporary nature of the disturbance, meaningful impacts to existing water-dependent recreational activities are unlikely.

As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

# 4.15.7 Mitigation Measures

### 4.15.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Construction-related mitigation measures to minimize and protect against impacts to recreation would include timing work windows to avoid certain recreational activities and communicating with user groups months ahead of construction, so trips can be scheduled outside of construction windows, which would be particularly important to backcountry uses in the ALWA. Phased project construction at back country sites would also help minimize impacts. For example, installing automated gates and solar panels at different lakes during different years would allow for users to plan trips around construction activities.

For in-water work, approved work windows are expected to occur during the late season (summer/fall) when flows are low. This time frame generally coincides with the period when water-dependent activities include tubing and SUP activities; kayaking and rafting generally occur during early season, high-flow periods. Some overlap between work windows and fishing seasons in the Wenatchee River could occur but are expected to be limited in physical footprint to localized areas of the river shoreline.

### 4.15.7.2 Long-term Impacts

Operational mitigation measures to minimize and protect against impacts to recreation would include relocating those portions of trails and campsites that would be inundated by increased lake levels. In regard to recreation, the majority of projects are expected to have

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

positive long-term impacts on water-dependent recreation opportunities in Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River.

# 4.16 Land Use

This section describes the potential short- and long-term impacts affecting land use, described in Section 3.16 Land Use, from the No-action Alternative and Program Alternatives. Consistency with the Wilderness Act and related land uses is addressed in Section 4.17, Wilderness Area.

## 4.16.1 No-action Alternative

### 4.16.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various agencies and other entities would continue to undertake individual actions to restore and enhance fish and aquatic resources in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area, but those actions would not be part of a coordinated program implemented with the support of the IWG. Actions implemented by individual agencies and entities could include construction of diversion improvements, irrigation system upgrades, LNFH improvements, and fish passage work.

Under the No-action Alternative, short-term land use impacts could occur during project construction. For work near water, such as improving points of diversions and habitat and fish passage work, construction-related activities could temporarily impact public access at construction locations because staging of heavy equipment and supplies, or active inwater work.

All construction-related activities would adhere to applicable federal, state, and local land use regulations and permitting, as well as BMPs to minimize any impacts. Consultation with Chelan County Community Development Department would confirm land use regulations pertaining to construction of projects, including compliance with CAO and SMP.

### 4.16.1.2 Long-term Impacts

The long-term impacts under the No-action Alternative would likely result from operation of several of the projects.

For projects that require the use of riparian lands, such as the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project and potential habitat projects, easements could be required. If these projects require the acquisition of land or easements, appropriate compensation would be required in accordance with applicable federal or state regulations.
Water made available through the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project would benefit improved domestic supply. This could lead to further population growth and urbanization of lands within the urban growth boundary. It could also lead to increased water availability for rural domestic growth if reserve accounting finds more water available in the reserve based on rural domestic conservation. However, long-term domestic supply projections through 2050 might not be met. Litigation over water supply between the City of Leavenworth and Ecology would likely resume. It is unclear if this would result in City of Leavenworth meeting projected water demand. Residential development that would occur if 400 acre-feet of water were conserved (Icicle Strategy goal) would have an estimated development impact of 56.1 acres based on assumptions described in section 1.5.1.4, and a development impact of 4,000 square feet (sq. ft.) per ERU (City of Leavenworth, 2013). Development under the No-action Alternative is expected to be less than this impact, but difficult to quantify.

Any land use conversion that may result from increased domestic supply would comply with all federal, state, and local land use regulations and zoning restrictions.

## 4.16.2 Alternative 1

Short-term land use impacts would primarily be related to temporary access restrictions. The overall expected long-term land use impacts associated with Alternative 1 include increased residential development as a result of increased water available for domestic growth. Additionally, there would be an increase in public land ownership in the uplands of the Icicle Creek Subbasin as a result of protection efforts associated with the Habitat Enhancement projects. All Program Alternatives would be required to comply with land use regulations, local zoning, and permitting. Consistency with applicable land use planning would occur at project level review or permitting.

## 4.16.2.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Construction-related activity to upgrade or replace existing outlet infrastructure could result in short-term, temporary obstruction of recreational access as described in Section 4.15, Recreation. Construction activities would need to comply with Chelan Counties Critical Area Ordinance (CAO) and Shoreline Master Plan (SMP). Consultation with Chelan County Community Development Department would be required to determine if this project would fall under the maintenance exemption provided in County Code 14.10(B)(2).

### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Conservation projects with construction-related activities could include some canal to pipeline conversion, canal lining, and on-farm efficiencies. These actions are not expected to impact short-term land use. The construction zones would not likely be within the critical area or covered under the SMP. However, consultation with Chelan

## ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

County Community Development Department would confirm land use regulations pertaining to construction of this project.

### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Under the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project, construction-related activities would include installing a new diversionary structure on the Wenatchee River or Icicle Creek and installing conveyance piping within the current canal's right-of-way. Installing a new pump station could temporarily impact public access of the Wenatchee River or Icicle Creek, depending on site location and equipment staging needs.

All construction-related activities would adhere to applicable federal, state, and local land use regulations and permitting, as well as BMPs to minimize any impacts. Consultation with Chelan County Community Development Department would confirm land use regulations pertaining to construction of this project, including compliance with CAO and SMP.

There are no anticipated construction-related impacts to land use associated with installing new conveyance piping within the current canal's right-of-way.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

The City of Leavenworth and Chelan County are proposing implementing a municipal and rural water efficiency project that includes project elements such as pipe replacements, meter installation, and water use conservation to improve the domestic supply. Construction-related activities are not expected to have any substantial impact on land use.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Construction-related activity related to upgrading infrastructure at Eightmile Lake may result in short-term, temporary obstruction of recreational access to the lake for equipment transportation, storage, and staging. To minimize access impacts, construction activities could occur in the fall after peak use. Consultation with Chelan County Community Development Department would confirm land use regulations pertaining to construction of this project, including compliance with CAO and SMP.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

Proposed activities under the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project would ensure that no negative effects occur to the tribal, as well as non-tribal, fishery on Icicle Creek. Consultation with Chelan County Community Development Department would confirm land use regulations pertaining to construction of this project, including compliance with CAO and SMP.

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The IWG is working with Chelan County and the USFWS to implement recommended habitat improvement actions and land acquisition projects throughout Icicle Creek. All habitat enhancement projects are located along lower Icicle Creek, between RM 0.0 and 4.3.

Construction-related activities associated with habitat protection and enhancement could result in temporary restrictions to public access and passage through lower Icicle Creek because of staging of heavy equipment and supplies, or active in-water work. All construction-related activities would adhere to applicable federal, state, and local land use regulations and permitting as well as BMPs to minimize any impacts. Consultation with Chelan County Community Development Department would confirm land use regulations pertaining to construction of this project, including compliance with CAO and SMP.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

This is an administrative action and no construction-related impacts to land use are expected.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

While much of the construction related to this project is anticipated to occur in the uplands, some of the construction projects could include work in and near streams, and in the floodplain on hatchery-owned lands. All construction-related activities would adhere to applicable federal, state, and local land use regulations and permitting as well as BMPs to minimize any impacts. Consultation with Chelan County Community Development Department would confirm land use regulations pertaining to construction of this project, including compliance with CAO and SMP.

#### Fish Passage Improvements

Construction-related activities associated with fish passage could result in temporary restrictions to public access and passage through lower Icicle Creek because of staging of heavy equipment and supplies or active in-water work. All construction-related activities would adhere to applicable federal, state, and local land use regulations and permitting as well as BMPs to minimize any impacts. Consultation with Chelan County Community Development Department would confirm land use regulations pertaining to construction of this project, including compliance with CAO and SMP. More detail on the impacts to shorelines is discussed in Section 4.18, Shorelines.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

Construction-related activities associated with upgrading fish screens could result in temporary restrictions to public access and passage through lower Icicle Creek because of staging of heavy equipment and supplies or active in-water work. All construction-related activities would adhere to applicable federal, state, and local land use regulations and permitting as well as BMPs to minimize any impacts. Consultation with Chelan County Community Development Department would confirm land use regulations pertaining to construction of this project, including compliance with CAO and SMP.

#### Water Markets

There are not construction components to this proposal, therefore no short-term land use impacts are anticipated.

## 4.16.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

There are no anticipated long-term changes to land use associated with the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project. As discussed in Section 3.17, Wilderness Area, IPID has easements to operate and maintain their dams on these lakes, and use would remain consistent with current operation. The only difference would be how often the lakes are drawn down. All water made available through this project would benefit instream flow.

### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

There are no anticipated long-term impacts to land use associated with the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project. All water made available through this project would benefit instream flow.

### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

There are no anticipated long-term impacts to land use associated with the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project. All water made available through this project would benefit instream flow.

Easements could be required for the pump station site. If this project requires the acquisition of land or easements, appropriate compensation would be required in accordance with applicable federal or state regulations.

## **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Water made available through the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project would benefit improved domestic supply. This could lead to further population growth and urbanization of lands within the urban growth boundary. It could also lead to increased water availability for rural domestic growth if reserve accounting finds more water available in the reserve based on rural domestic conservation.

Under this element, 400 acre-feet of water would be conserved and made available for new domestic uses. Making this quantity of water available for new residential development that would have an estimated development impact of 56.1 acres based on assumptions described in section 1.5.1.4, and a development impact of 4,000 sq. ft. per ERU (City of Leavenworth, 2013). Some development impacts are likely irrespective of the development of this Icicle Strategy. To what extent is unclear at this point and would likely depend on the outcome of litigation between City of Leavenworth and Ecology.

Any land use conversion that may result from increased domestic supply would comply with all federal, state, and local land use regulations and zoning restrictions.

## Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would make 900 acre-feet of domestic water available for projected future growth. This could lead to further population growth

and urbanization of lands within the urban growth boundary. It could also lead to increased rural domestic growth.

Resident development that would occur if 900 acre-feet of water were made available would have an estimated development impact of 208.8 acres based on assumptions described in section 1.5.1.4, and a development impact of 4,000 sq. ft. per ERU for urban development at 4,600 sq. ft. per ERU for rural development (City of Leavenworth, 2013; Chelan County, 2014b). Some development impacts are likely irrespective of the development of this Icicle Strategy. To what extent is unclear at this point and would likely depend on the outcome of litigation between City of Leavenworth and Ecology.

Any land use conversion that may result from increased domestic supply would comply with all federal, state, and local land use regulations, and zoning restrictions.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

There would be no long-term land use impacts associated with tribal fishery protections and enhancements.

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

As part of the Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project, the IWG would seek to acquire conservation lands in the uplands of the watershed. This would increase the amount of public land in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. A likely source of land acquisition would be private timber land. This would reduce the acres of working forest lands in the watershed. Use would likely pivot to recreation and habitat conservation.

Some instream and riparian habitat projects could have impacts on the function and extent of the floodplain, which could have long-term land use impacts.

All land use changes would comply with federal, state, and local land use regulations and zoning restrictions. Easements and/or property purchases could be required for conservation lands. If this project requires the acquisition of land or easements, appropriate compensation would be required in accordance with applicable federal or state regulations.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

The Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project would make an additional 0.4 cfs from the Wenatchee Reserve available for projected future growth in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. This could lead to increased rural domestic growth. Any land use conversion that may result from increased domestic supply would comply with all federal, state, and local land use regulations and zoning restrictions.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

There are no long-term effects from the LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements Project on land use. Water made available through this project would benefit instream flows.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The Fish Passage Project would not have any long-term effect on land use in the Icicle project area.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

There would be no long-term land use impacts associated with the fish screen improvements.

#### Water Markets

Under the Water Markets Project, irrigation water rights would be retired in the Icicle Creek Subbasin to mitigate interruptible users when the Instream Flow Rule is not met. This would change land use within the watershed by moving some land use away from irrigated agriculture to other uses. The lands that would be mitigated through the Water Markets Project are already in agricultural use. Any land use conversion that may result from this project would comply with all federal, state, and local land use regulations and zoning restrictions.

## 4.16.3 Alternative 2

The expected impacts of implementing Alternative 2 involve short-term constructionrelated impacts that are temporary, and long-term impacts resulting from the operation of proposed projects. These impacts are similar to those identified in Alternative 1 because of the commonality of projects, with the exception of the inclusion of the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project and the removal of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project. Potential short-term impacts include impacts to land use related to access during construction. There are no anticipated long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project.

## 4.16.3.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

Construction-related activities would include installing a new diversionary structure on the Wenatchee River. Installing a new pump station on the Wenatchee River could temporarily impact public access of the Wenatchee River, depending on site location and equipment staging needs. All construction-related activities would adhere to applicable federal, state, and local land use regulations and permitting as well as BMPs to minimize any impacts. Consultation with Chelan County Community Development Department would confirm land use regulations pertaining to construction of this project, including compliance with CAO and SMP.

## 4.16.3.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

There are no anticipated long-term impacts to land use associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. All water made available through this project would benefit instream flow. Easements could be required for the pump station site. If this project requires the acquisition of land or easements, appropriate compensation would be required in accordance with applicable federal or state regulations.

## 4.16.4 Alternative 3

The expected impacts of implementing Alternative 3 are similar to those identified in Alternative 2 because of the commonality of projects, with the exception of the inclusion of the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project and the removal of the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project. Potential short-term impacts include impacts to land use related to access during construction. Potential long-term impacts include domestic growth resulting from more water being available for domestic use.

## 4.16.4.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

This is an administrative action with no construction activities, therefore no short-term impacts to land use are anticipated.

## 4.16.4.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

The Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project would allow for new domestic use in the Icicle Creek Subbasin at times when the Instream Flow Rule is not met. This is because instream flow improvement and mitigation projects would not perfectly align when the highest instream and out-of-stream demand occurs. This project could result in increases to population growth and urbanization of lands within the urban growth boundary. It could also lead to increased rural domestic growth. Any land use conversion that may result from increased domestic supply would comply with all federal, state, and local land use regulations and zoning restrictions.

## 4.16.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 includes all the projects proposed in Alternative 1 with the exception of the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project, which is replaced with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project, and the addition of the Klonaqua Lake and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects. The anticipated short-term land use impacts are related to restricted access during construction. The anticipated long-term impacts are related to increased domestic growth resulting from water availability.

## 4.16.5.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project differs from the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project in that it calls for increasing the useable storage by

approximately 1,000 acre-feet. This would be accomplished by rebuilding the dam and raising the crest and increasing available draw down. The short-term impacts would be to the result of construction of the dam and would primarily affect recreational land use, as detailed in Section 4.15, Recreation. Consultation with Chelan County Community Development Department would confirm land use regulations pertaining to construction of this project, including compliance with CAO and SMP.

### **Upper Klonaqua Storage Enhancement**

The Upper Klonaqua Storage Enhancement Project takes advantage of the potential storage in Upper Klonaqua Lake by installing infrastructure to facilitate draw down. It is in the conceptual stages, but short-term impacts would primarily be to recreational land use as a result of construction. For details on recreational land use refer to Section 4.15, Recreation. These impacts are related to transporting, storing, and staging construction equipment. To minimize access impacts, construction activities could occur in the fall after peak use. Consultation with Chelan County Community Development Department would confirm land use regulations pertaining to construction of this project, including compliance with CAO and SMP.

### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

The Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would raise the dam on Upper Snow Lake to increase its storage capacity by 1,079 acre-feet. The short-term land use impacts would primarily affect recreational land use as a result of dam construction. These impacts are further detailed in Section 4.15.5.2, Short-term Impacts, Recreation. Consultation with Chelan County Community Development Department would confirm land use regulations pertaining to construction of this project, including compliance with CAO and SMP.

## 4.16.5.2 Long-term Impacts

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would raise the level of Eightmile Lake and increase the draw down, impacting its shoreline used primarily for recreation, as discussed in Sections 4.15.5.2, Long-term Impacts, Recreation, and 4.18.5.2, Long-term Impacts, Shorelines.

This project would make water available for instream uses and projected future municipal/domestic demand. This could lead to further population growth and urbanization of lands within the urban growth boundary. It could also lead to increased rural domestic growth. Any land use conversion that may result from increased domestic supply would comply with all federal, state, and local land use regulations and zoning restrictions.

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would draw down Upper Klonaqua Lake, impacting its shoreline used primarily for recreation, as discussed in sections 4.15 and 4.18.

This project would make water available for instream uses and projected future municipal/domestic demand. This could lead to further population growth and urbanization of lands within the urban growth boundary. It could also lead to increased rural domestic growth. Any land use conversion that may result from increased domestic supply would comply with all federal, state, and local land use regulations and zoning restrictions.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

The Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would raise the level of Upper Snow Lake and increase draw down, impacting its shoreline used primarily for recreation, as discussed in Sections 4.15.5.2, Long-term Impacts, Recreation, and 4.18.5.2, Long-term Impacts, Shorelines.

This project would make water available for instream uses and projected future municipal/domestic demand. This could lead to further population growth and urbanization of lands within the urban growth boundary. It could also lead to increased rural domestic growth. Any land use conversion that may result from increased domestic supply would comply with all federal, state, and local land use regulations and zoning restrictions.

## 4.16.6 Alternative 5

The expected impacts of implementing Alternative 5 involve short-term constructionrelated impacts that are temporary, and long-term impacts resulting from the operation of proposed projects. These impacts are similar to those identified in Alternative 1 because of the commonality of projects, with the exception of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies project would be replaced by the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange. Potential shortterm impacts include impacts to land use related to access during construction. There are no anticipated long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project.

### 4.16.6.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

Construction-related activities would include installing three new diversionary structures on the Wenatchee River. Installing new pump stations on the Wenatchee River could temporarily impact public access of the Wenatchee River, depending on site location and equipment staging needs. All construction-related activities would adhere to applicable federal, state, and local land use regulations and permitting as well as BMPs to minimize any impacts. Consultation with Chelan County Community Development Department

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

would confirm land use regulations pertaining to construction of this project, including compliance with CAO and SMP.

## 4.16.6.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

There are no anticipated long-term impacts to land use associated with the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project. All water made available through this project would benefit instream flow.

Easements could be required for the pump station site. If this project requires the acquisition of land or easements, appropriate compensation would be required in accordance with applicable federal or state regulations.

## 4.16.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

## 4.16.7.1 Short-term Impacts

The primary short-term impact to land use is related to access during construction. Property impacts would mainly be public, although some private lands could be impacted. To the extent possible, alternate access routes would be provided or projects would be timed to minimize access issues.

There would also be impacts related to in-water and near-water work. All work would comply with applicable permits and BMPs. This is discussed in more detail in Section 4.18, Shorelines.

## 4.16.7.2 Long-term Impacts

The primary long-term impact of the above described projects is increased water availability for domestic use. This could lead to land use changes related to increased domestic/residential use. Any land use conversion that may result from increased domestic supply would comply with all federal, state, and local land use regulations and zoning restrictions.

Some projects would require land acquisition or easements. Appropriate compensation would be required in accordance with applicable federal or state regulations.

# 4.17 Wilderness Area

This section describes the potential short- and long-term impacts that could affect the resources identified in Section 3.17, from construction and operation related to the No-action Alternative and Program Alternatives.

## 4.17.1 No-action Alternative

### 4.17.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various agencies and other entities would continue to undertake individual actions to restore and enhance fish and aquatic resources in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area, but those actions would not be part of a coordinated program implemented with the support of the IWG. Actions implemented by individual agencies and entities could include construction of diversion improvements, irrigation system upgrades, LNFH improvements, and fish passage work.

IPID and USFWS would likely pursue some construction and maintenance activities at their dam sites in the ALWA. Especially those in need of reconstruction and repair. Potential short-term impacts affecting wilderness would be associated with projects that require construction. Construction can affect wilderness characteristics such as solitude in the short-term. As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

As discussed in Section 3.17, these construction activities are permissible in the ALWA per easements granted by the USFS to IPID.

## 4.17.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts under the No-action Alternative to the Wilderness Area are anticipated to be largely the same as current conditions. Under the No-action Alternative, seasonal maintenance and water release operations of the seven lakes located within the ALWA would continue. This includes use of helicopters to access dam sites, as studied in the USFS Environmental Assessment on IPID helicopter use (USFS, 1981), and allowed for in the land exchanges agreement. This requires multiple trips by IPID staff every year to both open impoundment release controls during the summer and close them in the fall, respectively. These activities impact the Wilderness Area's untrammeled state and the sense of solitude to wilderness users. However, it would not pose a significant change from current conditions.

# 4.17.2 Alternative 1

Implementation of Alternative 1 has the potential to result in different impacts on the Wilderness Area compared with the No-action Alternative. There is a higher likelihood that certain projects would be implemented and the scale of certain efforts would likely be greater. The following sections describe the short- and long-term impacts that would occur under Alternative 1.

## 4.17.2.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Construction activities associated with this project would involve replacing existing gates and installing solar panels, actuators, flow monitoring equipment, and other new equipment to improved management and release of stored water at the lakes in the Icicle Creek Subbasin.

The short-term impact to the Wilderness Area is primarily related to accessing the project sites, staging equipment, and providing for worker accommodations because these activities could temporarily disturb the wilderness characteristics of natural, solitude, undeveloped, and untrammeled experienced by users at these sites. Providing worker accommodations onsite (i.e., camping) would reduce the number of helicopter trips, minimizing impacts to wilderness experience of helicopters (USBR, 2018). As noted in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

To minimize impacts, construction work could occur after peak use, and construction could be phased so not all lakes are impacted at the same time. Additionally, a minimum tools analysis will occur for all work proposed within the ALWA.

Notices would be posted so wilderness users would be aware of potential impacts before planning a trip to the Wilderness Area.

As discussed in Section 3.17, these construction activities are permissible in the ALWA per easements granted by the USFS to IPID. The easement for Eightmile, Klonaqua, and Colchuck Lake provides the following:

"Excepting and reserving the right to overflow and inundate the bed and shore; water rights granted; perpetual easement across, through, along, and upon the property for maintenance, repair, operation, modification, upgrading, and replacement of all facilities presently located in and upon the property. IPID may exercise the rights by any means reasonable... including... motorized transport and equipment or aircraft. These rights include... regulating water level. Grantor will not without the prior written consent of the Forest Service, which consent shall not unreasonably be withheld, materially increase the size or scope of the facilities."

Colchuck also has an agricultural and Irrigation Livestock Watering System Easement because the lakes outlet and dam is located on land note subject to the IPID, USFS land exchange discussed in Section 3.17. Square Lake also operates under this type of permit. These permits authorize right-of-way and water conveyance systems and operation and maintenance of facilities with consultation and concurrence from USFS. Modernizing and automating releases from these lakes fall under the facility maintenance and would require USFS concurrence.

Upper and Lower Snow Lake are owned by USFWS. As ownership of the lakes, USFWS has the right to upgrade and maintain storage facilities on their property.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

The proposed IPID Irrigation Efficiencies improvements are downstream from the ALWA and do not present any short-term impacts to the Wilderness Area.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

The proposed COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange improvements are downstream from the ALWA and do not present any short-term impacts to the Wilderness Area.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

The proposed Domestic Conservation Efficiencies improvements are downstream from the ALWA and do not present any short-term impacts to the Wilderness Area.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would involve demolishing the existing dam, installing a new low-level outlet pipeline, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures. Construction activities would occur along the lake shore. Short-term impacts to wilderness characteristics are expected as a result of construction. To minimize user impacts, construction work could occur after peak use and notices would be posted so wilderness users would be aware of potential impacts before planning a trip to the Wilderness Area. As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term wilderness impacts are not expected to be significant.

To minimize impacts, construction work could occur after peak use, and construction could be phased so not all lakes are impacted at the same time. Workers could camp to minimize helicopter trips. Additionally, a minimum tools analysis will occur for all work proposed within the ALWA. As discussed above, IPID reserved rights to maintenance, repair, operation, modification, upgrading, and replacement of all facilities at Eightmile

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Lake. With prior written consent of the Forest Service, which consent shall not unreasonably be withheld, IPID can increase the size of Eightmile Lake.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

All proposed tribal fishery improvements are downstream from the Wilderness Area, and thus no short-term impacts are associated with these actions.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

All proposed Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project construction activities are downstream from the Wilderness Area, and thus there are no potential impacts associated with these actions.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

There are no proposed construction activities associated with this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on the Wilderness character.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on the Wilderness character.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

As all currently proposed Fish Passage Improvements are downstream from the Wilderness Area, there are no potential impacts associated with these actions.

#### Fish Screen Compliance

As all proposed Fish Screen Compliance improvements are downstream from the Wilderness Area, there are no potential impacts associated with these actions.

#### Water Markets

There are no construction activities proposed under the Water Markets Project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on the Wilderness character.

## 4.17.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Operation of the proposed facilities for this project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from the lakes. This has several potential long-term impacts. Reservoir automation would significantly reduce seasonal reservoir maintenance and service visits, which are currently all done by hikes and helicopter visits to the lakes. Instead, stored water would be released via remote telemetry. Additionally, construction of the proposed facilities, such as antenna, solar panels, and equipment enclosures, could be designed to have an undeveloped, aesthetically appropriate look and feel so to appear unobtrusive on the natural wilderness character of the area.

As lake levels would be drawn down every year instead of rotating one or two lakes per year, stream and lake water levels would be changed in portions of the Wilderness Area.

As the resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system, downstream impacts are expected to beneficially increase flows in the Wilderness Areas in the summer months.

As it relates to wilderness character as described in the Wilderness Act, drawing down the lake levels from their current artificially impounded levels could have beneficial longterm impacts to the wilderness character by returning the lakes to their "natural," pre-1920s reservoir construction levels.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

The proposed IPID Irrigation Efficiencies improvements are downstream from the ALWA and do not present any long-term impacts to the wilderness character.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

The proposed COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange improvements are downstream from the ALWA and do not present any long-term impacts to the wilderness character.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Operation of the proposed facilities for this project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from Eightmile Lake. However, a larger inundated area and bigger draw down would likely impact the wilderness experience of users. However, the inundation area was experienced for decades prior to the partial erosion on of the dam, including at the time of wilderness designation. Draw down could be managed to minimize these impacts during peak use.

Additionally, a larger dam would impact the wilderness characteristics that users experience (natural, undeveloped, untrammeled). As discussed in Section 4.11, Aesthetics, visual impacts of this project could be minimized by dam design that would incorporate architectural components to make the dam feel more natural and less modern.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

All proposed tribal fishery improvements are downstream from the Wilderness Area, thus there are no potential impacts associated with these actions.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

The purpose of the Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project is to protect and enhance habitat within the Lower Icicle Creek corridor. There are also plans to obtain upland habitat for conservation purposes under this project. This would create additional public lands adjacent to the Wilderness Area, which would likely increase the feeling of a natural and undeveloped area to users.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

There are no construction activities proposed under the Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project. Long term, this proposal would result in removal of water from Icicle Creek at

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

the City of Leavenworth's diversion. Because this diversion is downstream of the Wilderness Area, no potential long-term impacts are anticipated to the Wilderness Area.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

All proposed LNFH improvements are downstream from the Wilderness Area, thus there are no potential long-term impacts associated with these actions.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

All proposed Fish Passage Improvements are downstream from the Wilderness Area, thus there are no potential long-term impacts associated with these actions.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

All proposed Fish Screen Compliance improvements are downstream from the Wilderness Area, thus there are no potential long-term impacts associated with these actions.

#### Water Markets

All proposed Water Markets Project improvements are downstream from the Wilderness Area, thus there are no potential long-term impacts associated with these actions.

## 4.17.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would also be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would not. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project.

## 4.17.3.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

All proposed improvements are downstream from the Wilderness Area, thus there are no potential long-term impacts associated with these actions.

## 4.17.3.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

All proposed improvements are downstream from the Wilderness Area, thus there are no potential long-term impacts associated with these actions.

## 4.17.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange and the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Projects would also be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation and Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Projects would not. This section describes the specific short- and longterm impacts associated with the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project. The impacts of the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project are discussed in Section 4.17.3.

## 4.17.4.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts with the potential to affect the Wilderness Area.

## 4.17.4.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

This project relates to domestic water use in the Icicle Creek Subbasin and instream flows as measured at the Ecology gage on lower Icicle Creek, all of which are downstream of the Wilderness Area. There are no anticipated impacts to wilderness character from this project.

## 4.17.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1. The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration project would be replaced with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project, and the Upper Klonaqua and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would also be included. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with these projects.

## 4.17.5.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

This project would involve demolishing the existing dam, installing a new low-level outlet pipeline, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures that would allow for an increase in the accessible storage at Eightmile Lake by 1,000 acre-feet.

The short-term impacts to the Wilderness Area are primarily related to accessing the project sites, staging equipment, and providing for worker accommodations. These impacts would temporarily disturb the wilderness characteristics of solitude, natural, undeveloped, and untrammeled. As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

To minimize user impacts, construction work could occur after peak use, and notices would be posted so wilderness users would be aware of potential impacts before planning a trip to the Wilderness Area. Workers could camp to minimize helicopter trips. Additionally, a minimum tools analysis will occur for all work proposed within the ALWA.

As discussed above, IPID reserved rights to maintenance, repair, operation, modification, upgrading, and replacement of all facilities at Eightmile Lake. With prior written consent of the Forest Service, which consent shall not unreasonably be withheld, IPID can increase the size of Eightmile Lake.

### Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

Short-term impacts on the Wilderness Area from this project would primarily be associated with construction activities required to provide a low-level outlet from Upper Klonaqua Lake to Lower Klonaqua Lake using one of the three conceptual connection options discussed in Chapter 2. The construction activity would be similar in nature to that described for the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project in 4.17.5.1 above, as would the short-term impacts. As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term recreational impacts are not expected to be significant.

To minimize user impacts, construction work could occur after peak use, and notices would be posted so wilderness users would be aware of potential impacts before planning a trip to the Wilderness Area. Workers could camp to minimize helicopter trips. Additionally, a minimum tools analysis will occur for all work proposed within the ALWA.

As discussed in Section 3.17, IPID reserved several right at Upper and Lower Klonaqua Lakes, including the right to increase the size and scope of the facilities with USFS written consent and the right to regulate water levels.

### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Short-term impacts on wilderness from this project would be primarily related to construction activities and are similar in type and mechanism to those discussed in Sections 4.17.5.1, Short-term Impacts, Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement, and 4.17.5.1, Short-term Impacts, Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement. As notes in Sections 4.11, Aesthetics, and 4.14, Noise, while construction activities would result in short-term visual changes and increased noise, the extent of these changes would be similar to operational and maintenance activities that currently occur, temporary, and relatively minimal. Therefore, short-term wilderness impacts are not expected to be significant.

To minimize user impacts, construction work could occur after peak use, and notices would be posted so wilderness users would be aware of potential impacts before planning a trip to the Wilderness Area. Workers could camp to minimize helicopter trips. Additionally, a minimum tools analysis will occur for all work proposed within the ALWA. As discussed in Section 3.17, USFWS owns easement to the Upper and Lower Snow Lake beds, and land adjacent to these lakes. Because USFWS owns these lands, this project would have to undergo a NEPA review.

## 4.17.5.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

The greatest potential for impacts on the Wilderness Area over the long term would occur as a result of increased inundated areas and larger draw downs. These changes would impact the wilderness characteristics of natural, undeveloped, and untrammeled. Additionally, a larger dam could also impact these wilderness characteristics. Wilderness impacts and whether the action is permissible under the Wilderness Act and IPID easements would be addressed during project level environmental review.

As discussed in Section 4.11, Aesthetics, to minimize these impacts, dam design could incorporate architectural components to make the dam feel more natural and less modern. Additionally, draw down could be managed to minimize these impacts during peak use.

#### Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

Under the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project, the high water mark would remain unchanged and the lake would still refill and outlet naturally through an existing channel to Lower Klonaqua Lake during most of the year. However, the new facilities would allow for the lake to be drawn down an additional 10 to 50 feet to allow for access to additional storage. The draw down would likely occur over a couple of months in the late summer. Modifications at Upper Klonaqua Lake would also result in the ability to release up to an additional 5 to 20 cfs from the lake.

Similar to the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project, these changes would impact the wilderness characteristics of natural, undeveloped, and untrammeled. With this project in the conceptual stage, exact impacts and mitigation measures are unclear. Wilderness impacts and whether the action is permissible under the Wilderness Act and IPID easements would be addressed during project level environmental review should this project proceed.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Similar to the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project, wilderness character would be impacted by a larger dam, greater area of inundation, and larger draw downs.

To minimize these impacts, dam design would incorporate architectural components to make the dam feel more natural and less modern and draw down could be managed to minimize these impacts during peak use. Wilderness impacts and whether the action is permissible under the Wilderness Act and IPID easements would be addressed during project level environmental review should this project proceed.

# 4.17.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies project would be replaced by the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project.

## 4.17.6.1 Short-term Impacts

### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

All proposed improvements are downstream from the Wilderness Area, thus there are no potential long-term impacts associated with these actions.

## 4.17.6.2 Long-term Impacts

### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

All proposed improvements are downstream from the Wilderness Area, thus there are no potential long-term impacts associated with these actions.

## 4.17.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential wilderness character impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

## 4.17.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Short-term impacts related to temporary construction on the Wilderness Area's feeling of solitude, naturalness, undeveloped, and untrammeled that users experience. To minimize the impacts of construction on these wilderness characters, notice would be provided, construction activities would occur outside of peak use when possible, and construction activities at lake sites would be staggered to allow for unimpacted wilderness experiences at some of the lakes during construction activities.

## 4.17.7.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts on the wilderness character could result from the increased frequency, and for some projects, increased level of draw down associated with proposals at the Alpine Lakes. To help minimize these impacts, releases could be managed to occur only when critical low flows are occurring in lower Icicle Creek. As a result, draw down might not occur in wet years when there is sufficient stream flow. Additionally, for storage restoration and enhancement projects some draw down could be managed outside of peak visitation windows.

Additional impacts to wilderness character could result from installation of equipment to allow for remote operation of control gates. This would include antenna, solar panels, and equipment enclosures. To minimize the impacts of this equipment, they would be made to blend into the natural environment to allow for the feeling of an untrammeled wilderness.

For storage enhancement projects discussed in Alternative 4, larger dams would also impact the wilderness experience. To minimize this impact, dam design would incorporate architectural components to make the dam feel more natural and less modern. Increased areas of inundation pose a potential significant impact, which would be examined in more detail during project level environmental review.

# 4.18 Shorelines

This section describes the potential short- and long-term impacts that could affect the resources identified in Section 3.18, Shorelines, from construction and operation related to the No-action Alternative and Program Alternatives. Potential shoreline impacts affecting aquatic and terrestrial habitat are addressed in Section 4.7, Fish, and Section 4.9, Wildlife.

## 4.18.1 No-action Alternative

## 4.18.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various entities and agencies would undertake individual actions that could result in short-term impacts on shorelines around the seven Alpine Lakes, Icicle and Peshastin Creeks, and the Wenatchee River. This is anticipated to entail construction of water diversion modifications, general habitat enhancement projects, LNFH improvements, required fish screening upgrades, modernization of infrastructure at the Alpine Lakes including the restoration of the Eightmile Lake Dam, and improvements to existing irrigation systems to support agricultural reliability. Potential short-term impacts affecting shorelines would be associated with projects that require construction. Construction could adversely affect shorelines in the short-term by resulting in ground disturbance that could increase shoreline erosion. An increase in the potential for shoreline erosion and flooding could also occur as the result of more permanent changes and are addressed under long-term impacts.

The agencies or entities implementing projects under the No-action Alternative would be required to comply with applicable local, state, and federal environmental review requirements and permits as described in Section 1.9, Related Permits, Actions, and Laws. Applicable permits would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

impacts on shorelines, such as revegetation of adversely affected areas and BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion (Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures). Therefore, short-term impacts under the No-action Alternative are not expected to be significant.

## 4.18.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts under the No-action Alternative are anticipated to be largely beneficial for shorelines because many projects would seek to restore riparian habitat and improve instream flows. However, because both instream flow and fish habitat enhancement projects would not generally be coordinated with other activities in the Icicle project area, these benefits are not anticipated to be as great as they would under the other Program Alternatives. Potential long-term benefits from such projects are also expected to be more localized, providing only minor overall benefits within the larger Icicle Creek Subbasin.

Depending on the extent of changes affecting the shoreline or the flow regime, there could also be some minor and localized increases in flooding and erosion potential over the long term, mainly along Icicle Creek but also at the Alpine Lakes. Changes to the shorelines or stream flows could result in increased potential for erosion of the streambank. Minor changes are anticipated at the Alpine Lakes compared to existing conditions because management of lake levels would remain similar to existing conditions. Although the frequency at which any given lake might be drawn down could increase, the timing and extent of draw down would generally be similar to existing conditions.

Any alterations of streambanks or the placement of new structures within the floodplain could also reduce the flood storage capacity of the adjacent floodplain; however, as noted previously, compliance with applicable regulations would require minimizing these risks. More specifically, work within shorelines of the state is regulated by the Shoreline Master Plan (SMP) and any development within the shoreline would require review by the local jurisdiction for consistency with SMP regulations and policies (Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures, for additional information).

## 4.18.2 Alternative 1

Implementation of Alternative 1 has the potential to result in greater impacts on shorelines compared with the No-action Alternative because there would be higher likelihood that certain projects would be implemented and the scale of certain efforts would likely be greater. The following sections describe the short- and long-term impacts that would occur under Alternative 1.

## 4.18.2.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Construction activities associated with this project would involve replacing existing gates and installing solar panels, actuators, flow monitoring equipment, and other new equipment. Most of the work would occur in upland areas. Some limited work would occur within the lake shorelines but within the dry when the lakes are drawn down at the end of the summer. There would be limited potential to affect flooding and erosion potential along the shorelines in the short term.

Accessing the project sites, staging equipment, and providing for worker accommodations could temporarily disturb shoreline vegetation mainly as the result of inadvertent trampling; however, no permanent changes or placement of additional structures are proposed.

As noted in Section 4.5, Water Quality, the potential for these activities to increase erosion would be low because work along the lake margins would occur after the lake was drawn down. In addition, this work would also likely require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification, which would help to further address potential impacts on shorelines.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Construction activities associated with this project include the conversion of IPID canals to pipelines and lining of irrigation canals with concrete. Short-term impacts on shorelines would be limited because most of the work would occur within areas that are already developed, such as within rights-of-way and existing irrigation canal easements, and would occur during the off-season when the irrigation canals are dry.

Compliance with applicable permits and approvals would include appropriate mitigation measures to reduce impacts on shorelines, such as implementing BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion (Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures). Therefore, short-term impacts on shorelines from construction work are expected to be less than significant.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Construction activities associated with COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange would be similar to those described above for IPID Irrigation Efficiencies with the exception of a new COIC pump station to be constructed along the shoreline of Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River. Depending on the specific location and the extent of the disturbance, these activities could result in short-term shoreline impacts, including minor localized potential for increased flooding and erosion, mainly related to vegetation clearing for the new facilities.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This work would likely require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification, which would help to further address potential impacts on shorelines. Compliance with applicable permits and approvals would include appropriate mitigation measures to reduce impacts on shorelines, such as implementing BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion (Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures). Therefore, short-term impacts on shorelines from construction work are expected to be less than significant.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Construction activities proposed under the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project include pipeline replacement and meter installation. These activities are unlikely to adversely affect shorelines because the work would be done in areas that are already developed away from waterways.

### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would involve demolishing the existing dam, installing a new low-level outlet pipeline, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures. Construction activities would occur along the banks and within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lake has been drawn down. As a result, the potential for increased erosion and flooding would be low.

This work would likely require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification, which would require BMPs to ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The focus of this project is to ensure that there would be no adverse effects on tribal fishing as a result of implementing other projects as part of the overall Icicle Strategy. The specifics of this project are not yet determined but would involve elements of restoration along the lower Icicle Creek that could result in localized shoreline disturbance, including vegetation removal and grading. At this stage, the primary options under consideration include the construction of facilities such as a plumbing to create a bubble curtain, a sprayer, or other minor modifications to the Hatchery Channel spillway at LNFH to promote favorable fishing conditions in the pool at the bottom of the spillway. Depending on the extent of the disturbance, there is the potential for some short-term increase in shoreline erosion and to a lesser extent flooding. However, as noted in Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures, work within the shoreline of Icicle Creek would require compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification, which would ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

The Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project could involve grading; planting and thinning vegetation; and hauling and placing logs, rock, soil, and other materials. These activities could increase the potential for shoreline erosion and flooding in the short-term. However, project activities with the potential to affect these resources would likely require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification, which would help to further address potential impacts on shorelines. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts on shorelines, such as requiring revegetation of adversely affected areas and BMPs designed to reduce the potential for erosion and minimize potential shoreline impacts (Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on shorelines.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

This project includes various elements geared towards improving water quality and hatchery rearing conditions at the LNFH. In general, construction of these elements has the potential to affect shorelines, depending on the specific location and type of disturbance. Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by the USFWS, an evaluation of the potential short-term impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined.

Similar to the construction activities described above, this work would also likely require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification, which would help to ensure that potential impacts would be avoided, minimized, or compensated as noted in Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The Fish Passage Improvements Project would potentially involve modification of existing LNFH instream structures in Icicle Creek as well as instream modifications to the Boulder Field near RM 5.6. This work would result in disturbances along the streambank and within Icicle Creek that would be addressed in subsequent environmental review and permitting once project specifics are determined. This work would also likely require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification, which would help to further address potential impacts on shorelines.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project involves replacing fish screens at three different diversions on lower Icicle Creek: LNFH/COIC, the City of Leavenworth, and IPID. Under this project, screens and associated infrastructure would be improved to bring all three intakes up to compliance with state and federal laws. This work would result in disturbances along the streambank and within Icicle Creek that would be addressed once project specifics are determined. This work would also likely require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies, including a shoreline permit, HPA, and a CWA Section 404 Permit and Section 401 Water Quality Certification, which would help to further address potential impacts on shorelines.

#### Water Markets

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on shorelines.

### 4.18.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Operation of the proposed facilities for this project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from the lakes. The greatest potential for long-term impacts on shorelines could occur as a result of disturbance during maintenance activities or from changes in operations with respect to how lake levels are managed. Because the facilities would be newer and largely operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes, or activities needed to maintain the facilities, are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions. In addition, there would be no new structures that would contribute to increased potential for flooding at the lakes.

However, the project would result in some changes in how lake levels are managed. Lake levels would be drawn down every year instead of rotating one or two lakes per year. Although the lakes would be drawn down more frequently, the high and low lake levels and the general pattern of releases would not change. As noted in Section 3.5, Water Quality, these changes are not expected to result in a significant increase in the potential for erosion that would adversely affect shorelines.

Likewise, the resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. In most years, the main change would be a beneficial increase in flows during the summer months.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

This project would not result in the construction of any new facilities and therefore would not result in long-term impacts on shorelines.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Of the elements proposed as part of this project, the new COIC pump station and intake facilities would have the potential to change instream flow dynamics that could contribute to increased potential for shoreline erosion. In addition, placement of these facilities along the shoreline could contribute to increased flooding. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, the 100-year floodplain includes a fairly narrow area that extends along Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. The floodplain extends further upland from the shoreline in broader valley areas near the Cities of Leavenworth and Wenatchee. The proposed intake and pump station structure would be constructed in and adjacent to the river or creek channel and 100-year floodplain.

Any adverse impacts would be likely minor because compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant long-term impacts, such as ensuring that stream channel morphology and floodplain storage capacity were not adversely affected (Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures) and the flood levels were not impacted. In addition, relocation of the pump station farther downstream would result in increased flows between the point of the old diversion (RM 5.7) and the new location. This would represent a restoration of increased flows along this segment of the creek, which would be beneficial to shorelines.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Increased conservation and re-use associated with the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project is expected to lead to decreased return flows, which could decrease flows in the Wenatchee River downstream of the Leavenworth Wastewater Treatment Plant; however, the long-term effects on stream flow and any associated impacts on shorelines are expected to be negligible.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from Eightmile Lake. The greatest potential for impacts on shorelines over the long term would occur as the result of increased shoreline disturbance during maintenance and any changes in operations with respect to how lake levels are managed.

Because the facilities would be newer and largely operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes, or activities needed to maintain the facilities, are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the Noaction Alternative. However, restoration of the facilities and re-operation of the lake would result in the ability to maintain the lake at higher levels compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative due erosion of the dam over time.

Under existing conditions, the lake fills to a maximum elevation of approximately 4,667 feet because the embankment portion of the dam has deteriorated. After the dam is restored, the lake would be able to fill to the historical high level of 4,671 feet. Under this project, lake levels would be managed to rise beginning in the late fall and would continue

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

to approximately 4,666 feet, which would be the crest elevation of a notch in the proposed dam. The lake would remain at this height until stop logs are placed in the notch early in the summer. Placement of the stop logs would allow the lake level to continue to rise to the spillway elevation of 4,671 feet, equal to the historical full water surface elevation. The lake would stay at this level for less than a month in the early summer, after which time IPID would begin drawing down the lake by releasing water.

The project would also allow for the lake to be drawn down below the existing low lake levels to an elevation of 4,621 feet, which is approximately 22.4 feet below the existing low. These changes would restore the maximum storage available for release from the lake to 2,500 acre-feet, which is the maximum volume permitted for release by IPID's water right and would not result in shoreline impacts because lake levels would be within the range of previously inundated shorelines.

The additional height and draw down are not expected to result in significant increases in erosion because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of several months each year. Potential changes to shoreline vegetation are addressed in Section 4.8, Vegetation.

Likewise, the resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. In most years, the main change would be a beneficial increase in flows during the summer months. As noted in Section 4.7, Fish, during high-flow years, there could also be a potential for this project to result in a reduced contribution by the lakes to peak flows that might otherwise contribute to increased erosion and flooding.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The purpose of this project is to protect and enhance the tribal fishery, which, depending on the specific actions, could result in long-term changes to shorelines that could increase the potential for erosion and flooding; however, these project elements are meant to preserve and enhance stream and riparian habitat, leading to a general improvement in ecosystem quality and functions. Additionally, work within the shoreline would require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant long-term impacts affecting shorelines (Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures). These requirements would be developed once project-specific details were available.

### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The purpose of the Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project is to protect and enhance habitat within the lower Icicle Creek corridor, which could require work within the shoreline. Projects would likely include placement of large woody debris and placement of other materials to enhance habitat and reduce bank and shoreline downcutting and erosion. The purpose of this project is to preserve and enhance stream and riparian habitat and would require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant long-term impacts (Section 4.18.6, Mitigation Measures). These requirements would be developed once project-specific details were available.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

Under the Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project, the Icicle Reserve, established under Chapter 137-545 WAC, would be increased by 0.4 cfs. Over the long term, this amendment would ultimately result in the removal of an additional 0.4 cfs from Icicle Creek only after habitat and flow restoration elements are implemented. Additional water withdrawals could result in reduced instream flows, which could adversely affect the shoreline primarily through impacts on riparian vegetation because there could be less water to support these areas. However, potential impacts on shorelines would be offset by the implementation of required instream flow and habitat restoration actions under this Program Alternative, as well as several other projects associated with Alternative 1.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

The potential long-term adverse impacts on shorelines would occur in areas where new facilities were constructed within the shoreline. Potential adverse impacts would likely be minor because work within the shoreline would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations, including NEPA, which would address the need for mitigation to reduce potential long-term impacts (Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures).

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

Although the details of the Fish Passage Improvements Project are not yet known, it would involve modification potentially affecting the shoreline at three locations on lower Icicle Creek. Depending on the extent of alteration to the shoreline, there could be increased potential for flooding and erosion along the shoreline. Work within the shoreline would require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant long-term impacts affecting shorelines (Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures). These requirements would be developed once project-specific details were available.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

Although the details of the Fish Screen Compliance Project are not yet known, it would involve modification of intake screen facilities potentially affecting the shoreline at three locations on lower Icicle Creek. Depending on the extent of alteration to the shoreline, there could be increased potential for flooding and erosion along the shoreline. Work within the shoreline would require multiple authorizations from local, state, and federal regulatory agencies. Applicable permits issued by these agencies would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant long-term impacts affecting shorelines (Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures). These requirements would be developed once project-specific details were available.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Water Markets

Proposed Water Markets Project elements would result in changes in the water market with the intention of increasing flows in lower Icicle Creek. Any increases would be consistent with the natural flow regime within the system and is not expected to result in significant adverse impacts, although in peak years, increased flows within Icicle Creek could contribute to increased flooding risks.

## 4.18.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would not. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. Impacts associated with other project elements are discussed in Alternative 1.

## 4.18.3.1 Short-term Impacts

### IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

Construction of a new pump station under this project would require work along the shorelines of the Wenatchee River. Such activities could result in many of the same construction-related short-term impacts described above, including the increased potential for erosion. As long as construction activities comply with required permit terms and conditions that would be required as discussed in Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures, potential impacts would not be significant. Specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting.

## 4.18.3.2 Long-term Impacts

### IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would result in new pump exchange and intake facilities constructed along the right bank of the Wenatchee River and, depending on the specific location, could potentially affect shorelines by increasing the potential for shoreline erosion and flooding over the long term.

Any adverse impacts would likely be minor because compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant long-term impacts, such as ensuring that stream channel morphology and floodplain storage capacity are not adversely affected (Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures) and that no increase in flood elevations result from the proposed project.

## 4.18.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 2 with the exception that the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 would be included while the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would not. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project. Impacts associated with other projects are discussed in Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

## 4.18.4.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts with the potential to affect shorelines.

## 4.18.4.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

If the proposed Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project were enacted, there could be potential conflicts with instream flow allocations. Under the proposed changes, junior domestic water rights could be exercised even when the Instream Flow Rule is not met, resulting in potential adverse impacts on riparian vegetation as a result of low-flow conditions. Although these changes would be generally adverse for shorelines, they would not contribute to an increased potential for flooding or erosion.

## 4.18.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1. The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would be replaced with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement project, and the Upper Klonaqua Lake and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would also be included. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with these projects compared to Alternative 1 and the No-action Alternative.

## 4.18.5.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

The Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would involve demolishing the existing dam, installing a new low-level outlet pipeline, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures that would allow for an increase in the accessible storage at Eightmile Lake to 3,500 acre-feet. Construction activities would occur along the banks and within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lake has been drawn down. As a result, the potential for increased erosion and flooding would be low.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

In addition, as noted in Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures, work within and around the lakes would require compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, which would require BMPs to ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

Short-term impacts on shorelines from the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would primarily be associated with construction activities required to provide a low-level outlet from Upper Klonaqua Lake to Lower Klonaqua Lake using one of the three conceptual connection options discussed in the project description in Section 2.8.3, Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement. Construction activity would occur between the lakes and along the banks within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lakes had been drawn down.

In addition, as noted in Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures, work within and around the lakes would require compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, which would require BMPs to ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Short-term impacts on shorelines from the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would be primarily related to construction activities and are similar in type and mechanism to those discussed in Sections 4.8.5.1, Short-term Impacts, Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement and Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement. Construction activities would occur along the banks and within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lake has been drawn down. As a result, the potential for increased erosion and flooding would be low.

In addition, as noted in Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures, work within and around the lakes would require compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, which would require BMPs to ensure that potential impacts would be less than significant.

## 4.18.5.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

Operation of the proposed facilities for the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would involve a more efficient and flexible system for releasing flows from Eightmile Lake. The greatest potential for impacts on shorelines over the long term would occur as the result of permanent conversion of any sensitive areas, disturbance during maintenance, and any changes in operations with respect to how lake levels are managed.

Because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. However, this project would result in the ability to maintain the lake at higher than historical levels compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. Under existing conditions, the maximum fill height of the lake is approximately 4,667 feet because the embankment portion of the dam has deteriorated. After the dam is restored, the lake would be able to fill to a new high water surface of 4,682 feet. Under this project, lake levels would be managed to rise beginning in the late fall and would continue to approximately 4,677 feet to the height of a notch in the proposed dam. The lake would remain at this height until stop logs are placed in the notch in the early summer. Placement of the stop logs would allow the lake level to continue to rise to the spillway elevation of 4,682 feet. The lake would stay at this level for less than a month in the early summer, after which time IPID would begin drawing down the lake by releasing water. These changes would increase the accessible storage to 3,500 acre-feet, which is 1,000 acre-feet more than currently permitted by IPID's water right.

Compared with existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, this means that an additional area of shoreline would be under water. Shoreline areas up to 4,671 feet have been historically inundated, but areas above 4,671 feet to 4,682 feet have not been inundated. The additional area would be under water for a little less than a month each summer. This change in lake levels could result in some changes to the vegetative community along the shoreline. The proposed project would inundate approximately 13.6 acres that are not currently inundated, which would not represent a substantial loss but rather a change in the mix of shoreline vegetation.

The project would also allow for the lake to be drawn down below existing lake levels to an elevation of 4,619 feet, which is approximately 24.4 feet lower than the existing low. This change would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed, mainly in the later summer months and early fall up to the point when the water would no longer be drawn down, generally around the end of September. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect shorelines by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity

Likewise, the resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. In most years, the main change would be a beneficial increase in flows during the summer months.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

Under the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project, potential long-term impacts to shorelines would be similar to those described under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (Section 4.18.5.2, Long-term Impacts). Potential benefits would mainly occur in Icicle Creek and would include an increased ability to augment stream flow in the late summer or during drought years, with flow augmentation primarily benefitting the section of Icicle Creek between Upper Klonaqua Lake and the IPID diversion.

The frequency in fluctuations in lake levels in Upper Klonaqua Lake would increase compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. Lake levels would also be drawn down further compared to existing conditions.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The new high lake level in Upper Klonaqua Lake would not change. The lake would still refill and outlet naturally through an existing channel to Lower Klonaqua Lake during most of the year. However, the new facilities would allow for the lake to be drawn down an additional 20 feet to allow for access to an additional 1,146 acre-feet of storage. The draw down would likely occur over a couple of months in the late summer. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect shorelines by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity.

Modifications at Upper Klonaqua Lake would also result in the ability to release up to an additional 5 to 20 cfs from the lake. Increased flows would be released from the dam into a downstream tributary, which flows into Icicle Creek. Increased flows would occur from the point of release at Klonaqua Dam down to the IPID diversion at RM 5.7.

The resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. In most years, the main change would be a beneficial increase in flows during the summer months.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Potential long-term impacts to shorelines under the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would be similar to those described under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project (Section 4.8.5.2, Long-term Impacts). Potential benefits would mainly occur in Icicle Creek and would include an increased ability to augment stream flow in the late summer or during drought years, with flow augmentation primarily benefitting the section of Icicle Creek between lower Snow Lake and the IPID diversion.

The proposed enhancement project would increase the high-water storage levels in both Upper and Lower Snow Lakes by 5 feet compared with existing high levels. This change would result in the inundation of some upland vegetation that has grown along the shoreline areas between the current and proposed high lake levels, most likely occurring in the fall through the early summer when releases would be likely to begin. This could result in some changes to the vegetative community along the shoreline.

The project would also allow for the Lower Snow Lake to be drawn down 3 feet below the current lake level, which would result in the exposure of slightly more lake bed. The additional draw down is not expected to adversely affect the shorelines by comparison, particularly because draw down of the lake would occur over a period of a couple of months and would not result in substantial increases in turbidity.

The resulting downstream changes in flows in Icicle Creek would be within the natural variation already occurring within the system. In most years, the main change would be a beneficial increase in flows during the summer months.

## 4.18.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of the same projects as Alternative 1 except instead of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies, the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project would be included.

### 4.18.6.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project**

Construction of three new pump stations under this project would require work along the shorelines of the Wenatchee River. Removal of existing diversion facilities would also require work along Icicle and Peshastin Creeks. Ground disturbance would occur along the entire existing IPID delivery system as the canal system is replaced with a pressurized pipeline. Such activities could result in many of the same construction-related short-term impacts described above, including the increased potential for erosion. As long as construction activities comply with required permit terms and conditions that would be required as discussed in Section 4.18.7, Mitigation Measures, potential impacts would not be significant. Specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting. Therefore, short-term impacts on shorelines from construction work are expected to be less than significant.

### 4.18.6.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project**

The IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would result in new pump stations and intake facilities at three locations on the Wenatchee River. Depending on the specific location, these new facilities could potentially affect shorelines by increasing the potential for shoreline erosion and flooding over the long term.

Any adverse impacts would likely be minor because compliance with applicable local, state, and federal permits or approvals would require appropriate mitigation measures to reduce any potentially significant long-term impacts, such as ensuring that stream channel morphology and floodplain storage capacity are not adversely affected (Section 4.18.7 Mitigation Measures) and that no increase in flood elevations result from the proposed project.

As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, the 100-year floodplain includes a fairly narrow area that extends along Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. The floodplain extends further upland from the shoreline in broader valley areas near the Cities of Leavenworth and Wenatchee. The proposed intake and pump station structures would be constructed in and adjacent to the river or creek channel and 100-year floodplain.

## 4.18.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

## 4.18.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Short-term impacts on shorelines related to increasing the potential for shoreline erosion would be mitigated by complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal regulations and project-specific permits and approvals, including local building, grading, and stormwater construction permits; state stormwater permits; Shoreline Management Act shoreline permits; HPAs; and CWA Section 404 permits and their associated Section 401 Water Quality Certifications, among others. Common permit conditions are likely to include conducting work in a manner to minimize potential disturbance of sensitive shoreline vegetation communities, minimizing soil disturbance, and implementing BMPs to control and minimize erosion.

Specific mitigation measures would be developed as part of future project-level review and permitting. In addition to those measures identified in Sections 4.5.7, Water Quality, and Section 4.8.7, Vegetation, implementation of the following measures would ensure impacts would be less than significant.

- Where project elements may be permanently located in or substantially alter the floodplain, conduct a study to assess the potential for the project activities to adversely affect floodplain storage capacity and flood levels.
- Where project elements may be permanently located in the stream channel, ensure that the project is designed in a manner that does not result in long-term changes in sediment transport of the affected water way.

## 4.18.7.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts on shorelines would be mitigated by complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal regulations and project-specific permits and approvals, as described above.

# 4.19 Utilities

The primary utility types to be impacted by the alternatives discussed in this document are related to municipal water service and irrigation districts. Short-term impacts would be reductions or disturbances in service related to project construction. Impacts are considered minor if the impact is short or can be scheduled to minimize impacts. Longterm impacts are related to increased demand on a utility. Impacts are considered minor if the increases would not affect regional supplies.
In addition to water utilities, potential impacts on power utilities are discussed.

## 4.19.1 No-action Alternative

## 4.19.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various agencies and other entities would continue to undertake individual actions to restore and enhance fish and aquatic resources in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area, but those actions would not be part of a coordinated program implemented with the support of the IWG. Actions implemented by individual agencies and entities could include construction of diversion improvements, irrigation system upgrades, LNFH improvements, and fish passage work.

Implementing projects under the No-action Alternative could result in some construction impacts to water service. However, coordination and timing should limit any such impacts. No other construction related impacts to utilities are anticipated.

## 4.19.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts on utilities from implementing the No-action Alterative would relate to increased power consumption.

Increased power use would likely be associated with any project that increases pressurized water pumping versus historical gravity flow, such as the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange, IPID Dryden or Full Pump Exchange project, and the groundwater augmentation portion of the LNFH improvements. These increases in power use would not affect regional power supplies.

## 4.19.2 Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, short-term effects to utilities include potential impacts to water service by the City of Leavenworth and irrigation districts. Preventative steps such as construction on Alpine Lakes projects occurring during normal or high water years and coordinating construction projects with water purveyors would minimize potential effects. Long-term impacts to utilities include increased water service and power consumption. Increased power consumption is not expected to affect regional power supplies and is considered insignificant.

## 4.19.2.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Construction for this project would require the Alpine Lakes to be drawn down prior to construction. To avoid service disruptions to IPID, which relies on the water stored in these lakes to provide irrigation water to their district in drought years, construction would have to be scheduled for a normal or above average water year.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Under the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project, construction activities would likely include piping or lining canals and on-farm irrigation efficiency upgrades. These construction activities would occur outside the irrigation season, and water service disruptions would be unlikely. There are no anticipated impacts on other utility types.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

The COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project would include a point of diversion change and pressurized piping of the current canal and lateral system. Construction activities would occur outside the irrigation season, and there are no anticipated water service disruptions. No other service disruptions are anticipated under this project.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Construction activities under the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project would include replacing mainlines and installing new meters. Other aspects of this project are more administrative in nature. Some service disruption could occur as a result of mainline replacements. However, this would be of short duration and would be coordinated with water users to minimize the impact.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Construction of the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would require Eightmile Lake to be drawn down. To avoid service disruptions to IPID, which relies on the water stored in this lake to provide irrigation water to their district in drought years, construction would have to be scheduled for a normal or above average water year.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

Any construction activities associated with this project are not expected to have impacts on utility service.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

Any construction activities associated with this project are not expected to have impacts on utility service.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

This is an administrative action with no construction component. No short-term impacts to utilities are anticipated.

# Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

One aspect of the LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements Project involves rehabilitating the LNFH intake structure. If COIC is still sharing a point of diversion with LFNH when construction occurs, it could impact COIC delivery. To minimize any impacts, construction activities would be coordinated with COIC if they are still sharing a point of diversion at the time of construction. No other short-term utility impacts are anticipated.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

Construction activities related to fish passage are generally not expected to impact water service delivery or any other utility. However, construction activities at the Boulder Field have the potential to impact both the City of Leavenworth and IPID's diversion given their proximity to the Boulder Field. Construction activities related to passage at the Boulder Field would need to be coordinated with both entities to minimize any impacts and disruption to their service.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

Fish Screen installation would have to be coordinated with the City of Leavenworth, IPID, LNFH, and COIC to ensure no impact on water service. No other short-term utility impacts are anticipated.

#### Water Markets

This is an administrative action with no construction component. No short-term impacts to utilities are anticipated.

## 4.19.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

The Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would provide water for instream flow benefit when the district generally does not need to use the water stored in the Alpine Lakes (non-drought years). Because the water would still be available to IPID when they need it, there are no anticipated long-term effects to water service.

Power for automation would be provided by a small solar panel. There are no anticipated impacts to electrical utilities.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Lining and piping portions of the IPID canal is not anticipated to have any impacts to water delivery by the district.

Because the system would continue to be gravity fed, there are no anticipated impacts to electrical utilities.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Piping the COIC canal and laterals and changing the point of diversion is not anticipated to impact water delivery by the district.

Using a pump station on the Wenatchee River or Icicle Creek would lead to increased power consumption. However, this increase in electrical use is expected to be relatively small and would not affect regional power supplies.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Water service is not expected to be significantly impacted by this project.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Under the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project, water made available through domestic conservation efforts would go to new domestic users. This would allow increased water service in the City of Leavenworth and potentially for other small water purveyors that provide water to rural domestic water users.

Impacts on electrical use are expected to be neutral.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would make additional water available to the City of Leavenworth and rural domestic water users. This would allow increased water service in the City of Leavenworth and potentially for other small water purveyors that provide water to rural domestic water users.

If the City of Leavenworth takes any additional water from their Icicle Creek diversion, the impact on electrical use is expected to be minimal. However, if the City of Leavenworth takes any additional water made available from this project from their Wenatchee River well field then power consumption would increase. This increased power demand would likely be provided by Chelan PUD and would not affect regional power supplies.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

This project is not expected to have long-term impacts on water service or power utilities.

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

This project is not expected to have long-term impacts on water service or power utilities.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

The Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project would provide additional water for rural domestic use within the Icicle Creek Subbasin. This would allow increased water service from small water purveyors that provide water to rural domestic water users. Additionally, it would make more water available for small domestic groundwater users.

Power consumption would likely increase because of increased groundwater use. However, this increased electrical use is expected to be relatively small and would not affect regional power supplies.

# Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

The LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements Project is not anticipated to have long-term impacts on water service within the Icicle project area.

It is currently unknown what impact this project would have on power consumption, although with increased reliance on groundwater sources and the use of circular tanks, power use would likely increase. However, this increase in electrical use is expected to be relatively small and may be partially offset by reduction in the use of chillers for egg temperature control. Impacts would be less than significant and would not affect regional power supplies.

#### Fish Passage Improvements

Fish passage projects are not anticipated to have any impact on water service or electrical utilities.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project is not anticipated to have any impact on water service or electrical utilities.

#### Water Markets

The Water Markets Project is not anticipated to have any impact on water service or electrical utilities.

## 4.19.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 contains many of the same project elements as Alternative 1, with the addition of the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project and the removal of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project. This section describes the shortand long-term impacts of the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. All other project impacts are described under Alternative 1.

## 4.19.3.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project proposes to pump water from the Wenatchee River rather than from Icicle Creek. Construction activities are not expected to impact utility service or have any other short-term impacts to utilities.

## 4.19.3.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

IPID's point of diversion on Icicle Creek is gravity fed and requires no electricity to operate. Using a pump station on the Wenatchee River to reduce use on Icicle Creek would lead to increased power consumption. However, this increase in electrical use is expected to not affect regional power supplies.

Water service is not expected to be significantly impacted by this project.

## 4.19.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 contains many of the same project elements as Alternative 2, with the addition of the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project and the removal of the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project. This section describes the short- and long-term impacts of the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Alternative 3 Project. All other project impacts are described under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

### 4.19.4.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

The Legislative Change to OCPI Project is an administrative action without a construction component. There are no anticipated short-term impacts to utilities resulting from this project.

## 4.19.4.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

Under this project, domestic water use could increase. This would allow increased water service from the City of Leavenworth and small water purveyors that provide water to rural domestic water users.

Power consumption would likely increase because of increased pumping associated with increased water use. However, this increased electrical use is expected to be relatively small and would not affect regional power supplies.

## 4.19.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 contains many of the same project elements as Alternative 1, except that the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would replace the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project, and the Upper Klonaqua Lake and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would be added. This section describes the short- and long-term impacts of those additional projects. All other project impacts are described under Alternative 1.

## 4.19.5.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

Construction of the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would require Eightmile Lake to be drawn down. To avoid service disruptions to IPID, which relies on the water stored in this lake to provide irrigation water to their district in drought years, construction would have to be scheduled for a normal or above average water year.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

Construction of the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would involve construction at Upper Klonaqua Lake, which is currently not managed for IPID water delivery. There are no expected short-term impacts to water service or other utility use.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Construction of Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would require Upper Snow and Lower Snow Lakes to be drawn down. IPID relies on water stored in these lakes to provide irrigation water during drought years only. USFWS relies on storage to sustain water supply to the hatchery every year, but the need is greater during dry years. To avoid service disruptions to IPID and the USFWS, construction would have to be scheduled for a normal or above average water year.

## 4.19.5.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

The Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would make additional water available to the City of Leavenworth and rural domestic water users. The impacts to utilities are similar to the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project (4.19.2.2, Long-term Impacts). This project would allow increased water service in the City of Leavenworth and potentially for other small water purveyors that provide water to rural domestic water users.

If the City of Leavenworth takes any additional water from their Icicle Creek diversion, the impact on electrical use is expected to be minimal. However, if the City of Leavenworth takes any additional water made available from this project from their Wenatchee River well field, the anticipated increase in power demand is not expected to not affect regional power supplies.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would primarily benefit instream flows. Some water might be made available to the City of Leavenworth and rural domestic water users. This would allow increased water service in the City of Leavenworth and potentially for other small water purveyors that provide water to rural domestic water users.

If the City of Leavenworth takes any additional water from their Icicle Creek diversion, the impact on electrical use is expected to be minimal. However, if the City of Leavenworth takes any additional water made available from this project from their Wenatchee River well field, increase in power demand is expected. This increased demand would not affect regional power supplies.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

The Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would primarily benefit instream flows. Some water might be made available to the City of Leavenworth and rural domestic water users. This would allow increased water service in the City of Leavenworth and potentially for other small water purveyors that provide water to rural domestic water users.

If the City of Leavenworth takes any additional water from their Icicle Creek diversion, the impact on electrical use is expected to be minimal. However, if the City of Leavenworth takes any additional water made available from this project from their Wenatchee River well field, increase in power demand is expected. This increased demand would not affect regional power supplies.

## 4.19.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 contains many of the same project elements as Alternative 1, with the addition of the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project and the removal of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project. This section describes the short- and long-term impacts of the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. All other project impacts are described under Alternative 1.

## 4.19.6.1 Short-term Impacts

### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

The IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project proposes to pipe the entire IPID system and pump water from the Wenatchee River rather than from Icicle and Peshastin Creek. Construction activities are not expected to impact water or utility service or have any other short-term impacts to utilities.

## 4.19.6.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

IPID's point of diversion on Icicle Creek is gravity fed and requires no electricity to operate. Using pump stations on the Wenatchee River to replace use from Icicle Creek would lead to increased power consumption, likely provided by Chelan PUD. At this point in project planning, the exact impacts have not been fully analyzed, however power consumption is not anticipated to affect regional power supplies and is therefore not viewed as a significant effect.

Water service is not expected to be significantly impacted by this project.

## 4.19.7 Mitigation Measures

This section discusses mitigation measures to address impacts identified and discussed above.

## 4.19.7.1 Short-term Impacts

The primary short-term impact identified above is potential disruptions of water service by the City of Leavenworth or irrigation districts. Coordinating the timing of construction work should mitigate many of these potential impacts.

## 4.19.7.2 Long-term Impacts

Long-term impacts identified in this section include improved water service and increased power consumption. The increased power consumption is not anticipated to affect regional power supplies and is therefore not viewed as a significant effect. Improved water service is also not considered a significant effect.

## 4.20 Transportation

This section discusses the short- and long-term impacts of the alternatives on transportation. Anticipated short-term impacts are related to construction activities and include the movement of heavy equipment to and from the project sites as well as commutes by workers during construction. Long-term impacts relate primarily to maintenance trips from project operation. Many of the project elements are located at already existing infrastructure. For already existing infrastructure in the ALWA, the number of maintenance trips is expected to decline. For new infrastructure, such as the IPID pump station, maintenance trips would increase.

## 4.20.1 No-action Alternative

## 4.20.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various agencies and other entities would continue to undertake individual actions to restore and enhance fish and aquatic resources in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area, but those actions would not be part of a coordinated program implemented with the support of the IWG. Actions implemented by individual agencies and entities could include construction of diversion improvements, irrigation system upgrades, LNFH improvements, and fish passage work.

The No-Action Alternative would likely result in construction activities in lower Icicle Creek and near the confluence of Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River. Transporting equipment to project sites would likely impact traffic flow on Icicle Road and Highway 2. Additionally, commutes from construction workers would increase traffic on these roads. No roadways would be closed and standard safety procedures would be followed for transport of heavy equipment to the project sites.

## 4.20.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Transportation is expected to be relatively unchanged under the No-action Alternative. IPID would continue flying or hiking into their lake sites several times per season for maintenance and inspection activities, and points of diversions and water conveyance structures on lower Icicle Creek would undergo a similar level of maintenance and inspection as they currently do. There would likely be no new projects implemented that would require additional trips for monitoring or maintenance.

## 4.20.2 Alternative 1

Under Alternative 1, short-term impacts to transportation include increased traffic or traffic slowdowns resulting from the transportation of heavy equipment and workers to construction sites, and increased air support and foot traffic to construction sites within the ALWA. Long-term impacts to transportation are considered insignificant. They include a potential slight increase in maintenance trips to some project sites and decreased maintenance trips to the Alpine Lakes.

## 4.20.2.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Construction of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would require the use of hand and power tools, which would either be packed in via trails or flown in by helicopter. Workers would have to either hike in or be flown in as well. This would create a temporary increase in foot and air traffic to the Alpine Lakes sites. The USFS Environmental Assessment found the use of helicopter transport to support IPID maintenance activities to be acceptable (USFS, 1981). However, this increase could disrupt wilderness use as discussed in Section 4.17, Wilderness. To minimize impacts to wilderness uses of increased air and foot traffic, construction activities could occur in fall after the peak backpacking season, and construction notices would be posted so users would be aware of potential impacts.

### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Under the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project, construction activities, such as canal lining and piping, would impact transportation by increasing traffic from construction worker commuter trips and slowing traffic from heavy equipment transport. No roadway closures are anticipated and standard safety procedures would be followed for transport of heavy equipment.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Under the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange and Pump Exchange Project, construction activities, such as system piping and building a pump station, would impact transportation by increasing traffic from construction worker commuter trips and slowing traffic from heavy equipment transport. Road access may temporarily be limited to single lane closures and would include consultation with local public utilities and transportation authorities in accordance with state and local laws.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Construction activities, such as mainline replacement and meter installation, would impact transportation by increasing traffic from construction worker commuter trips and slowing traffic from heavy equipment transport. Standard safety procedures would be followed for transport of heavy equipment. Road access may temporarily be limited and would include consultation with local public utilities and transportation authorities in accordance with state and local laws.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Construction of the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would require the use of hand and power tools, which would either be packed in via trails or flown in by helicopter, and the use of heavy equipment, which would likely have to be flown in or walked up National Forest Road 7601 and overland adjacent to the Eightmile Lake Trail. Workers would likely have to hike in to the site or be flown in by helicopter, with support equipment being flown or packed in. This would create a temporary increase in foot and air traffic to the lake site. The USFS Environmental Assessment found the use of helicopter transport to support IPID maintenance activities to be acceptable (USFS, 1981). However, this increase could disrupt wilderness use as discussed in Section 4.17, Wilderness. To minimize impacts to wilderness uses, construction activities may occur in fall after the peak backpacking season, and construction notices would be posted so users would be aware of potential impacts.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

Some minor construction activities could be associated with this project. Any transportation of heavy equipment or increased construction worker commuter traffic could increase or slow traffic. No roadway closures are anticipated and standard safety procedures would be followed for transport of heavy equipment.

#### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

Construction activities associated with the Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project would include grading, vegetation planting and removal, and placement of logs and rocks in riparian areas. Impacts to transportation would include increased traffic from construction worker commuter trips and slowed traffic from heavy equipment transport. No roadway closures are anticipated and standard safety procedures would be followed for transport of heavy equipment.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

The Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project is an administrative action with no construction component. No short-term impacts to transportation are anticipated.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

Construction activities associated with the LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements Project would include well drilling, installing circular tanks, installation of a pump at the hatchery outfall, and rehabilitating the intake structure. Impacts to transportation would include increased traffic from construction worker commuter trips and slowed traffic from heavy equipment transport. No roadway closures are anticipated and standard safety procedures would be followed for transport of heavy equipment.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

Construction activities associated with the Fish Passage Improvements Project include modifying or removing passage barriers. Impacts to transportation would include increased traffic from construction worker commuter trips and slowed traffic from heavy equipment transport. No roadway closures are anticipated and standard safety procedures would be followed for transport of heavy equipment.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

Construction activities associated with the Fish Screen Compliance Project involve replacing/installing fish screens at major diversions. Impacts to transportation would include increased traffic from construction worker commuter trips and slowed traffic

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

from heavy equipment transport. No roadway closures are anticipated and standard safety procedures would be followed for transport of heavy equipment.

#### Water Markets

The Water Markets Project has no construction component and therefore no short-term impacts to transportation are anticipated.

#### 4.20.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

The Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would result in fewer operational trips to the lake sites. Releases from the lakes would be automated, and trips to adjust gates throughout the season would not be required. There would still be occasional maintenance and inspection trips to the lake sites to ensure equipment and dams are in good repair.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

There are no significant long-term impacts to transportation associated with the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project. Routine inspection and maintenance trips would be required but would not be more frequent than current trips required to maintain the existing infrastructure.

#### **COID Irrigation Efficiencies**

There are no significant long-term impacts to transportation associated with the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange and Pump Exchange Project. Routine inspection and maintenance trips would be required but would not be more frequent than current trips required to maintain the existing infrastructure.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

There are no significant long-term impacts to transportation associated with the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project. Routine inspection and maintenance already occur on this infrastructure.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

There are no significant long-term impacts to transportation associated with the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project. Routine inspection and maintenance already occur on this infrastructure.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

This project is not expected to impact the use of transportation infrastructure in the long-term.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

Under the Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project, some routine maintenance or inspection of plantings, logjams, and other improvements could be required. However, this is not expected to significantly impact traffic or transportation.

#### Instream Flow Rule Amendment

Amendment of the Instream Flow Rule is not expected to increase the use of transportation infrastructure.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

There are no significant long-term impacts to transportation associated with the LNFH Conservation and Water Quantity Improvements Project. Routine inspection and maintenance already occur on LNFH's operational infrastructure.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

Under the Fish Passage Improvements Project, some routine maintenance or inspection of infrastructure may be required. However, this is not expected to significantly impact traffic or transportation.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

There are no significant long-term impacts to transportation associated with the Fish Screen Compliance Project. Routine inspection and maintenance already occur at the major diverters points of diversion.

#### Water Markets

The implementation of the Icicle Water Market Project is not expected to increase the use of transportation infrastructure in the long term.

## 4.20.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 contains many of the same project elements as Alternative 1, with the addition of the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project and the removal of the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project. This section describes the shortand long-term impacts of the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. All other project impacts are described under Alternative 1.

## 4.20.3.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

Construction activities, such as canal piping and building a pump station, would impact transportation by increasing traffic from construction worker commuter trips and slowing traffic from heavy equipment transport. Standard safety procedures would be followed for transport of heavy equipment. Road access may temporarily be limited and would include consultation with local public utilities and transportation authorities in accordance with state and local laws.

## 4.20.3.2 Long-term Impacts

## IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

Under the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project, some routine maintenance or inspection of infrastructure could be required. However, this is not expected to significantly impact traffic or transportation.

## 4.20.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 contains many of the same project elements as Alternative 2, with the addition of the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project and the removal of the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project. This section describes the short- and long-term impacts of the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3. All other project impacts are described under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

## 4.20.4.1 Short-term Impacts

### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

The Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project is an administrative action without a construction component. There are no anticipated short-term impacts to transportation resulting from this project.

## 4.20.4.2 Long-term Impacts

## Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

It is not anticipated that long-term impacts to transportation would result from the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3.

## 4.20.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 contains many of the same project elements as Alternative 1, except for the removal of the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project and the addition of the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project, Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enchantment Project, and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project. This section describes the short- and long-term impacts of those additional projects. All other project impacts are described under Alternative 1.

## 4.20.5.1 Short-term Impacts

## Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

Construction of the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would require the use of hand and power tools, which would either be packed in via trails or flown in by helicopter, and the use of heavy equipment, which would likely have to be flown in via helicopter or be walked up National Forest Road 7601 and overland adjacent to the Eightmile Lake Trail. Workers would likely have to hike in to the site, with support equipment being flown or packed in. This would create a temporary increase in foot and air traffic to the lake site. The USFS Environmental Assessment found the use of helicopter transport to support IPID maintenance activities to be acceptable (USFS, 1981). However, this increase could disrupt wilderness use as discussed in Section 4.17, Wilderness. To minimize impacts to wilderness uses construction activities could occur in fall after the peak backpacking season, and notices would be posted so users would be aware of potential impacts.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

Construction of the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would require the use of hand and power tools, which would either be packed in via trails or flown in by helicopter, and potentially the use of heavy equipment, which would likely be walked up National Forest Road 7600 and trails. Workers would have to hike in or fly into the site, with support equipment being flown or packed in. This would create a temporary increase in foot and air traffic to the lake site. The USFS Environmental Assessment found the use of helicopter transport to support IPID maintenance activities to be acceptable (USFS, 1981). However, this increase could disrupt wilderness use as discussed in Section 4.17, Wilderness. To minimize impacts to wilderness uses, construction activities could occur in fall after the peak backpacking season, and notices would be posted so users would be aware of potential impacts.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Construction of the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project would require the use of hand and power tools, which would either be packed in via trails or flown in by helicopter, and potentially the use of heavy equipment, which would likely be walked up Icicle Road and the Snow Lakes Trail. Workers would likely have to hike in to the site, with support equipment being flown or packed in. This would create a temporary increase in foot and air traffic to the lakes site. The USFS Environmental Assessment found the use of helicopter transport to support IPID maintenance activities to be acceptable (USFS, 1981). However, this increase could disrupt wilderness use as discussed in Section 4.17, Wilderness. To minimize impacts to wilderness uses, construction activities could occur in fall after the peak backpacking season, and notices would be posted so users would be aware of potential impacts.

## 4.20.5.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

There are no significant long-term impacts to transportation associated with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project. Routine inspection and maintenance already occur on this infrastructure.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would require maintenance and inspection trips to Upper Klonaqua Lake, which do not currently occur. These trips could be coordinated with inspection and maintenance trips to lower Klonaqua Lake that currently occur.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

There are no significant long-term impacts to transportation associated with the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project. Routine inspection and maintenance already occur on this infrastructure.

## 4.20.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 contains many of the same project elements as Alternative 1, with the addition of the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would replace the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project. This section describes the short- and long-term impacts of the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project. All other project impacts are described under Alternative 1.

## 4.20.6.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

Construction activities, such as canal piping and building a pump station, would impact transportation by increasing traffic from construction worker commuter trips and slowing traffic from heavy equipment transport. Standard safety procedures would be followed for transport of heavy equipment. Road access may temporarily be limited and would include consultation with local public utilities and transportation authorities in accordance with state and local laws.

## 4.20.6.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

Under the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project, some routine maintenance or inspection of infrastructure could be required. However, this is not expected to significantly impact traffic or transportation.

## 4.20.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes mitigation measures to reduce short-term and long-term impacts identified throughout Section 4.20.

## 4.20.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Mitigation measures to reduce construction-related impacts on transportation would include using flaggers and signage and providing detour routes where possible and appropriate. Private access to properties would be maintained during construction activities. Advanced notice would be provided to wilderness users to minimize impacts of transportation on those users.

## 4.20.7.2 Long-term Impacts

For most of the alternatives, there would be no significant long-term impacts on transportation and no mitigation would be necessary. The Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project under Alternative 4 would require inspection and maintenance trips in the Wilderness Area that do not currently occur. The impact of these inspection and maintenance trips would be reduced by coordinating them with trips that already occur to Lower Klonaqua Lake.

## 4.21 Cultural Resources (Archaeological, Ethnographic, and Historic Sites of Significance)

This section describes the potential short- and long-term impacts that could affect the resources identified in Section 3.21, Cultural Resources, from construction and operation related to the No-action Alternative and Program Alternatives.

## 4.21.1 No-action Alternative

## 4.21.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various entities and agencies would undertake individual actions that could result in short-term impacts on cultural resources in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area. This is anticipated to entail construction of water diversion modifications, general habitat enhancement projects, LNFH improvements, required fish screening upgrades, modernization of infrastructure at the Alpine Lakes including the restoration of the Eightmile Lake Dam, and improvements to existing irrigation systems to support agricultural reliability. Short-term impacts would generally be associated with projects that require construction. Although impacts would occur as the result of construction, they would not be permanent. Cultural resources would be adversely affected if any of these activities disturbed or damaged archaeological sites, historic structures, or other important cultural properties.

Ground-disturbing activities can potentially damage archaeological resources that may be otherwise hidden below ground. Construction activities can alter or damage historic structures, such as buildings, to an extent that the culturally important features are compromised. Cultural properties may also include areas where activities have occurred or are occurring that contribute to the cultural identity of a group of people or that are a significant part of a unique historic event. Depending on the nature and extent of the construction activities, it is also possible to disrupt or damage the important features of cultural properties. Sites that are sacred to Indian tribes are addressed in Section 4.22, Indian Sacred Sites.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Although projects have the potential to affect cultural resources, various local, state, and federal laws and regulations protect sensitive cultural resources as described in Section 1.9, Related Permits, Actions, and Laws. Prior to construction, federal agencies taking actions on the projects would be required to ensure compliance with these regulations. Projects involving state capital funding would be required to comply with Governor's Executive Order 05-05, which requires consultation with DAHP, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and potentially affected Indian tribes as part of the decision to provide funds.

Compliance could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts, such as conducting site-specific surveys and evaluations, minimizing ground-disturbing activities, stopping work if previously unknown cultural resources are uncovered, and compensating for any impacts that cannot be avoided (Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures). Therefore, short-term impacts under the No-action Alternative are not expected to be significant.

## 4.21.1.2 Long-term Impacts

As discussed above, any impacts with the potential to result in lasting damage to cultural resources would be addressed prior to construction. For the most part, the No-action Alternative is not expected to result in any additional changes that would adversely affect cultural resources. Operational and maintenance activities, particularly those that would result in any ground disturbance or additional modifications to sensitive resources could have a limited potential to result in cultural resources impacts. However, this chance would be low given that the activities would be affecting areas already evaluated as described above. Potential long-term impacts on sites sacred to Indian tribes are addressed in Section 4.22, Indian Sacred Sites.

## 4.21.2 Alternative 1

Implementation of Alternative 1 has the potential to result in both increased adverse and beneficial impacts to cultural resources compared with the No-action Alternative because there would be greater likelihood that multiple projects would be implemented and the scale of certain efforts would likely be greater. The following sections describe the short-and long-term impacts that would occur under Alternative 1.

## 4.21.2.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Under the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project, most of the work would occur in upland areas. Some limited work would occur within the lake shorelines but within the dry when the lakes are drawn down at the end of the summer. As discussed in Section 3.21, Cultural Resources, pedestrian surveys at Eightmile, Square, Klonaqua, and Colchuck Lakes revealed no archaeological sites along the passable section of the shoreline. The remainder of the area is too steep to traverse and unlikely to contain archaeological materials. The majority of workers and equipment could be flown in, but IPID could also walk in some equipment via the Eightmile Lake Trail. No cultural resources were observed along the existing width of the trail that would be affected by this activity.

As discussed in Section 3.21, Cultural Resources, four of the five dams where construction activities are proposed are considered potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. Eligibility is recommended because the facilities are associated with historically significant and controversial water management infrastructure in Chelan County. The facilities are unique in style and influenced by the extremely difficult terrain and constraints of mid-century construction methods, and they have the potential to yield data about early twentieth century engineering and construction.

Proposed construction activities at these lakes include mounting actuators on headgates where possible to remotely control operation. At some of the lakes, this could involve renovating or replacing some of the surrounding infrastructure, such as gates or pipes leading to and from the headgate, headwall, or housing. Electronic equipment would be powered by solar panel-charged batteries. These activities would occur at Eightmile, Square, Colchuck, Klonaqua, and Upper Snow/Nada Lakes.

If these activities altered any of the existing features such that the criteria listed above were no longer met, there would be a potential for a significant impact on these resources. More specifically, significant impacts could occur if any of the visible, historic components, such as the masonry dams, concrete headwalls, or headgate cranks, were removed or altered. These impacts could potentially be avoided, minimized, or mitigated by installing replacement structures that are consistent with historic components and by installing equipment on historic components. Replacing in the same location infrastructure that is not visible and is of unknown age, such as pipes running from headgates to release channels, would not significantly alter the structures and would therefore avoid potentially significant adverse impacts.

Impacts could also occur if equipment were placed on historic components in a manner that diminishes their integrity. These impacts could potentially be avoided, minimized, or mitigated by implementing mitigation measures. These could include placing removable equipment that does not damage the structures, provided the equipment is not visible (for example, inside an existing vault) or is designed to blend in with the existing structure, or placing equipment in the vicinity but not on the structures (for example, a solar panel in a nearby tree).

Activities at these lakes would require an inadvertent discovery plan and compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources as described in Section 4.21.6, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Construction activities associated with this project include the conversion of irrigation canals to pipelines and lining of irrigation canals with concrete. Work within already disturbed areas, such as existing irrigation canals, is not likely to encounter archaeological resources.

These activities would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources, as described in Section 4.21.6, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Construction activities associated with the COIC Efficiencies Project would result in short-term impacts similar to those described above with the exception of a new COIC pump station to be constructed along the shoreline of Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River. Based on the analysis summarized in Section 3.21, Cultural Resources, there is a moderate to high potential for construction of the COIC pump station to encounter cultural resources along Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River.

These activities would require an inadvertent discovery plan (IDP) and compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources, as described in Section 4.21.6, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Certain components of the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project, such as evaluating conservation-oriented rate structures and expanding conservation education, xeriscape, and rebate programs, would not result in any construction activities. Other activities, such as replacing leaky water mains and residential meters, could result in some minor construction activities, including the potential for ground disturbance. However, any ground work would occur in areas that were previously disturbed during construction of the initial plumbing and pipework. Therefore, the potential for any impacts on cultural resources would be low.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project involves demolishing the existing dam, installing a new low-level outlet pipeline, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures to restore the maximum water storage level in the lake to an elevation of 4,671 feet and restore the accessible storage in the lake to the volume permitted by

## CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

IPID's water right (2,500 acre-feet). While most construction equipment (potentially including a small tracked excavator) and materials would likely be flown into the project site via helicopter, IPID is considering the option of walking in a larger tracked excavator or a spider excavator.

As noted previously, the water release system at Eightmile Lake is recommended for listing in the NRHP based on the criteria listed in Section 4.21.2.1, Short-term Impacts, Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation. No cultural resources were observed along the margins of the lake or within the existing width of the trail to the project site.

Construction activity would occur along the banks and within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lake has been drawn down. Construction would involve making improvements to and/or replacing failing infrastructure, including replacing the low-level outlet pipeline and possibly extending it further downstream, replacing the damaged headgate, and replacing the rock masonry, concrete, and embankment dam structure with a new concrete and embankment dam structure.

If improvements and additions are constructed in materials that are similar to the historically used materials, the potential impacts on cultural resources would likely be low. Because the project would completely replace much of the water release system, the potential impacts would likely be significant.

These activities would require an inadvertent discovery plan and compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources, as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The focus of this project is to ensure that there would be no adverse effects on tribal fishing as a result of implementing other projects as part of the overall Icicle Strategy. The specifics of this project are not yet determined but would involve elements of restoration along the lower Icicle Creek that could result in localized construction-related ground disturbance. At this stage, the primary options under consideration include the construction of facilities such as plumbing needed to create a bubble curtain, a sprayer, or other modifications near the spillway in front of the LNFH to promote favorable fishing conditions.

Depending on the location and extent of any necessary ground disturbance, there is a potential for impacts on any previously undiscovered cultural resources. Generally speaking, any activities that occur within the water have a low potential to affect cultural

### 

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

resources. However, any ground disturbance in upland areas would have a higher chance of encountering archaeological sites.

These activities would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources, as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

The Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project could involve grading; planting and thinning vegetation; and hauling and placing logs, rock, soil, and other materials in or adjacent to lower Icicle Creek. Depending on the location and extent of any necessary ground disturbance, there is a potential for impacts on any previously undiscovered cultural resources. Generally speaking, any activities that occur within the water have a low potential to affect cultural resources. However, any ground disturbance in upland areas would have a higher chance of encountering archaeological sites.

These activities would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources, as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

Cultural resources impacts are not anticipated to occur under the Instream Flow Rule Amendment project because it would not involve any construction work.

# Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

As noted in Section 3.21, Cultural Resources, the LNFH is listed in the NRHP. Previous studies at the LNFH have indicated that it is located in an area that was previously an active part of the Icicle Creek channel but has now been filled and armored. Therefore, there is a low potential for archaeological resources to occur at this location.

The focus of this project is to implement improvements for water quality and water use efficiency. Some ground disturbance would occur as well as modifications to the facility.

Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential short-term impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could

result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The Fish Passage Improvements Project would potentially involve modification of the existing LNFH instream structures in Icicle Creek as well as instream modifications to the Boulder Field near RM 5.6. This work would result in disturbances along the streambank and within Icicle Creek that would be addressed in subsequent environmental review and permitting once project specifics are determined.

Depending on the location and extent of any necessary ground disturbance, there is a potential for impacts on any previously undiscovered cultural resources. Generally speaking, any activities that occur within the water have a low potential to affect cultural resources. However, any ground disturbance in upland areas would have a higher chance of encountering archaeological sites.

These activities would require an inadvertent discovery plan and compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources, as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

This project involves replacing fish screens at three different diversions on lower Icicle Creek: LNFH/COIC, the City of Leavenworth, and IPID. Some ground-disturbing activities would likely be required.

Depending on the location and extent of any necessary ground disturbance, there is a potential for impacts on any previously undiscovered cultural resources. Generally speaking, any activities that occur within the water have a low potential to affect cultural resources. However, any ground disturbance in upland areas would have a higher chance of encountering archaeological sites.

These activities would require an inadvertent discovery plan and compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources, as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

## ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Water Markets

Cultural resources impacts are not anticipated to occur under the Water Markets Project because it would not involve any construction work.

## 4.21.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Similar to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, some level of ongoing operations and maintenance activities would occur under this project; however, because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Re-operation of the lakes would result in changes in how frequently the lakes are drawn down but would not result in any changes in the high or low levels. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, increased frequency of withdrawals are not anticipated to result in increased erosion that could inadvertently expose buried cultural resources.

As noted above, this project would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources, as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

As noted above, the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project would not involve ground disturbance in areas that are not already developed with existing irrigation facilities. Operation and maintenance activities of these facilities would have limited potential to result in long-term impacts on cultural resources.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

In general, the long-term impacts associated with the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project would be similar to those described for the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project with the exception of those related to the COIC pump station and intake facilities. These facilities would result in ground disturbance along lower Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River and depending on the specific location could adversely affect cultural resources that may be present at the selected site. The potential for longterm impacts affecting cultural resources would be addressed prior to construction as described in greater detail in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

The Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project involves evaluating conservationoriented rate structures and expanding conservation education, xeriscape, and rebate programs, which would not affect cultural resources. After completing any elements involving construction, such as fixing leaky water mains and replacing residential meters, operation and maintenance activities affecting these facilities are expected to be less than what would occur with existing conditions and the No-action Alternative. As noted in 4.21.2.1, Short-term Impacts, any ongoing work in these areas would have a very low potential for encountering cultural resources.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Similar to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, some level of ongoing operations and maintenance activities would occur under the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project; however, because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Re-operation of the lake would allow the lake to rise to approximately 4 feet higher than the current high level to match the historical high water surface elevation. The lake would typically be full, to the new high water surface elevation, for less than a month in early summer. It would also allow for the lake to be drawn down to approximately 22.4 feet below the existing low. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, these changes are not anticipated to result in increased erosion and therefore would not be expected to inadvertently expose buried cultural resources.

As noted above, this project would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources, as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

As noted in 4.21.2.1, Short-term Impacts, the specifics of this project are not yet determined, but could involve some minor new facilities along Icicle Creek, near the LNFH. It is not anticipated that operation and maintenance activities would result in any new or ongoing impacts on cultural resources; however, as noted above, this project would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources, as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

As noted in 4.21.2.1, Short-term Impacts, the specifics of this project are not yet determined, but would include restoration and enhancement activities that are not likely to include new facilities that would require any ongoing operation or maintenance activities. As noted above, this project would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources, as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

The Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project involves an administrative change to the instream flow rule to allow for additional water withdrawals to occur in the Icicle Creek Subbasin if certain conditions are met and would not result in any long-term changes that would affect cultural resources.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

As noted in 4.21.2.1, Short-term Impacts, the specifics of this project are not yet determined, but would involve some modifications to the LNFH. Operation and maintenance activities would occur within the facilities and would be likely to affect cultural resources over the long term; however, as noted above, because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with Reclamation, USFWS, DAHP, and other affected parties if applicable. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The Fish Passage Improvements Project would potentially involve modification of existing LNFH instream structures in Icicle Creek, as well as instream modifications to the Boulder Field near RM 5.6. After completing any elements involving construction, operation and maintenance activities would occur within areas already developed and would have limited potential to result in impacts on cultural resources.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project involves replacing fish screens at three different diversions on lower Icicle Creek: LNFH/COIC, the City of Leavenworth, and IPID.

After completing any elements involving construction, operation and maintenance activities would occur within areas already developed and would have limited potential to result in impacts on cultural resources. Additionally, these activities are expected to be less than what currently occurs or would occur under the No-action Alternative and therefore would not result in long-term impacts on cultural resources.

#### Water Markets

The Water Markets Project involves the creation of a market system with the intention of increasing water availability within the Icicle Creek Subbasin and would not result in any long-term changes that would affect cultural resources.

## 4.21.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would not. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. Impacts associated with other project elements proposed under Alternative 2 are discussed under Alternative 1.

## 4.21.3.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would involve constructing a new pump station and intake facilities on the bank of the Wenatchee River near the town of Dryden to deliver water to the IPID canals and possibly a new re-regulation pond. Based on the analysis summarized in Section 3.21, Cultural Resources, there is a moderate to high potential for construction of the IPID pump exchange facilities to encounter cultural resources, depending on the site that is selected.

These activities would require an inadvertent discovery plan and compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources, as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

## 4.21.3.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

As noted above, the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would construct an IPID pump station on the Wenatchee River and possibly a re-regulation pond. Operation and maintenance activities of these facilities would take place within developed areas and would have limited potential to result in long-term impacts on cultural resources.

## 4.21.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 2 with the exception that the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project would be included while the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would not. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project. Impacts associated with other projects proposed under this alternative are discussed in Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

## 4.21.4.1 Short-term Impacts

### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on cultural resources are expected.

## 4.21.4.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

If the proposed Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority Project for Alternative 3 Project were enacted, there could be potential conflicts with instream flow allocations; however, these changes would not have the potential to affect cultural resources.

## 4.21.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would replace the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project, and the Upper Klonaqua Lake and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would be included. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with these projects compared to Alternative 1 and the No-action Alternative.

## 4.21.5.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

The Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would involve demolishing the existing dam, installing new piping, and constructing new impoundment and water control structures that would allow for an increase in the accessible storage at Eightmile Lake to 3,500 acre-feet. The spillway elevation would be raised to allow for storage at a higher level (4,682 feet) than current or historical water storage levels and the project would allow for additional draw down of the lake.

As noted previously, the water release system at Eightmile Lake is recommended for listing in the NRHP based on the criteria listing in Section 4.21.2.1, Short-term Impacts, Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation. No cultural resources were

observed along the margins of the lake or within the existing width of the trail to the project site.

Construction activity would occur along the banks and within the dry areas of the lake margins once the lake has been drawn down. Construction would involve making improvements to and/or replacing failing infrastructure, including replacing the low-level outlet pipeline and possibly extending it further downstream, replacing the damaged headgate, and replacing the rock masonry, concrete, and embankment dam structure with a new concrete and embankment dam structure. Because the project would completely replace much of the water release system, the potential impacts would likely be significant.

These activities would require an inadvertent discovery plan and compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources, as described in Section 4.21.6, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

The Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project would likely include ground disturbance in an area that has not been surveyed for archaeological resources at Upper Klonaqua Lake. Depending on the location and extent of any necessary ground disturbance, there is a low to moderate potential to encounter any previously undiscovered cultural resources.

As noted previously, the water release system at Klonaqua Lake is recommended for listing in the NRHP based on the criteria listing in Section 4.21.2.1, Short-term Impacts, Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation; however, there is no irrigation infrastructure at the Upper Lake where construction activities are proposed and therefore no potential for construction to result in adverse impacts on this resource.

In addition, these activities would require an inadvertent discovery plan and compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

This project would likely include modification of existing dam structures at Upper and Lower Snow Lakes. The structures have not been recorded, and it is not known whether they would contribute to either the LNFH or the potential Alpine Lakes Irrigation

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Historic District. If they do, then project activities have the potential to result in a significant adverse effect on this resource.

The area has also not been surveyed for other archaeological resources. Depending on the location and extent of any necessary ground disturbance, there is a low to moderate potential to encounter any previously undiscovered cultural resources.

This project would require an inadvertent discovery plan and compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations, including NEPA, which would address the protection of cultural resources as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

## 4.21.5.2 Long-term Impacts

### Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

Similar to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, some level of ongoing activities would occur for operations and maintenance under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project; however, because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Re-operation of the lake would allow the lake to rise to approximately 15 feet higher than the current high and 11 feet higher than the historical high water level. The lake would operate full to the new high water level for less than a month in early summer. It would also allow for the lake to be drawn down to approximately 24.4 feet below the existing low. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, these changes are not anticipated to result in increased erosion and therefore would not be expected to inadvertently expose buried cultural resources.

As noted above, this project would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources, as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

Compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, some level of ongoing activities would occur for operations and maintenance under the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project; however, these activities would focus on maintaining and

operating the new facilities and are not expected to result in any substantial changes to the structures or ground disturbance.

Re-operation of the lake would allow Upper Klonaqua Lake to be lowered approximately 20 feet, which would likely occur for 1 to 2 months in the late summer. There would be no changes at Lower Klonaqua Lake. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, these changes are not anticipated to result in increased erosion and therefore would not be expected to inadvertently expose buried cultural resources.

In addition, this project would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address the protection of cultural resources as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Similar to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, some level of ongoing activities would occur for operations and maintenance under the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project; however, because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by USFWS, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Re-operation of the lakes would allow both lakes to rise to approximately 5 feet higher than the current high level and 3 feet lower than the current low level. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, these changes are not anticipated to result in increased erosion and therefore would not be expected to inadvertently expose buried cultural resources.

In addition, this project would require compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations, including NEPA, which address the protection of cultural resources as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

## 4.21.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of the same projects as Alternative 1 except instead of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies, the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project would be included.

## 4.21.6.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

The IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project would involve fully replacing the IPID canal systems with a pressurized pump delivery system and constructing three intake and pump station facilities on the Wenatchee River. Existing surface water diversion facilities on Icicle and Peshastin Creeks could be removed. Based on the analysis summarized in Section 3.21, Cultural Resources, there is a moderate to high potential for construction of the IPID pump station facilities to encounter cultural resources within the IPID service area, especially along the Wenatchee River or lower Icicle Creek.

These activities would require an inadvertent discovery plan and compliance with various local, state, and federal regulations that address in part the protection of cultural resources, as described in Section 4.21.7, Mitigation Measures. If deemed necessary, compliance with these regulations could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce cultural resources impacts in coordination with DAHP. With implementation of appropriate mitigation, this project is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources.

### IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project

As noted above, the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project would construct three pump stations on the Wenatchee River, as well as fully replace the existing IPID canal system with a pressurized pipeline. Operation and maintenance activities of the pump facilities would take place within developed areas and would have limited potential to result in long-term impacts on cultural resources.

## 4.21.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

## 4.21.7.1 Short-Term Impacts

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which includes ensuring the suite of selected projects does not result in significant adverse impacts on tribal resources. In addition, federal actions and projects receiving state capital funds require coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes.

Continued coordination is ongoing and the potential for cultural resources to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. In the event of potential short-term impacts, the following types of mitigation measures may be implemented.

• Conduct tribal outreach to identify potentially affected cultural and tribal resources and avoid potential access conflicts or permanent changes adversely affecting these resources to the extent feasible.

- Limit the timing of construction activities with the potential to disturb use of affected cultural and tribal resources.
- Document the historic infrastructure before it is altered or removed.
- Compensate for potential disturbance to affected cultural and tribal resources as appropriate.

### 4.21.7.2 Long-term Impacts

As discussed above, any impacts with the potential to result in lasting damage to cultural resources would be addressed prior to construction.

## 4.22 Indian Sacred Sites

This section describes the potential short- and long-term impacts that could affect the resources identified in Section 3.22, Indian Sacred Sites, from construction and operation related to the No-action Alternative and Program Alternatives.

## 4.22.1 No-action Alternative

## 4.22.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various entities and agencies would undertake individual actions that have the potential to affect sacred sites that may be present in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area. The No-action Alternative would include construction of water diversion modifications, general habitat enhancement projects, LNFH improvements, required fish screening upgrades, modernization of infrastructure at the Alpine Lakes including the restoration of the Eightmile Lake Dam, and improvements to existing irrigation systems to support agricultural reliability.

Construction activities can disturb sacred sites by resulting in increased noise, dust, or activity that conflicts with the use of the sacred site. Construction could also result in physical changes that can disrupt or conflict with the sacred or ceremonial use. The extent of the impact would depend on the specific uses at the site and the nature and extent of the construction activity.

Prior to construction, project proponents would be required to ensure compliance with regulations related to sacred sites as described in Section 1.9, Related Permits, Actions, and Laws. Compliance could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce impacts, such as minimizing disruptive activities, implementing timing restrictions on the activities, and compensating for any impacts that cannot be avoided (Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures).

## 4.22.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Any impacts with the potential to result in lasting damage to sacred sites would be addressed prior to construction. For the most part, the No-action Alternative is not expected to result in any additional changes that would adversely affect sacred sites over the long term. Operational and maintenance activities, particularly those that would result in any ground disturbance or additional modifications to sensitive resources could have a limited potential to result in impacts. The potential would be low given that the activities would be affecting areas already evaluated as described above.

## 4.22.2 Alternative 1

Implementation of Alternative 1 has the potential to result in both increased adverse and beneficial impacts on sacred sites compared with the No-action Alternative because there would be greater likelihood that multiple projects would be implemented and the scale of certain efforts would likely be greater. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses tribal resources in general by improving instream flows, improving the sustainability of LNFH, protecting tribal and non-tribal harvest, and enhancing Icicle Creek riparian habitat. In addition, federal actions and projects receiving state capital funds require coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes. The following sections describe the short- and long-term impacts that would occur under Alternative 1.

## 4.22.2.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

As noted in Section 3.21, Cultural Resources, historically, there has been relatively limited study of the project site for cultural activities related to sacred sites because of its remoteness. As noted in Section 3.22, Indian Sacred Sites, no sacred sites have been formally identified with the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project sites.

Most of the work would occur in upland areas. Some limited work would occur within the lake shorelines but within the dry when the lakes are drawn down at the end of the summer. This work is expected to have a low potential to result in short-term impacts of any sacred sites. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

## **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Construction activities associated with this project include the conversion of irrigation canals to pipelines and lining of irrigation canals with concrete. This work would occur within already developed areas and has a low likelihood of disturbing sacred sites. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Construction activities associated with COIC Efficiencies would be similar to those described for the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies project with the exception of a new COIC pump station to be constructed along the shoreline of Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River. Depending on the specific location and the presence of any sacred sites, there is a potential for this project to result in short-term impacts. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Certain components of the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project, such as evaluating conservation-oriented rate structures and expanding conservation education, xeriscape, and rebate programs, would not result in any construction activities. Other activities, such as replacing leaky water mains and residential meters, could result in some minor construction activities, including the potential for ground disturbance. However, any ground work would occur in areas that were previously disturbed during construction of the initial plumbing and pipework. Therefore, the potential for any impacts on sacred sites would be very low.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

As noted in Section 3.21, Cultural Resources, historically, there has been relatively limited study of the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project site for cultural activities related to sacred sites because of its remoteness. As noted in Section 3.22, Indian Sacred Sites, no sacred sites have been formally identified within the project site.

Construction activities for this project would be largely limited to the dry lake margins and existing structures and is expected to have a low potential to result in short-term impacts of any sacred sites. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The specifics of this project are not yet determined but could involve some minor new facilities along Icicle Creek near the LNFH. Depending on the specifics of this project, there is a potential that construction activity could affect Indian sacred sites in the short term.

## 

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

The specifics of the Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project are not yet determined, but would likely involve some construction activity, including grading; planting and thinning vegetation; and hauling and placing logs, rock, soil, and other materials in or adjacent to lower Icicle Creek. Depending on the specifics of this project, there is a potential that construction activity could affect Indian sacred sites in the short term.

Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

The Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project would not involve any construction activities, physical changes, or disturbance in the short term and would therefore not result in any short-term impacts on Indian sacred sites.

#### Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

The focus of this project is to implement improvements for water quality and water use efficiency. Some ground disturbance would occur as well as modifications to the facility. Most activity is anticipated to occur within the boundaries of the hatchery; however, there would be some construction activities along lower Icicle Creek.

Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential short-term impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The Fish Passage Improvements Project would potentially involve modification of existing LNFH instream structures in Icicle Creek as well as instream modifications to the Boulder Field near RM 5.6. This work would result in disturbances along the streambank and within Icicle Creek.

Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review.
Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project involves replacing fish screens at three different diversions on Lower Icicle Creek: LNFH/COIC, the City of Leavenworth, and IPID. Some ground-disturbing activities would likely be required.

Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

#### Water Markets

The Water Markets Project would not involve any construction activities, physical changes, or disturbance in the short-term and would therefore not result in any short-term impacts on sacred sites.

## 4.22.2.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Similar to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, some level of ongoing operations and maintenance activities would occur under the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project; however, because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Re-operation of the lakes would result in changes in how frequently the lakes are drawn down but would not result in any changes in the high or low levels. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, increased frequency of withdrawals are not anticipated to result in increased erosion that would significantly alter the shoreline.

Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

#### **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

As noted above, the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project would not involve ground disturbance in areas that are not already developed with existing irrigation facilities. Operation and maintenance activities of these facilities would have limited potential to result in long-term impacts adversely affecting Indian sacred sites.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

In general, the long-term impacts associated with the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project would be similar to those described for the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project with the exception of those related to the COIC pump station and intake facilities. These facilities would result in new facilities along lower Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River and depending on the specific location could adversely affect sacred sites that may be present at the selected site. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

The Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project involves evaluating conservationoriented rate structures and expanding conservation education, xeriscape, and rebate programs, which would have a very low potential to affect sacred sites. After completing any elements involving construction, such as fixing leaky water mains and replacing residential meters, operation and maintenance activities affecting these facilities are expected to be less than what would occur with existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

## **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Similar to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, some level of ongoing operations and maintenance activities would occur under the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project; however, because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Re-operation of the lake would allow the lake to rise to approximately 4 feet higher than the current high level, which would occur for less than a month in early summer. It would also allow for the lake to be drawn down to approximately 22.4 feet below the existing low. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, increased frequency of withdrawals are not anticipated to result in increased erosion and therefore would not be expected to inadvertently expose buried cultural resources.

Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

As noted above, the specifics of the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project are not yet determined but could involve some minor new facilities along Icicle Creek near the LNFH. It is not anticipated that operation and maintenance activities would result in any new or ongoing impacts on Indian sacred sites.

Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

#### **Habitat Protection and Enhancement**

The specifics of the Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project are not yet determined but would include restoration and enhancement activities that are not likely to include new facilities that would require any ongoing operation or maintenance activities. There would be limited potential for long-term impacts affecting Indian sacred sites.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

The Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project involves an administrative change to the Instream Flow Rule to allow for additional water withdrawals to occur on Icicle Creek if certain conditions are met.

Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

# Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

As noted above, the specifics of this project are not yet determined, but would involve some modifications to the LNFH. Operation and maintenance activities would occur within the facilities and would not be likely to affect sacred sites over the long term.

Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

## **Fish Passage Improvements**

As noted above, the specifics of the Fish Passage Improvements Project are not yet determined but could involve some minor new facilities along Icicle Creek near the LNFH. It is not anticipated that operation and maintenance activities would result in any new or ongoing impacts on sacred sites. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

#### **ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED**

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

As noted above, the specifics of the Fish Screen Compliance Project are not yet determined but would involve replacing fish screens along Icicle Creek. It is not anticipated that operation and maintenance activities would result in any new or ongoing impacts on sacred sites. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

#### Water Markets

The Water Markets Project is expected to result in beneficial impacts for increased water availability within the Icicle Creek Subbasin and is not expected to adversely affect Indian sacred sites.

# 4.22.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would not. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses tribal resources in general by improving instream flows, improving the sustainability of LNFH, protecting tribal and non-tribal harvest, and enhancing Icicle Creek riparian habitat. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. Impacts of other projects proposed under Alternative 2 are discussed under Alternative 1.

## 4.22.3.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project involves construction of a new IPID pump station and intake facilities on the Wenatchee River. Depending on the specific location in relation to any sacred sites, there is a potential that construction activity could affect that sacred site in the short term. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

## 4.22.3.2 Long-term Impacts

#### **IPID Dryden Pump Exchange**

As noted above, the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would construct an IPID pump station on the Wenatchee River and possibly a re-regulation pond. Operation and maintenance activities of these facilities would take place within developed areas and would have limited potential to result in long-term impacts on Indian sacred sites.

# 4.22.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 2 with the exception that the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project needed to allow for permitting additional domestic supplies would be included while the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would not. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses tribal resources in general by improving instream flows, improving the sustainability of LNFH, protecting tribal and non-tribal harvest, and enhancing Icicle Creek riparian habitat. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project. Impacts of other projects proposed under this Alternative are discussed under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

## 4.22.4.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on Indian sacred sites.

## 4.22.4.2 Long-term Impacts

#### Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

If the proposed Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project were enacted, there could be potential conflicts with instream flow allocations. Under the proposed changes, junior domestic water rights could be exercised even when the Instream Flow Rule is not met.

Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

# 4.22.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement project would replace the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration project, and the Upper Klonaqua Lake and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would be included. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses tribal resources in general by improving instream flows, improving the sustainability of LNFH, protecting tribal and non-tribal harvest, and enhancing Icicle Creek riparian habitat. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with these projects compared to Alternative 1 and the No-action Alternative.

# 4.22.5.1 Short-term Impacts

## **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

As noted in Section 3.21, Cultural Resources, historically, there has been relatively limited study of the project site for cultural activities related to sacred sites because of its remoteness. As noted in Section 3.22, Indian Sacred Sites, no sacred sites have been formally identified with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project site.

Construction activities for this project would be largely limited to the dry lake margins and existing structures and is expected to have a low potential to result in short-term impacts of any sacred sites. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.6, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

## Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

As noted in Section 3.21, Cultural Resources, historically, there has been relatively limited study of the project site for cultural activities related to sacred sites because of its remoteness. As noted in Section 3.22, Indian Sacred Sites, no sacred sites have been formally identified with the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project site.

Construction activities for this project would be largely limited to the dry lake margins and existing structures and is expected to have a low potential to result in short-term impacts of any sacred sites. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

## **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

As noted in Section 3.21, Cultural Resources, historically, there has been relatively limited study of the project site for cultural activities related to sacred sites because of its remoteness. As noted in Section 3.22, Indian Sacred Sites, no sacred sites have been formally identified with the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project site.

Construction activities for this project would be largely limited to the dry lake margins and existing structures and is expected to have a low potential to result in short-term impacts of any sacred sites. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

## 4.22.5.2 Long-term Impacts

## Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

Similar to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, some level of ongoing activities would occur for operations and maintenance under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project; however, because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Re-operation of the lake would allow the lake to rise to approximately 15 feet higher than the current high level and 11 feet higher than the historical high water levels. The lake would operate full to the new high water level for less than a month in early summer. It would also allow for the lake to be drawn down to approximately 24.4 feet below the existing low. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, increased frequency of withdrawals are not anticipated to result in increased erosion and therefore would not be expected to inadvertently expose buried cultural resources.

Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

## **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

Compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, some level of ongoing activities would occur for operations and maintenance under the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project; however, these activities would focus on maintaining and operating the new facilities and are not expected to result in any substantial changes to the structures or ground disturbance.

Re-operation of the lake would allow Upper Klonaqua Lake to be lowered approximately 20 feet, which would likely occur for 1 to 2 months in the late summer. There would be no changes at Lower Klonaqua Lake. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, these changes are not anticipated to result in increased erosion and therefore would not be expected to inadvertently expose buried cultural resources.

Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

## **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Similar to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, some level of ongoing activities would occur for operations and maintenance under the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement; however, because the facilities would be newer and

## ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Re-operation of the lakes would allow both lakes to rise to approximately 5 feet higher than the current high level and 3 feet lower than the current low. As noted in Section 3.18, Shorelines, these changes are not anticipated to result in increased erosion and therefore would not be expected to inadvertently expose buried cultural resources.

Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which would include NEPA. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

# 4.22.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of the same projects as Alternative 1 except instead of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies, the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project would be included.

## 4.22.6.1 Short-term Impacts

## **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project**

The IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project involves construction of three new pump stations and intake facilities on the Wenatchee River, and fully replacing the existing IPID canal delivery system with a pressurized pipeline. Depending on the specific location in relation to any sacred sites, there is a potential that construction or ground disturbing activity could affect that sacred site in the short term. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

# 4.22.6.2 Long-term Impacts

## **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project**

As noted above, the Full Project would construct three new pump stations on the Wenatchee River and replace the existing canal delivery system. Operation and maintenance activities of the pump stations would take place within developed areas and would have limited potential to result in long-term impacts on Indian sacred sites.

Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.22.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts on Indian sacred sites are addressed.

# 4.22.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

## 4.22.7.1 Short-Term Impacts

As noted in Section 1.2, The Icicle Strategy Guiding Principles, the Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring the suite of selected projects does not result in significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest, among other things. In addition, federal actions and projects receiving state capital funds require coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes.

Continued coordination is ongoing and the potential for Indian sacred sites to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. In the event of potential short-term impacts, the following types of mitigation measures could be implemented.

- Conduct tribal outreach to identify potentially affected cultural and tribal resources, including sacred sites, and avoid potential access conflicts or permanent changes adversely affecting sacred sites to the extent feasible.
- Limit the timing of construction activities with the potential to disturb use of affected cultural and tribal resources, including sacred sites.
- Compensate for potential disturbance to affected cultural and tribal resources, including sacred sites as appropriate.

## 4.22.7.2 Long-term Impacts

As discussed above, any impacts with the potential to result in lasting damage to sacred sites would be addressed prior to construction.

# 4.23 Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest

This section describes the potential short- and long-term impacts that could affect the resources identified in Section 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest, from construction and operation related to the No-action Alternative and Program Alternatives. Potential impacts on water quality are addressed in Section 4.5, Water Quality. Potential impacts on fish and special-status species are addressed in Sections 4.7, Fish, and 4.10, Threatened and Endangered Species, respectively. Any impacts to land-based ITAs such as reservation lands or Native Allotments would require review by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Impacts to resource-based ITAs such as treaty-protected fisheries rights would require negotiation between the Indian tribe and the State of Washington. Projects involving state capital funding would also be required to comply with Governor's

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Executive Order 05-05, which requires consultation with potentially affected Indian tribes as part of the decision to provide funds.

# 4.23.1 No-action Alternative

# 4.23.1.1 Short-term Impacts

Under the No-action Alternative, various entities and agencies would undertake individual actions that have the potential to affect ITAs that may be present in the Icicle Creek Watershed project area. The No-action Alternative would include construction of water diversion modifications, general habitat enhancement projects, LNFH improvements, required fish screening upgrades, modernization of infrastructure at the Alpine Lakes including the restoration of the Eightmile Lake Dam, and improvements to existing irrigation systems to support agricultural reliability.

Construction activities can disturb ITAs by blocking access to the resource, including any Usual & Accustomed fishing areas, such as occur near the LNFH plunge pool, or by resulting in other environmental impacts that can degrade the ITAs, such as water quality impacts adversely affecting fish. Water quality impacts are addressed in Section 4.5, Water Quality.

Prior to construction, federal agencies taking action on the projects would be required to ensure compliance with the regulations specific to the protection of ITAs described in Section 1.9, Related Permits, Actions, and Laws. Any impacts to land-based ITAs such as reservation lands or Native Allotments would require review by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Impacts to resource-based ITAs such as treaty-protected fisheries rights would require negotiation between the Indian tribe and the State of Washington. Projects involving state capital funding would also be required to comply with Governor's Executive Order 05-05, which requires consultation with potentially affected Indian tribes as part of the decision to provide funds.

Compliance could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce impacts, such as minimizing disruptive activities, implementing timing restrictions on construction activities, and compensating for any impacts that cannot be avoided (see Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures).

# 4.23.1.2 Long-term Impacts

Any impacts with the potential to result in lasting damage to ITAs would be addressed prior to construction through the compliance processes described above. For the most part, the No-action Alternative is not expected to result in any additional changes that would adversely affect ITAs over the long term because most of the affected facilities already exist, would not be located in areas where ITAs exist, or would have already been evaluated prior to construction as described above. Potential long-term impacts on sites sacred to Indian tribes are addressed in Section 4.22, Indian Sacred Sites.

# 4.23.2 Alternative 1

Implementation of Alternative 1 has the potential to result in an increase in impacts on tribal resources compared with the No-action Alternative because there would be greater likelihood that multiple projects would be implemented and the scale of certain efforts would likely be greater. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses tribal resources in general by improving instream flows, improving the sustainability of LNFH, protecting tribal and non-tribal harvest, and enhancing Icicle Creek riparian habitat. The following sections describe the short- and long-term impacts that would occur under Alternative 1.

## 4.23.2.1 Short-term Impacts

#### Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

As noted in Section 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest, no ITAs have been formally identified within the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project sites and no tribal fish harvest is known to occur at the project site. However, coordination with the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Indian Nation (YN) and Confederated Tribes of the Coleville Reservation (CTCR) is ongoing with the intention of minimizing the potential for impacts on any ITAs.

Most of the work would occur in upland areas. Some limited work would occur within the lake shorelines but within the dry when the lakes are drawn down at the end of the summer. This work is expected to have a low potential to result in short-term impacts on any ITAs. The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review.

## **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

Construction activities associated with the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project include the conversion of irrigation canals to pipelines and lining of irrigation canals with concrete. This work would occur within already developed areas and has a low likelihood of disturbing ITAs, including tribal fish harvest. The Icicle Creek Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

## **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

Construction activities associated with the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project would be similar to those described above with the exception of a new COIC pump station to be constructed along the shoreline of Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River. Depending on the specific location of the pump station, there is a potential for

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

construction activities to disturb ITAs, including tribal fish harvest, in the short term. Potential impacts on fish in general are addressed in Section 4.7, Fish.

The Icicle Creek Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

## **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

Certain components of the Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project, such as evaluating conservation-oriented rate structures and expanding conservation education, xeriscape, and rebate programs, would not result in any construction activities. Other activities, such as replacing leaky water mains and residential meters, could result in some minor construction activities, including the potential for ground disturbance. However, any groundwork would occur in areas that were previously disturbed during construction of the initial plumbing and pipework. Therefore, the potential for any impacts on ITAs would be low.

## **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

As noted in Section 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest, no ITAs have been formally identified with the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project site and no tribal fish harvest occurs at the project site. However, coordination with the YN and CTCR is ongoing with the intention of minimizing the potential for impacts on any ITAs.

Construction activities for this project would be largely limited to the dry lake margins and existing structures and is expected to have a low potential to result in short-term impacts of any ITAs.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

## **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

The specifics of the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project are not yet determined but could involve some minor new facilities along Icicle Creek near the LNFH. Depending on the specifics of this project, there is a potential that construction activity could affect ITAs, including potential disruption of fishing activities, in the short term. The potential impacts on fish in general are addressed in Section 4.7, Fish. The overall project is intended to preserve ITAs in accordance with the Guiding Principles.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued

coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The specifics of the Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project are not yet determined, but would likely involve some construction activity, including grading; planting and thinning vegetation; hauling and placing logs, rock, soil, and other materials; and some inwater work on lower Icicle Creek. Depending on the specifics of this project, there is a potential that construction activity could affect ITAs, including potential disruption of fishing activities, in the short term. The potential impacts on fish in general are addressed in Section 4.7, Fish.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

The Instream Flow Rule Amendment Project would not involve any construction activities or physical changes or disturbance in the short-term and would therefore not result in any short-term impacts on ITAs.

# Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

The focus of this project is to implement improvements for water quality and water use efficiency at the LNFH. Some ground disturbance would occur as well as modifications to the facility. Most activity is anticipated to occur within the boundaries of the hatchery; however, there would be some construction activities along lower Icicle Creek. Depending on the specifics of this project, there is a potential for construction activity to affect ITAs, including disruption of fishing activities, in the short term. The potential impacts on fish in general are described in Section 4.7, Fish.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential short-term impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.6, Mitigation Measures.

## ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

The Fish Passage Improvements Project would potentially involve modification of existing LNFH instream structures in Icicle Creek as well as instream modifications to the Boulder Field near RM 5.6. This work would result in disturbances along the streambank and within Icicle Creek. Depending on the specifics of this project, there is a potential for construction activity to affect ITAs, including disruption of fishing activities, in the short term. The potential impacts on fish in general are described in Section 4.7, Fish.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

## **Fish Screen Compliance**

The Fish Screen Compliance Project involves replacing fish screens at three different diversions on Lower Icicle Creek: LNFH/COIC, the City of Leavenworth, and IPID. Some ground-disturbing activities would likely be required. Depending on the specifics of this project, there is a potential for construction activity to affect ITAs, including disruption of fishing activities, in the short term. The potential impacts on fish in general are described in Section 4.7, Fish.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

## Water Markets

The Water Markets Project would not involve any construction activities, physical changes, or disturbance in the short term and would therefore not result in any short-term impacts on ITAs.

## 4.23.2.2 Long-term Impacts

## Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation

Similar to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, some level of ongoing operations and maintenance activities would occur under the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project; however, because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Re-operation of the lakes would result in changes in how frequently the lakes are drawn down but would not result in any changes in the high or low levels. As noted in Sections

3.11, Aesthetics, and 3.18, Shorelines, increased frequency of withdrawals are not anticipated to result in substantial visual changes or increased erosion that would significantly alter the shoreline. Therefore, the potential for long-term impacts affecting any ITAs that might occur within this area is low.

As noted in Section 4.7, Fish, there is a potential for impacts on fish as the result of increased flows in lower Icicle Creek. These impacts could include some localized changes in habitat, increased competition between fish for any limiting resources, and some genetic mixing within otherwise distinct populations of the same species; however, the overall impacts are anticipated to be beneficial for fish and for related fisheries, including those supporting tribal harvest.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation and monitoring measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

## **IPID Irrigation Efficiencies**

As noted in Section 4.23.2.1, Short-term Impacts, the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project would not result in the development of new facilities. Operation and maintenance activities of existing facilities would have limited potential to result in long-term impacts adversely affecting ITAs or fish harvest.

As discussed in greater detail in Section 4.7, Fish, this project would result in changes to instream flows that have a potential to alter the distribution of fish within lower Icicle Creek. These changes may affect tribal fishing. As part of the overall Icicle Strategy, efforts to characterize the impacts of the managed flows on fish species are ongoing. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs and tribal fishing to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts are addressed.

## **COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange**

In general, the long-term impacts associated with the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project would be similar to those described for the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project with the exception of those related to the COIC pump station and intake facilities. These facilities would result in new facilities along lower Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River, and depending on the specific location could adversely affect ITAs and tribal fishing. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for these resources to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts are adequately addressed.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Domestic Conservation Efficiencies**

The Domestic Conservation Efficiencies Project involves evaluating conservationoriented rate structures and expanding conservation education, xeriscape, and rebate programs, which are not expected to affect ITAs. After completing any elements involving construction, such as fixing leaky water mains and replacing residential meters, operation and maintenance activities affecting these facilities are expected to be less than what would occur with existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration**

Similar to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, some level of ongoing operations and maintenance activities would occur under the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project; however, because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Re-operation of the lake would allow the lake to rise to approximately 4 feet higher than the current high level, which would occur for less than a month in early summer. It would also allow for the lake to be drawn down to approximately 22.4 feet below the existing low. As noted in Sections 3.11, Aesthetics, and 3.18, Shorelines, increased frequency of withdrawals are not anticipated to result in substantial visual changes or increased erosion that would significantly alter the shoreline. Therefore, the potential for long-term impacts affecting any ITAs that might occur within this area is low.

As noted in Section 4.7, Fish, there is a potential for impacts on fish as the result of flow changes in lower Icicle Creek. These impacts could include some localized changes in habitat, increased competition between fish for any limiting resources, and some genetic mixing within otherwise distinct populations of the same species; however, the overall impacts are anticipated to be beneficial for fish and for related fisheries, including those supporting tribal harvest. The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.6, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement**

As noted above, the specifics of the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project are not yet determined but could involve some minor new facilities along Icicle Creek near the LNFH. It is not anticipated that operation and maintenance activities would result in any new or ongoing impacts on ITAs.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs

to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

### Habitat Protection and Enhancement

The specifics of the Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project are not yet determined but would include restoration and enhancement activities that are not likely to include new facilities that would require any ongoing operation or maintenance activities. There would be limited potential for long-term impacts affecting ITAs.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Instream Flow Rule Amendment**

This project involves an administrative change to the Instream Flow Rule to allow for additional water withdrawals to occur on Icicle Creek if certain conditions are met.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

## Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

As noted above, the specifics of this project are not yet determined, but would involve some modifications to the LNFH. Operation and maintenance activities would occur within the facilities and would not be likely to affect ITAs over the long term.

Because this facility is owned by Reclamation and operated by USFWS, an evaluation of the potential impacts under NEPA would be completed once the full scope of the project is determined. The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Fish Passage Improvements**

As noted above, the specifics of the Fish Passage Improvements Project are not yet determined but could involve some minor new facilities along Icicle Creek near the LNFH. It is not anticipated that operation and maintenance activities would result in any new or ongoing impacts on ITAs. The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Fish Screen Compliance**

As noted in 4.23.2.1, Short-term Impacts, the specifics of the Fish Screen Compliance Project are not yet determined but would involve replacing fish screens along Icicle Creek. It is not anticipated that operation and maintenance activities would result in any new or ongoing impacts on ITAs. The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### Water Markets

The Water Markets Project is expected to result in beneficial impacts for increased water availability within the Icicle Creek Subbasin and is not expected to adversely affect ITAs.

# 4.23.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would not. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project. Impacts of other projects are discussed in Alternative 1.

## 4.23.3.1 Short-term Impacts

#### IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

The IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project involves construction of a new IPID pump station and intake facilities on the Wenatchee River. Depending on the specifics of this project, there is a potential that construction activity could affect ITAs, including fishing harvest, in the short term.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued

coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

# 4.23.3.2 Long-term Impacts

## IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

As noted above, the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would construct an IPID pump station on the Wenatchee River and possibly a re-regulation pond. Operation and maintenance activities of these facilities would take place within developed areas and would have limited potential to result in long-term impacts on ITAs.

# 4.23.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would result in the implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 2 with the exception that the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project would be included while the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would not. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project.

# 4.23.4.1 Short-term Impacts

## Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

There are no construction activities proposed under this project and therefore no potential short-term impacts on ITAs.

# 4.23.4.2 Long-term Impacts

## Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3

If the proposed Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project were enacted, there could be potential conflicts with instream flow allocations. Under the proposed changes, junior domestic water rights could be exercised even when the Instream Flow Rule is not met.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

# 4.23.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project would replace the Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project, and the Upper Klonaqua Lake and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would be

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

included. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with these projects compared to Alternative 1 and the No-action Alternative.

## 4.23.5.1 Short-term Impacts

#### **Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement**

As noted in Section 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest, no ITAs have been formally identified with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project site and no tribal fish harvest occurs at the project site. However, coordination with the YN and CTCR is ongoing with the intention of minimizing the potential for impacts on any ITAs.

Construction activities for this project would be largely limited to the dry lake margins and existing structures and is expected to have a low potential to result in short-term impacts of any ITAs.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

As noted in Section 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest, no ITAs have been formally identified with the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project site and no tribal fish harvest occurs at the project site. However, coordination with the YN and CTCR is ongoing with the intention of minimizing the potential for impacts on any ITAs.

Construction activities for this project would be largely limited to the dry lake margins and existing structures and is expected to have a low potential to result in short-term impacts of any ITAs.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

As noted in Section 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest, no ITAs have been formally identified with the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project site and no tribal fish harvest occurs at the project site. However, coordination with the YN and CTCR is ongoing with the intention of minimizing the potential for impacts on any ITAs.

Construction activities for this project would be largely limited to the dry lake margins and existing structures and is expected to have a low potential to result in short-term impacts of any ITAs.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

## 4.23.5.2 Long-term Impacts

## Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

Similar to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, some level of ongoing operations and maintenance activities would occur under the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement project; however, because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Re-operation of the lake would allow the lake to rise to approximately 15 feet higher than the current high level and 11 feet higher than the historical high water level. The lake would operate full to the new high water level for less than a month in early summer. It would also allow for the lake to be drawn down to approximately 24.4 feet below the existing low.

As noted in Sections 3.11, Aesthetics, and 3.18, Shorelines, increased frequency of releases are not anticipated to result in substantial visual changes or increased erosion that would significantly alter the shoreline. Therefore, the potential for long-term impacts affecting any ITAs that might occur within this area is low.

As noted in Section 4.7, Fish, there is a potential for impacts on fish as the result of flow changes in lower Icicle Creek. These impacts could include some localized changes in habitat, increased competition between fish for any limiting resources, and some genetic mixing within otherwise distinct populations of the same species; however, the overall impacts are anticipated to be beneficial for fish and for related fisheries, including those supporting tribal harvest. The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation and monitoring measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### **Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement**

Compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, some level of ongoing activities would occur for operations and maintenance under the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project; however, these activities would focus on maintaining and operating the new facilities and are not expected to result in any substantial changes to the structures or ground disturbance.

Re-operation of the lake would allow Upper Klonaqua Lake to be lowered approximately 20 feet, which would likely occur for 1 to 2 months in the late summer. There would be no changes at Lower Klonaqua Lake. As noted in Sections 3.11, Aesthetics, and 3.18, Shorelines, increased frequency of withdrawals are not anticipated to result in substantial visual changes or increased erosion that would significantly alter the shoreline. Therefore, the potential for long-term impacts affecting any ITAs that might occur within this area is low.

As noted in Section 4.7, Fish, there is a potential for impacts on fish as the result of flow changes in lower Icicle Creek. These impacts could include some localized changes in habitat, increased competition between fish for any limiting resources, and some genetic mixing within otherwise distinct populations of the same species; however, the overall impacts are anticipated to be beneficial for fish and for related fisheries, including those supporting tribal harvest. The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

#### **Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement**

Similar to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative, some level of ongoing activities would occur for operations and maintenance under the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Project; however, because the facilities would be newer and operated remotely by IPID, any trips to and from the lakes or activities needed to maintain the facilities are expected to be less frequent and extensive than what would occur compared to existing conditions and the No-action Alternative.

Re-operation of the lakes would allow both lakes to rise to approximately 5 feet higher than the current high level and 3 feet lower than the current low. As noted in Sections 3.11, Aesthetics, and 3.18, Shorelines, increased frequency of withdrawals are not anticipated to result in substantial visual changes or increased erosion that would significantly alter the shoreline. Therefore, the potential for long-term impacts affecting any ITAs that might occur within this area is low.

As noted in Section 4.7, Fish, there is a potential for impacts on fish as the result of flow changes in lower Icicle Creek. These impacts could include some localized changes in habitat, increased competition between fish for any limiting resources, and some genetic

mixing within otherwise distinct populations of the same species; however, the overall impacts are anticipated to be beneficial for fish and for related fisheries, including those supporting tribal harvest. The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures.

# 4.23.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of the same projects as Alternative 1 except instead of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies, the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project would be included.

## 4.23.6.1 Short-term Impacts

## **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

The IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project involves construction of new pump stations and intake facilities on the Wenatchee River. This project would also fully replace the IPID canal systems with a pressurized pipeline delivery system. Depending on the specifics of this project, there is a potential that construction activity could affect ITAs, mainly fishing harvest, in the short term.

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review, which could include the development of mitigation measures, such as are listed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures. Potential impacts on fish in general are addressed in Section 4.7, Fish.

## 4.23.6.2 Long-term Impacts

## **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

As noted above, the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project would construct three new pump stations on the Wenatchee River and replace the entire existing IPID canal delivery system with a pressurized pipeline. Operation and maintenance activities of the pump stations would take place within developed areas and would have limited potential to result in long-term impacts on ITAs.

Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for these resources to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. Compliance with the regulations as discussed in Section 4.23.7, Mitigation Measures, would ensure any potential impacts are adequately addressed.

# 4.23.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

# 4.23.7.1 Short-Term Impacts

The Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring the suite of selected projects does not result in significant adverse impacts on tribal harvest. In addition, federal actions and projects receiving state capital funds require coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes.

Continued coordination is ongoing and the potential for ITAs to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. In the event of potential short-term impacts, the following types of mitigation measures could be implemented.

- Conduct tribal outreach to identify potentially affected cultural and tribal resources, including ITAs, and avoid potential access conflicts or permanent changes adversely affecting ITAs to the extent feasible.
- Limit the timing of construction activities with the potential to disturb use of affected cultural and tribal resources, including ITAs.
- Compensate for potential disturbance to affected cultural and tribal resources, including ITAs as appropriate.

## 4.23.7.2 Long-term Impacts

As discussed above, any impacts with the potential to result in lasting conflicts or damage to ITAs would be addressed prior to construction.

• Adaptive monitoring of the Tribal Harvest as project implementation occurs.

# 4.24 Socioeconomics

This section describes the potential short- and long-term impacts that could affect the resources identified in Section 3.24, Socioeconomics, from construction and operation related to the No-action Alternative and Program Alternatives.

Although a cost-benefit analysis is not required by the State Environmental Policy Act, one may be completed to aid in the consideration of environmentally different Program Alternatives and has, therefore, been completed to provide additional decision-making information. To this end, Ecology's Office of Economic and Regulatory Research completed an analysis of anticipated costs and benefits, using the Washington State OFM 2007 Input/Output Model for the No-Action Alternative and Alternatives 1 through 4.

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The analysis need not be displayed in monetary terms when there are important qualitative considerations (WAC 197-11-726). Although the OFM modeling did not include Alternative 5, the discussion of costs and benefits presented below does address the relative socioeconomic impacts of Alternative 5 in qualitative terms.

Results from the Office of Financial Management (OFM) 2007 Input/Output Model are presented in Table 4-5. Inputs to the model, such as construction costs, are preliminary estimates to be refined as the project elements are more fully developed and designed. For this reason, the model results are most useful for comparing the costs and benefits of the Program Alternatives rather than providing an absolute value of costs or benefits. The output categories include the total number of jobs created, the corresponding labor income, and the related long-term economic impact of the increase in spending and jobs. Outputs also include the number of additional households that would be served by increased domestic water supply afforded under each Program Alternative, the associated increase in land value as the result of development, and the corresponding increases in property tax revenue that would be generated as the result of the additional households. These results are more fully described in the sections that follow for each Program Alternative.

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

	Construction Costs <sup>1</sup>	Job Creation	Labor Income	Long-term Economic Impact	Additional Households Served by Increased Domestic Water Supply	Increase in Land Value Associated with Additional Households	Increase in Property Tax Revenue Associated with Additional Households
Alternative 1	\$43.7 M	514	\$29.2 M	\$100.4 M	10,076	\$1,312.6 M	\$1.6 M
Alternative 2	\$49.0 M	576	\$32.7 M	\$112.5 M	10,076	\$1,312.6 M	\$1.6 M
Alternative 3	\$47.8 M	562	\$32.0 M	\$109.9 M	5,709	\$743.7 M	\$0.9 M
Alternative 4	\$45.2 M*	531	\$30.2 M	\$103.8 M	12,473	\$1,624.8 M	\$2.0 M
Alternative 5 <sup>2</sup>	\$43.7 M +	514 +	\$29.2 M +	\$100.4 M +	10,076	\$1,312.6 M	\$1.6 M

 Table 4-5

 OFM 2007 Input/Output Model Results for Costs and Benefits Associated with Program Alternatives

Source: Washington State Department of Ecology

<sup>1</sup>OFM model input based on assumed costs of construction. Not a model output. Construction costs were estimated based on previous studies and do not include additional contingencies added for Wilderness-related construction described in Table 4-9, which provides a more conservative estimate of construction benefits.

<sup>2</sup>The costs and benefits of Alternative 5 are unknown at this point but are expected to be great than Alternative 1. This is because Alternative 5 includes the same projects as Alternative 1, but IPID Irrigation Efficiency project is replaced by the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project. Construction costs and instream flow benefits will be greater for the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project.

\*Construction costs unavailable for Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project because it is currently in the conceptual stage.

M = million

OFM = Washington State Office of Financial Management

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

In addition to the OFM analysis, biologists with Ecology analyzed the anticipated net increases in wild steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and hatchery fish for the Icicle Creek Reach 2. The number of returning fish was based on several factors, including the anticipated instream flow increases described in Sections 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, and 2.8, and the expected escapement and stock size. The analysis further assumes that the fish would return to their natal streams over a period of 20 years. A per-fish value of \$7,200 was assigned, based on Layton et al.'s research *Valuing Programs to Improve Multi-Species Fisheries* (Layton et al., 1999). As with the results from the OFM 2007 Input/Output Model, the findings presented in Table 4-6 are most useful when considered as the basis for a relative comparison. Additional increases in fish populations beyond those presented in Table 4-6 are anticipated to occur within the Wenatchee River.

	Wild Steelhead	Hatchery Fish	Total Value of Fish Increases	
Alternative 1	50	28	\$561,600	
Alternative 2	54	31	\$612,000	
Alternative 3	49	28	\$554,400	
Alternative 4	51	29	\$576,000	
Alternative 5	69	39	\$777,600	

Table 4-6 Assumed Fish Increases for Each Program Alternative

# 4.24.1 No-action Alternative

Under the No-action Alternative, projects could be developed and executed on their own that would lead to some job creation, labor income, long-term economic impacts, increased housing and growth, changes in land values, and additional property tax revenue. However, there would be no coordinated and integrated effort to ensure that the projects move forward in a well-planned manner. Because implementation of individual projects would be more localized, the socioeconomic benefits are expected to be lower compared to the other Program Alternatives.

# 4.24.2 Alternative 1

Relative to the other Program Alternatives, Alternative 1 would result in the lowest construction costs, job creation, labor income, and long-term economic impact. Job creation and the long-term economic impact reflect the cycles of spending and earning in the economy as the initial construction investment works its way through the economy. Essentially, construction spending provides a jump-start to broader economic growth.

As increased water becomes available for future land development and growth, additional housing is expected to be developed. Alternative 1 ranks in the middle regarding the

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

number of households likely to increase as a result and in the middle with respect to the expected increase in land value and property tax revenue associated with development.

Based on the amount of water made available that would benefit fish, Alternative 1 would result in the second lowest increase in fish.

# 4.24.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 is assumed to have the highest construction costs, and, therefore, is expected to result in the highest job creation, labor income, and long-term economic impact compared to the other Program Alternatives. These results could change once construction costs for Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement can be estimated for Alternatives 4 and 5. Construction costs for that project were not available at the time of this analysis.

Alternative 2 provides for the same increase as Alternative 1 in the number of households likely to be supported by the increase in domestic water supply, and by extension, the same increase in land value and property tax revenue. Both are in the middle range compared to the other Program Alternatives.

The anticipated fish increases are greater than Alternatives 1, 3, and 4, but less than Alternative 5.

# 4.24.4 Alternative 3

Construction costs, job creation, labor income, and long-term economic impact with Alternative 3 are higher than Alternatives 1 and 4, but less than Alternative 2<sup>1</sup> and most likely Alternative 5. The increase in households related to increased domestic water supply and associated increases in land value and property tax revenue are approximately half of what is anticipated with Alternatives 1 and 2. This decline in the number of additional households by comparison is likely due to the fact that Alternative 3 would require adoption of a legislative change to allow for some additional water to be withdrawn to support future growth, meaning water available for future development would be more limited. Because less water is available to meet domestic needs, there would be less growth in the number of households expected under Alternative 3.

The increases in the number of and overall value of fish would be lowest.

# 4.24.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 is assumed to have greater construction costs, and therefore, higher job creation, labor income, and long-term economic impact than Alternative 1, but less than

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> As noted previously, costs associated with Alternative 3 may be less than Alternative 4 after incorporation of construction costs for the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project, which were not available at the time of this analysis.

Alternatives 2, 3, and 5 although it is possible that construction costs and job creation associated with Alternative 4 could be close to the highest overall after incorporation of construction costs for the Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project; however, this information was not available at the time of this analysis. In terms of the domestic water supply, Alternative 4 provides for the greatest increase in households served and the associated increases in land value and property tax overall. It also provides for the third greatest increase in the number and value of fish just below Alternatives 2 and 5.

# 4.24.6 Alternative 5

Although this information was not available at the time this EIS was published, Alternative 5 is expected to have the highest construction costs of all the Program Alternatives because the cost of the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project alone is \$72.5 to \$83.7 million. The higher the costs of construction, the greater the job creation, labor income, and long-term economic impact. Alternative 5 is also expected to result in the greatest increase in fish for the Icicle Reach 2 of all the Program Alternatives.

# 4.25 Environmental Justice

This section considers the potential to disproportionately affect minority and low-income populations, as described in Section 3.25, Environmental Justice, from construction and operation related to the No-action Alternative and Program Alternatives.

Environmental justice impacts occur when significant environmental impacts disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations. To determine the potential for environmental justice impacts, this analysis first assesses the presence of populations or important resources to these populations within the Icicle Creek Watershed project area.

As noted in Section 3.25, Environmental Justice, U.S. Census Bureau data do not indicate the presence of minority or low-income populations in a substantially greater proportion compared to Chelan County or the State of Washington. However, as discussed in Sections 3.21, Cultural Resources; 3.22, Indian Sacred Sites; and 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest, there are important cultural and tribal resources that are especially important resources to the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation and Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation. These Indian tribes are both members of the IWG and preliminary information has been gathered during initial project planning and early coordination with these Indian tribes. Ongoing coordination through the IWG and subsequent project-level permitting and review, including formal environmental justice assessments for any federal actions, would occur through program implementation. Accordingly, the analysis in this section focuses on the potential for the

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Icicle Strategy to result in significant impacts on cultural and tribal resources as discussed in greater detail below.

# 4.25.1 No-action Alternative

# 4.25.1.1 Short-term Impacts

In the short term, environmental justice impacts would occur if construction significantly disturbed cultural or tribal resources. Depending on the extent of ground disturbance, construction activities could damage any archaeological resources or sacred sites that may be present. Construction can also disturb or conflict with ceremonial uses, ITAs, and use of any Usual & Accustomed Areas, including tribal fishing harvest.

Under the No-action Alternative, the greatest potential for environmental justice impacts would be related to projects involving work in areas with high archaeological potential as noted in Section 3.21, Cultural Resources, or within or near waterways in areas that could directly or indirectly conflict with tribal fishing as noted in Section 3.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest.

As noted previously, prior to construction, federal agencies taking action on the projects would be required to ensure compliance with the regulations specific to the protection of ITAs described in Section 1.9, Related Permits, Actions, and Laws. Any impacts to land-based ITAs such as reservation lands or Native Allotments would require review by the BIA. Impacts to resource-based ITAs such as treaty-protected fisheries rights would require negotiation between the Indian tribe and the State of Washington. Projects involving state capital funding would also be required to comply with Governor's Executive Order 05-05, which requires consultation with potentially affected Indian tribes as part of the decision to provide funds.

Compliance could result in the development of mitigation measures to reduce impacts, such as minimizing disruptive activities, implementing timing restrictions on construction activities, and compensating for any impacts that cannot be avoided (Section 4.25.7, Mitigation Measures).

# 4.25.1.2 Long-term Impacts

The greatest potential for environmental justice impacts would occur for any projects resulting in long-term operations and maintenance activities that could conflict with tribal uses, including sacred or ceremonial sites, ITAs, or tribal fishing harvest. These impacts would be primarily related to any new or upgraded facilities, affecting flow changes, or long-term access to fishing areas. Under the No-action Alternative, the projects likely to be implemented are expected to improve aquatic habitat, which would benefit tribal fishing; however, work at the LNFH or any new facilities along Icicle Creek could result in potential long-term conflicts with tribal fishing. As noted previously, compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations would require addressing potential impacts on these resources (Section 4.25.7, Mitigation Measures).

# 4.25.2 Alternative 1

Implementation of Alternative 1 has the potential to result in greater impacts on cultural and tribal resources, and, therefore, environmental justice impacts, compared with the No-action Alternative, because there would be higher likelihood that certain projects would be implemented and the scale of certain efforts would likely be greater. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses tribal resources in general by improving instream flows, improving the sustainability of LNFH, protecting tribal and non-tribal harvest, and enhancing Icicle Creek riparian habitat. The following sections describe the short- and long-term impacts that would occur under Alternative 1.

## 4.25.2.1 Short-term Impacts

Implementation of Alternative 1 would result in an increase in the potential for short-term impacts on cultural and tribal resources compared to the No-action Alternative. Under Alternative 1, there is a moderate to low potential for significant short-term impacts on cultural and tribal resources at Eightmile Lake (primarily associated with changes to the dam structure), at the LNFH, and at other locations, not yet determined, along the lower Icicle Creek. Depending on the specific location for the COIC pump station, potential impacts could also occur along the Wenatchee River.

Depending on the specific location and extent of the activities, construction disturbance in these areas could adversely affect any sacred or ceremonial sites or ITAs if the activities altered important features of these resources or directly disturbed their use. Construction activities within or along the shoreline of Icicle Creek could also alter the quality of fishing habitat, directly harm or disturb fish, or block access to fishing areas.

As noted in Section 1.2, The Icicle Strategy Guiding Principles, the Icicle Strategy would be required to comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on cultural and tribal resources. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for tribal resources to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. With implementation of mitigation as described in Section 4.25.7, Mitigation Measures, the potential for significant environmental justice impacts in the short term would be low.

# 4.25.2.2 Long-term Impacts

Because potential impacts resulting in the direct damage or disturbance of cultural or tribal resources, including sacred sites, ceremonial uses, or ITAs, would largely be addressed during project-level permitting prior to construction, the greatest potential for long-term environmental justice impacts would occur as the result of operation and maintenance activities, including long-term flow changes affecting Icicle Creek, that could adversely affect tribal fishing.

As noted in Section 4.7, Fish, implementation of the projects being considered under Alternative 1 would generally result in beneficial impacts on fish and by extension, tribal fishing; however, there is the potential for some of the projects to result in localized

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

impacts on tribal fishing over the long term. Specifically, operation and maintenance activities at LNFH and the management of releases from the Alpine Lakes by IPID and USFWS could result in changes to aquatic habitat and fishing conditions within lower Icicle Creek over time.

In recognition of these potential impacts, the Icicle Strategy would comply with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on cultural and tribal resources. Additionally, implementation of Alternative 1 includes the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project to ensure that any long-term impacts on tribal fishing are appropriately mitigated. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes is ongoing and the potential for tribal resources to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. With implementation of mitigation as described in Section 4.25.7, Mitigation Measures, the potential for significant environmental justice impacts in the long term would be low.

# 4.25.3 Alternative 2

Alternative 2 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project would be included while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project would not. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses tribal resources in general by improving instream flows, improving the sustainability of LNFH, protecting tribal and non-tribal harvest, and enhancing Icicle Creek riparian habitat. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project and describes the primary differences in impacts from not implementing the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project compared to Alternative 1 and the No-action Alternative.

# 4.25.3.1 Short-term Impacts

The potential impacts on cultural and tribal resources would be similar to those described under Alternative 1 with the exception that there would be no modernization of facilities at Colchuck, Upper Klonaqua, Square, Nada, and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes. Therefore, the relatively low potential to adversely affect cultural or tribal resources at these lakes would not occur. By comparison, Alternative 2 would result in a slightly increased potential for disturbing archaeological resources and possibly tribal fishing along the Wenatchee River. The overall likelihood is considered to be moderate and the degree of the impact would depend on the specific location of the IPID Dryden pump exchange.

Similar to Alternative 1, Alternative 2 would require complying with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on cultural and tribal resources. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes would continue and the potential for tribal resources to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. With implementation of mitigation as described in Section 4.25.7,

Mitigation Measures, the potential for significant environmental justice impacts in the short term would be low.

## 4.25.3.2 Long-term Impacts

Over the long term, the potential for impacts on cultural or tribal resources would be similar to Alternative 1. Under Alternative 2, the majority of the projects are the same with the exception that there would be an additional new facility, the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project, constructed on the Wenatchee River. This would result in a slightly increased potential for long-term impacts on tribal fishing compared to Alternative 1, depending on the specific location of the facilities.

Similar to Alternative 1, Alternative 2 would require complying with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on cultural and tribal resources. Additionally, implementation of Alternative 1 includes the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project to ensure that any long-term impacts on tribal fishing are appropriately mitigated. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes would continue and the potential for tribal resources to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. With implementation of mitigation as described in Section 4.25.7, Mitigation Measures, the potential for significant environmental justice impacts in the long term would be low.

# 4.25.4 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1 with the exception that the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project and the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project would also be included, while the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation and Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Projects would not. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses tribal resources in general by improving instream flows, improving the sustainability of LNFH, protecting tribal and non-tribal harvest, and enhancing Icicle Creek riparian habitat. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project and the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project and describes the primary differences in impacts from not implementing the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation or Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Projects compared to Alternative 1 and the No-action Alternative.

## 4.25.4.1 Short-term Impacts

The potential impacts on cultural and tribal resources at the Alpine Lakes would be lower compared with Alternative 1 because there would no activities proposed at any of the lakes under Alternative 3. Potential impacts along Icicle Creek and the Wenatchee River corridors would generally be the same as Alternative 2 except for a slight potential increase to result in impacts related to construction of the IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project.

## ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Alternative 3 would also be implemented in compliance with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on cultural and tribal resources. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes would continue and the potential for tribal resources to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. With implementation of mitigation as described in Section 4.25.7, Mitigation Measures, the potential for significant environmental justice impacts in the short term would be low.

# 4.25.4.2 Long-term Impacts

Over the long term, the potential for impacts on cultural or tribal resources would be slightly greater compared to Alternative 1. This is because Alternative 3 would require implementing the Legislative Change Creating OCPI Authority for Alternative 3 Project to ensure there was adequate future water for municipal users over the long term. If implemented, this change could result in the withdrawal of additional water from Icicle Creek that could potentially conflict with minimum instream flows, resulting in adverse impacts on aquatic habitat in general, including possible adverse impacts on tribal fishing.

Alternative 3 would also be implemented in compliance with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on cultural and tribal resources. Additionally, implementation of Alternative 1 includes the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project to ensure that any long-term impacts on tribal fishing are appropriately mitigated. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes would continue and the potential for tribal resources to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. With implementation of mitigation as described in Section 4.25.7, Mitigation Measures, the potential for significant environmental justice impacts in the long term would be low.

# 4.25.5 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would result in implementation of many of the same projects included in Alternative 1. The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project would be replaced with the Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement Project, and the Upper Klonaqua Lake and Upper and Lower Snow Lakes Storage Enhancement Projects would be included. Compliance with the Guiding Principles addresses tribal resources in general by improving instream flows, improving the sustainability of LNFH, protecting tribal and non-tribal harvest, and enhancing Icicle Creek riparian habitat. This section describes the specific short- and long-term impacts associated with these projects compared to Alternative 1 and the No-action Alternative.

# 4.25.5.1 Short-term Impacts

The potential for short-term impacts on cultural and tribal resources at the Alpine Lakes would be greater under Alternative 4 compared to Alternative 1. This is because there would be more extensive construction disturbance at Eightmile, Upper Klonaqua, and

Upper and Lower Snow Lakes under this Program Alternative. The potential for disturbance of cultural or tribal resources along Icicle Creek or the Wenatchee River would be the same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 4 would also be implemented in compliance with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on cultural and tribal resources. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes would continue and the potential for tribal resources to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. With implementation of mitigation as described in Section 4.25.7, Mitigation Measures, the potential for significant environmental justice impacts in the short term would be low.

# 4.25.5.2 Long-term Impacts

Over the long term, the potential for impacts on cultural or tribal resources would be similar to Alternative 1. Alternative 4 would also be implemented in compliance with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on cultural and tribal resources. Additionally, implementation of Alternative 1 includes the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project to ensure that any long-term impacts on tribal fishing are appropriately mitigated. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes would continue and the potential for tribal resources to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. With implementation of mitigation as described in Section 4.25.7, Mitigation Measures, the potential for significant environmental justice impacts in the long-term would be low.

# 4.25.6 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 would result in implementation of the same projects as Alternative 1 except instead of the IPID Irrigation Efficiencies, the IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange project would be included.

# 4.25.6.1 Short-term Impacts

## **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

The potential impacts on cultural and tribal resources would be greater compared to those under Alternative 1. This is because Alternative 5 would result in an increased potential for disturbing archaeological resources related to full piping of the IPID conveyance system and at three pump station locations along the Wenatchee River.

Alternative 5 would require compliance with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on cultural and tribal resources. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes would continue and the potential for tribal resources to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. With implementation of mitigation as described in Section 4.25.7, Mitigation Measures, the potential for significant environmental justice impacts in the short term would be low.

# 4.25.6.2 Long-term Impacts

## **IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange**

Over the long term, the potential for impacts on cultural or tribal resources would be similar to Alternative 1. Under Alternative 5, the majority of the projects are the same with the exception that there would be three pump stations constructed on the Wenatchee River and the existing IPID canal delivery system would be fully replaced with a pressurized pipeline. This would result in a slightly increased potential for long-term impacts on tribal fishing compared to Alternative 1, depending on the specific location of the pump stations.

Alternative 5 would require compliance with the Guiding Principles, which include ensuring there are no significant adverse impacts on cultural and tribal resources. Additionally, implementation of Alternative 1 includes the Tribal Fishery Preservation and Enhancement Project to ensure that any long-term impacts on tribal fishing are appropriately mitigated. Continued coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes would continue and the potential for tribal resources to be affected would be addressed during project-level review. With implementation of mitigation as described in Section 4.25.7, Mitigation Measures, the potential for significant environmental justice impacts in the long term would be low.

# 4.25.7 Mitigation Measures

This section describes required permits and approvals that would help to mitigate the potential environmental impacts identified above. Additional mitigation measures are also identified as appropriate.

# 4.25.7.1 Short-term Impacts

Short-term impacts on cultural and tribal resources would be mitigated by meeting the goals of the Guiding Principles, continuing coordination with potentially affected Indian tribes, and complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal regulations and obtaining required project-specific permits and approvals. Common mitigation measures that would protect these resources from short-term impacts are addressed in the following sections:

- Section 4.5, Water Quality
- Section 4.7, Fish
- Section 4.8, Vegetation
- Section 4.9, Wildlife
- Section 4.10, Threatened and Endangered Species
- Section 4.21, Cultural Resources
- Section 4.22, Indian Sacred Sites
- Section 4.23, Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest
### 4.25.7.2 Long-term Impacts

Potential impacts associated with the potential for lasting conflicts or damage to cultural or tribal resources would be addressed prior to construction as noted above. In addition, evaluation and monitoring of the potential impacts to fish and fish habitat related to the management of instream flows would be ongoing. For an additional discussion of how the Icicle Strategy proposes to evaluate these issues over time, see Section 4.7.7, Mitigation Measures in Section 4.7, Fish.

# 4.26 Summary of Impacts and Benefits of the Icicle Strategy by Alternative

## 4.26.1 Short-Term

Construction activities required for many of the project elements comprising the Program Alternatives would cause short-term impacts. These impacts include erosion and sedimentation, construction dewatering, vegetation removal, construction emissions and dust, noise, aesthetic impacts for equipment and stock piles, and traffic delays. Construction may also temporarily block access to areas near construction sites, resulting in temporary disruption to activities in those areas, such as fishing or recreational use. Additionally, other impacts such as increased noise and dust or aesthetic changes might create a disturbance for recreationalists and wilderness users. Noise and vibrations could also temporary disturb fish and wildlife species. Cultural resources could also be disturbed during construction and access to Usual & Accustomed Fishing sites could be temporary restricted, especially for any construction near the plunge pool in front of the LNFH. These access impacts would be temporary and could be minimized by scheduling construction after the fishing season. Table 4-7 provides short-term impacts of implementation for the five Program Alternatives and the No-Action Alternative.

Implementation of the various projects under the Program Alternatives would be phased overtime depending on the design process, environmental review, and available funding. Because of this, construction impacts for various projects under an alternative are not likely to occur at the same time, minimizing the cumulative impact at any given time. Additionally, some project may be phased specifically to reduce recreational, Indian Trust Assets, and Wilderness user impacts.

Many of the projects proposed under the Program Alternatives could advance under the No-action Alternative. Ongoing projects would likely include work at LNFH to implement water re-use, water quality improvements, and groundwater augmentation. Additionally, Fish Screening Compliance, COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange, and some fish passage would likely continue. The construction level, short-term impacts for these project elements would be the same under the Program

#### ICICLE CREEK WATERSHED PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Alternatives and the No-action Alternative. But because fewer projects would likely be implemented, overall construction-related impacts would be lowest under the No-action Alternative compared with other alternatives. IPID and USFWS would likely maintain and upgrade their storage and hatchery facilities under the No-action Alternative, and construction level impacts could be similar to those discussed in the Program Alternatives.

The short-term impacts identified for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 5 are similar because they contain many of the same projects. The most significant difference is there would be fewer construction-related impacts in the ALWA under Alternative 2, 3, and 5 and more along the Wenatchee River corridor. This could lead to increased impacts to fish and shorelines with the construction of a Wenatchee River pump stations under Alternative 2, 3, and 5, but fewer impacts to other threatened and endangered species and wilderness users. Alternative 3 would have no construction-related short-term impacts in the ALWA as part of the Icicle Strategy above the No-action Alternative, with less resiliency to climate change.

Alternative 4 would have the greatest construction impacts because it is made up of the most projects. In addition to the short-term impacts identified for Alternative 1 in common with Alternative 4, there would be additional impacts from building two additional storage enhancement projects, and expending storage at Eightmile Lake. In addition to Alternative 4 having more projects, the scale of the storage projects is relatively larger than the scale of other water development projects proposed in Alternative 1.

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Earth	Construction-related erosion and sedimentation from ongoing projects.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1, greater in Wenatchee corridor
Surface Water Resources	Use of cofferdams and dewatering during construction of on-going project.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1 greater in Wenatchee corridor
Groundwater Resources	Dewatering impacts during construction of ongoing projects.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1 greater in Wenatchee corridor
Water Quality	Construction of ongoing projects could result in temporary water quality impacts. Impacts include risk of erosion and contamination from construction activities.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1 greater in Wenatchee corridor
Water Use	Potential construction related impacts to surface water diversions. Work would be coordinated to minimize impacts.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1 greater in Wenatchee corridor

Table 4-7 Summary of Short-Term Impacts

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Fish	Temporary habitat disturbance, construction-related impacts.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1, greater in Wenatchee corridor
Vegetation	Some vegetation removal from construction of ongoing projects.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1, greater in Wenatchee corridor
Wildlife	Temporary disruption of habitat during construction of ongoing projects.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1, greater in Wenatchee corridor
Threatened and Endangered Species	Temporary disruption of habitat during construction from noise and disturbance. Construction would generally occur outside breeding season, reducing impacts.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1, greater in Wenatchee corridor
Aesthetics	Construction activities and equipment of ongoing projects would generally create impacts on visual settings.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1, greater in Wenatchee corridor
Air Quality	Construction related emissions from ongoing projects including transportation and use of heavy equipment.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1, greater in Wenatchee corridor

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Climate Change	Minor amounts of greenhouse gas emissions related to construction of ongoing projects.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Noise	Increased noise from construction of ongoing projects.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Recreation	Access restriction, nuisance noise, and aesthetics impacts during construction of ongoing projects.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Land Use	Temporary access restrictions during construction of ongoing projects. Private owner access would be maintained.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Wilderness Area	Ongoing projects would likely be outside ALWA. No wilderness impacts are anticipated.	Temporary impacts to wilderness character related to construction activities include noise, construction equipment transport and staging, and presence and housing of construction workers.	Less than Alternative 1	Projects would likely be outside ALWA. No wilderness impacts are anticipated.	Greater than Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Shorelines	Increased potential for shoreline erosion related to ground disturbing activities.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Utilities	Potential temporary disruption in water service related to instream construction activities near diversions.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Transportation	Traffic delays associated with equipment transport and construction of ongoing projects. Least number of helicopter trips during construction.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action. Several helicopter trips for transporting construction equipment.	Similar to Alternative 1 Less than Alternative 1.	Less than Alternative 1 Similar to the No- action Alternative.	Greater than Alternative 1 More than Alterative 1.	Greater than Alternative 1 Similar to Alternative 1.
Cultural Resources	Ground disturbing activities and construction work on culturally significant structures could result in impacts. Compliance with regulations and coordination with affected tribes would ensure any potential issues and mitigation measures would be addressed prior to construction.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Resources	No-Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Indian Sacred Sites	Ground disturbing activities would have the potential to impact sacred sites. Ongoing coordination with potentially affected tribes and compliance with regulations would ensure any potential issues would be addressed prior to construction.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest	Potential to temporarily block access to Usual & Accustomed fishing areas.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Socioeconomics	Increased construction jobs from ongoing projects. Impacts would be smallest of all alternatives because fewer projects would be constructed.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1

# 4.26.2 Long-Term

Implementation of the Icicle Strategy would provide benefit to Icicle Creek Subbasin by meeting the Guiding Principles. The Guiding Principles, which are discussed in detail in Section 1.2, The Icicle Strategy Guiding Principles, of this document, include improved instream flows, improved sustainability of LNFH, protection of the tribal and non-tribal fish harvest, improved domestic supply, improved agricultural reliability, enhancement of Icicle Creek habitat, and compliance with state and federal laws and Wilderness Acts. All Program Alternatives would meet the Guiding Principles and provide these benefits; although there are important differences, which are summarized below. Additionally, all the Program Alternatives would increase resiliency to stream impacts resulting from climate change. Table 4-8 provides an overview of long-term impacts for each Program Alternative and the No-action Alternative.

The No-action Alternative would not meet the goals and provide the benefits prescribed in the Guiding Principles, although some instream flow, LNFH, fish passage, and screening improvements would be made. Under the No-action Alternative, ongoing projects could increase streamflow by approximately 32 cfs, with localized benefit in water quality, fish habitat, and improved riparian vegetation. Impacts of the No-action Alternative would include decreased ability to respond to climate change and conflict between water users would not be resolved. Under the No-action Alternative, IPID would still manage, operate, and repair their dam sites, so long-term impacts identified by these activities would still likely occur under the No-action Alternative.

Alternative 1 would provide 88 cfs of instream flow benefit and meet all the Guiding Principles. Additionally, Alternative 1 would allow flexibility in flow management and allow the instream flow goal of 100 cfs to be met in 2080 under low, medium, and high climate change scenarios. Additionally, under Alternative 1 there would be net-benefit water quality improvements, increased available water for out-of-stream users, improved habitat benefit for fish and wildlife, and improved water-based recreational opportunities. Impacts of Alternative 1 would include noise disturbance resulting from the operation of a pump station, and aesthetic impacts resulting from increased draw down at Eightmile Lake and installation of modernized equipment in the ALWA, which could be minimized by construction design.

Alternative 2 would provide 83 cfs of instream flow benefit and meet all the Guiding Principles. Additionally, Alternative 2 would allow the instream flow goal of 100 cfs to be met in 2080 under low and medium climate change scenarios, but not under a high climate change scenario. Many of the net benefits to water quality, water use, habitat, and recreation that would exist under Alternative 1 would also exist under Alternative 2 because of the commonality of projects. Additionally, Alternative 2 would have many of the same impacts as Alternative 1. The impact of Alternative 2 compared to Alternative 1 is reduced flexibility in flow management that would result from not implementing the Alpine Lake Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project, and greater longterm reliance on power supplies over gravity diversions.

Alternative 3 would provide 70 cfs of instream flow benefit and meet all the Guiding Principles. Many of the net benefits to water quality, water use, habitat, and recreation that would exist under Alternative 1 would also exist under Alternative 3 because many projects are common to both alternatives. In addition, many of the impacts under Alternative 1 would also occur under Alternative 3. The primary impacts of Alternative 3 compared to Alternative 1 would be less resiliency to climate change and no flexibility in flow management, and greater long-term reliance on power supplies over gravity diversions. Alternative 3 would have less long-term recreation, aesthetics, and Wilderness impacts because Alpine Lake Automation would not be constructed as part of the Icicle Strategy.

Alternative 4 would provide 131 cfs of instream flow benefit and meet all the Guiding Principles. Alternative 1 would allow flexibility in flow management and allow the instream flow goal of 100 cfs to be met in 2080 under low, medium, and high climate change scenarios. As with other alternatives, there would also be net benefits to water quantity, water use, and water-based recreation. Alternative 4 would have the greatest impact on wilderness character and recreation in the Wilderness Area. This is because more infrastructure would be built or expanded in the Wilderness Area. Additionally, this would have an increased impact on shoreline vegetation and habitat.

Alternative 5 would provide 195 cfs of instream flow benefit and meet all the Guiding Principles. Additionally, Alternative 5 would allow the instream flow goal of 100 cfs to be met in 2080 under low, medium, and high climate change scenarios. Many of the net benefits to water quality, water use, habitat, and recreation that would exist under Alternative 1 would also exist under Alternative 5 because of the commonality of projects. Additionally, Alternative 5 would have many of the same impacts as Alternative 1, but have greater long-term reliance on power supplies over gravity diversions.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Table 4-8
Summary of Long-Term Impacts

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Earth	Some potential for erosion, and sediment transport resulting from long- term operation of ongoing projects. These impacts are expected to be minor.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Surface Water Resources	Ongoing projects would likely increase stream flow by 20 to 30 cfs. Benefits would be localized.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action. Would increase instream flow by 88 cfs. Increases expected when flow is naturally at its lowest. Flexibility in flow management to respond to low-flow conditions.	Similar to Alternative 1. Would increase instream flow by 83 cfs. Increases expected when flow is naturally at its lowest.	Less than Alternative 1. Would increase instream flow by 70 cfs. Benefits would not be as adaptable to low flows.	Greater than Alternative 1. Would increase instream flow by 131 cfs. Increases expected when flow naturally at its lowest. Flexibility in flow management to respond to low-flow conditions.	Greater than Alternative 1. Would increase stream flow by 195 cfs. Increases expected when flow is naturally at its lowest.
Groundwater Resources	Groundwater recharge near Icicle Creek is expected to decrease compared to other alternatives. Groundwater recharge could increase in some areas compared with other alternatives because some conservation projects (piping canals or fix leaky pipes) would not be implemented.	Increased groundwater use; increased groundwater recharge near lcicle Creek; reduced groundwater recharge resulting from conservation projects.	Similar to Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Water Quality	Localized benefits from ongoing water quantity and quality improvements. Expected benefits include increased dissolved oxygen and cooler temperatures.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Similar to Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1
Water Use	Water use would be relatively unchanged. Localized instream flow benefit from ongoing conservation projects. No water made available for projected domestic growth.	Increased water available for instream and out-of- stream uses. Water available to meet projected domestic growth.	Similar to Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1
Fish	Ongoing projects could provide localized habitat and flow improvements. However, critical low-flow periods would likely persist in some reaches, which would continue to impact habitat availability and passage.	Increased stream flow, passage improvements, and habitat improvements. Flow releases from Alpine Lakes would be managed to provide greatest fisheries benefit and minimize any impacts.	Similar to Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1. Less instream flow benefit, OCPI needed, and benefits would not be as adaptable to low flows.	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater benefits than Alternative 1 through increased instream flow

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Resources	No-Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
	Alternative					
Vegetation	Localized benefits to riparian vegetation from ongoing projects.	Improvements to riparian habitat resulting from increased flows and riparian habitat restoration efforts. Relatively small negative impacts from increased Eightmile Lake level; however, this is within historical range. Installation of pump station may also have small impacts.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less benefit to riparian vegetation in Icicle Creek than Alternative 1. Impacts associated with Eightmile Lake may not occur under this alternative.	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater benefits than Alternative 1 through increased instream flow improving vegetation
Wildlife	Largely beneficial for wildlife dependent on lcicle Creek because ongoing projects would seek to improve instream flows during low- flow season. Benefit is more limited than under other alternatives. Impacts are less than significant.	Similar but greater benefits compared to No-action. Greater impacts, although impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less benefit than Alternative 1. Impacts to wildlife greater than Alternative 1.	Greater benefits and impacts than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Resources	No-Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Threatened and Endangered Species	Atternative Ongoing projects would provide localized habitat and flow improvements.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-Action. Overall positive impacts from habitat improvements. Minor changes in shoreline associated with Eightmile project and new pump station not anticipated to impact threatened and endangered	Similar to Alternative 1	Less habitat improvement than Alternative 1, which is less beneficial to aquatic threatened and endangered species. Less terrestrial habitat impacts Alternative 1.	Greater instream habitat improvement than Alternative 1. Greater terrestrial habitat impacts than Alternative 1.	Similar to Alternative 1
Aesthetics	Anticipated to be largely beneficial for aesthetics because the projects likely to be implemented are expected to improve habitat and upgrade aging and degraded infrastructure.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-Action. Potential visual impacts from pump station project, which would be mitigated. Less than significant impacts of increased lake bed exposure.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Air Quality	No significant long - term impacts identified	No significant long - term impacts identified	No significant long - term impacts identified. Greater impacts than Alternative 1 due to increased power reliance.	No significant long - term impacts identified. Greater impacts than Alternative 1 due to increased power reliance.	No significant long - term impacts identified. Similar to Alternative 1.	No significant long - term impacts identified. Greater impacts than Alternative 1 due to increased power reliance.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Resources	No-Action	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Climate Change	Water supply shortages and critically low stream flow conditions would likely become worse. Limited ability to respond to climate change- induced impacts.	Increased instream flow and water supplies. Ability to adaptively manage flow to respond to impacts of climate change. Meets 100cfs streamflow goals in 2080 under low, medium, and high climate change scenarios.	Greater impacts than Alternative 1 due to increased power reliance.	Greater impacts than Alternative 1 due to increased power reliance.	Similar to than Alternative 1	Greater impacts than Alternative 1 due to increased power reliance.
Noise	Increased noise related to pump station operation. Construction measures would ensure compliance with Chapter 137-60 WAC.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action.	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1
Recreation	Increased streamflow resulting from implementation of ongoing projects expected to improve water-based recreation.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action. Increased lake levels may have some impacts on current location of campsites and trails at Eightmile Lake. However, these impacts are expected to be limited because lake level increase would be modest.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater benefits than Alternative 1 from increased flow; similar impacts for other recreation

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Land Use	Easements or property acquisition could be required for some ongoing projects. Long-term impacts on current land use trends. Development of up to 56.1 acres.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No-action. Potential land use change from market reallocation of water and increased water for domestic supply. Conversion of some upland areas from private to public ownership.	Similar to Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1
Wilderness Area	Ongoing projects would likely be outside ALWA. No wilderness impacts are anticipated. Maintenance activities by IPID and USFWS in ALWA would remain unchanged.	Long-term impacts to wilderness character would include equipment related to projects in ALWA (i.e. solar panels). Concealing equipment and implementing architectural style to complement the area would minimize impacts.	Similar to Alternative 1	Similar to No Action.	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1
Shorelines	Long-term impacts on shorelines would likely result from the COIC project, but are anticipated to be less than significant. These impacts would be mitigated by complying with the terms and conditions of local, state, and federal regulations.	Similar but greater impacts compared to No Action. Increased drawdown range at Eightmile lake is expected to impact shorelines, but impacts would be less than significant compared to current conditions.	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1 Impacts from pump stations will be greater, however there would be no impact resulting from changes to drawdown range at Eightmile Lake.	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Utilities	No anticipated impacts on water- based utilities associated with this project. Power demand is not expected to significantly increase because of ongoing projects.	Increased water service potential related to increased domestic supply. Power demand is not expected to significantly increase because of projects.	Greater than Alternative 1 because of long- term power reliance.	Greater than Alternative 1 because of long- term power reliance.	Greater than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1 because of long- term power reliance.
Transportation	No long-term impacts to transportation anticipated.	Reduced helicopter supported transport in the Wilderness Area related to IPID maintenance activities	No long-term impacts to transportation anticipated.	No long-term impacts to transportation anticipated.	Similar to Alternative 1	No long-term impacts to transportation anticipated. Similar to Alternative 1
Cultural Resources	For all projects, coordination with DAHP and mitigation measures would be required.	Alpine Lakes dams are eligible for listing under the National Register of Historic Places. Mitigation measures would be required to avoid significant adverse impacts. For all projects, coordination with DAHP and mitigation measures would be required.	Similar to Alternative 1	Less than Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1

# CHAPTER 4.0 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Resources	No-Action Alternative	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Indian Sacred Sites	No expected adverse impacts to Indian Sacred Sites.	Ongoing coordination with potentially affected tribes and compliance with regulations would ensure any potential issues would be addressed prior to construction.	Similar to Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1	Greater than Alternative 1	Similar to Alternative 1
Indian Trust Assets and Fishing Harvest	No significant long- term impacts as required by Guiding Principles.	No significant long- term impacts as required by Guiding Principles	No significant long- term impacts as required by Guiding Principles	No significant long- term impacts as required by Guiding Principles	No significant long- term impacts as required by Guiding Principles	No significant long- term impacts as required by Guiding Principles
Socioeconomics	Assumed lowest socioeconomic benefits because fewer projects would be implemented.	Lowest construction costs, job creation, long-term economic benefit, and second- lowest assumed fish increases of Program Alternatives	Highest construction costs, job creation, and long-term economic benefit of Program Alternatives. Second highest assumed fish increases.	Higher construction jobs and long-term economic benefit than Alternatives 1 and 4. Lowest assumed fish increases.	Higher construction jobs and long-term economic benefit than Alternative 1. third highest assumed fish increases.	Lowest construction costs, job creation, and long-term economic benefit of Program Alternatives. Highest assumed fish increases.
Environmental Justice	Ongoing projects are not expected to disproportionately impact minority or low-income communities.	Projects are not expected to disproportionately impact minority or low-income communities.	Projects are not expected to disproportionately impact minority or low-income communities.	Projects are not expected to disproportionately impact minority or low-income communities.	Projects are not expected to disproportionately impact minority or low-income communities.	Projects are not expected to disproportionately impact minority or low-income communities.

# 4.27 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts are the sum of incremental effects of an action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. These impacts can be individually minor, but collectively significant impacts. To a degree, many of the cumulative impacts are discussed throughout this chapter are inherently cumulative because certain actions anticipated to continue into the future (conservation actions) are part of the impact analysis. Generally, an impact can be considered cumulative if the impacts of various actions occur at the same place, impacts to a specific resource are similar in nature, and impacts are long-term. This section highlights the major cumulative impacts that could result from the implementation of the Alternatives.

## 4.27.1 Past Actions

Since the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century logging, agricultural, and residential development altered the Icicle Creek Subbasin through the installation of dams on the Wenatchee (Lamb-Davis mill dam) and diversions on Icicle Creek. This created passage barriers, decreased flows, changed in stream morphology and floodplain function, water quality, and overall instream habitat degradation. The construction of LNFH in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century and continued development have exacerbated these issues and have led to conflict of instream and out-of-stream water use.

In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, seven lakes in the upper reaches of the watershed were altered with the installation of dams at their outlet. This resulted in water storage that has been used for irrigation and fish hatchery water supplies. The installation of these dams resulted in the flooding of some shoreline habitat and riparian area, which is regularly filled, released, and inundated each calendar year.

## 4.27.2 Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions

Present and reasonably foreseeable future actions that are anticipated in the project area that are relevant to the Icicle Strategy includes:

- New residential and commercial development. Ongoing residential and commercial development in the Icicle Creek Subbasin and Leavenworth area, which has been planned for as part of regional land use planning, would be facilitated by improvements in water supply that would occur under the Alternatives.
- Changes in agricultural crops. Agricultural development is not expected to increase in the project area, as there will be no increased irrigation acreage made available under the Icicle Strategy. However, the Alternatives would increase the

reliability of water supplies, which could lead to changes in crop type and irrigation application methodologies.

- Changes in precipitation patterns resulting from climatic changes. Climate Change is predicated to increase temperatures and change the patterns of precipitation in the Icicle Creek Subbasin. This is expected to shift the hydrograph so peak flows occur earlier in the year, with low flow periods spanning more of the summer months. These changes in streamflow are expected to impact habitat, water quality, water supply, and fish passage.
- Hatchery improvements. Improvements are planned at the LNFH and associated lakes, including routine maintenance activities, the Snow Lake Valve Replacement Project, and compliance activities under the Federal LNFH BiOp.
- IPID improvements. IPID plans improvements as outlined in its Irrigation Comprehensive Plan, which include ongoing operation and maintenance of all its infrastructure, including associated dams at the Alpine Lakes.
- Other habitat and conservation activities. Salmon recovery activities are ongoing in the area that include an annual funding cycle from multiple entities that fund construction-related projects to improve passage, water quality, habitat, and instream flow.
- City of Leavenworth activities. The City plans for municipal growth and infrastructure projects in the area as part of land use and water system planning updates that result in construction-related projects.

# 4.27.3 Cumulative Impacts of the Alternatives

Overall, the cumulative effect of the Icicle Strategy is expected to be beneficial. The Icicle Strategy is expected to provide benefit to the project area, as laid out in the Guiding Principles. The alternatives are intended to substantially improve low flow conditions, aquatic habitat, and water supply in the project area. The integrated planning approach developed for the Icicle Strategy is intended to improve water resources and the riverine ecosystem on a watershed scale. While all Program Alternatives are intended to improve streamflow, habitat, and supply issues in the project area, the cumulative impacts vary based between Alternatives.

Overall, cumulative impacts from implementing the Icicle Strategy are expected to be small. Project construction footprints are small, and generally in areas separated by great distances. Project pairing and project sequencing is planned by the co-leads with advice from the IWG to reduce temporal overlaps that could lead to cumulative impacts. Where project construction efforts can be combined, this may also reduce cumulative impacts.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### 4.27.3.1 Alternative 1 (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternative 1, streamflow in lower Icicle Creek is anticipated to increase by 88 cfs. There would also be flow increases in other portions of Icicle Creek and several tributaries. This Alternative is expected to decrease the potential for adverse impacts from low flow, passage barriers, changes in stream morphology and floodplain function, water quality, and overall instream habitat degradation to accumulate and contribute to conditions that have negatively affected water resources in the project area.

Impacts of past actions in the ALWA would continue. Under Alternative 1, reoperation and restoration of storage would result in moderate, but less than significant impacts to baseline conditions. An additional 3.6 acres of lands would be inundated, but these lands had been inundated in the recent past. Mitigation measures would minimize impacts to aesthetics and wilderness character, and conservation acquisitions would occur. It is anticipated that after the initial construction phase, helicopter transport and annual operation trips would be less than current conditions under this alternative.

Improved water supply would lead to continued, ongoing residential and commercial development in the Icicle Creek Subbasin and Leavenworth area, which has been planned for as part of regional land use planning. This development could increase impacts on habitat that have resulted from past development. However, current regulations and overall instream flow benefit would minimize these impacts.

Agricultural development is not expected to increase in the project area, as there would be no increased irrigation acreage made available under the Icicle Strategy. However, Alternative 1 would increase the reliability of water supplies, which could lead to changes in crops and irrigation application methodologies. This is not expected to create cumulative impacts based on past, present, and foreseeable future actions.

The impacts of instream flow benefit would improve adaptability to climate change within the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Additionally, under this alternative there would be flexibility to manage flow based on conditions in the creek, ameliorating many of the flow impacts that are expected to result from climate change.

#### 4.27.3.2 Alternative 2

The cumulative impacts to surface water under Alternative 2 is less than under Alternative 1. Under this alternative, streamflow in lower Icicle Creek is anticipated to increase by 83 cfs. There would also be flow increases in other portions of Icicle Creek and several tributaries. This Alternative is expected to decrease the potential for adverse impacts from low flow, passage barriers, changes in stream morphology and floodplain function, water quality, and overall instream habitat degradation to accumulate and contribute to conditions that have negatively affected water resources in the project area.

Impacts of past action in the ALWA would continue. An additional 3.6 acres of lands would be inundated, but these lands had been inundated in the recent past. Mitigation measures would minimize impacts to aesthetics and wilderness character, and

conservation acquisitions would occur. It is anticipated that after the initial construction phase, helicopter transport and annual operation trips would be the same or less than current conditions under this alternative.

Improved water supply would lead to continued, ongoing residential and commercial development in the Icicle Creek Subbasin and Leavenworth area, which has been planned for as part of regional land use planning. This development could increase impacts on habitat that have resulted from past development. However, current regulations and overall instream flow benefit would minimize these impacts.

Agricultural development is not expected to increase in the project area, as there would be no increased irrigation acreage made available under the Icicle Strategy. However, the Program Alternatives would increase the reliability of water supplies, which could lead to crop changes and irrigation application methodologies. This is not expected to create cumulative impacts based on past, current, and foreseeable future actions.

The impacts of instream flow benefit would improve adaptability to climate change within the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Additionally, under this alternative there would be flexibility to manage flow based on conditions in the creek, ameliorating many of the flow impacts that are expected to result from climate change.

### 4.27.3.3 Alternative 3

The cumulative impacts to surface water under Alternative 3 would be less than under any other Program Alternative. Under this alternative, streamflow in lower Icicle Creek is anticipated to increase by 70 cfs. This Alternative is expected to decrease the potential for adverse impacts from low flow, passage barriers, changes in stream morphology and floodplain function, water quality, and overall instream habitat degradation to accumulate and contribute to conditions that have negatively affected water resources in the project area.

Impacts of past action in the ALWA would continue. Helicopter transport and annual operation trips would remain the same as current conditions under this alternative.

Improved water supply would lead to continued, ongoing residential and commercial development in the Icicle Creek Subbasin and Leavenworth area, which has been planned for as part of regional land use planning. This development could increase impacts on habitat that have resulted from past development. Current regulations would minimize potential impacts to riparian and floodplain habitat. However, under this alternative flow benefits would not be perfectly matched with increased domestic use. This, when considered with past impacts, could decrease streamflow during critical low-flow periods, decrease water quality metrics such as dissolved oxygen and temperatures, and increase passage issues in Icicle Creek.

Agricultural development is not expected to increase in the project area, as there would be no increased irrigation acreage made available under the Icicle Strategy. However, the

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Program Alternatives would increase the reliability of water supplies, which could lead to crop changes and irrigation application methodologies. This is not expected to create cumulative impacts based on past, current, and foreseeable future actions.

The impacts of instream flow benefit would improve adaptability to climate change within the Icicle Creek Subbasin.

#### 4.27.3.4 Alternative 4

Under this alternative, streamflow in lower Icicle Creek is anticipated to increase by 131 cfs. There would also be flow increases in other portions of Icicle Creek and several tributaries. This Alternative is expected to decrease the potential for adverse impacts from low flow, passage barriers, changes in stream morphology and floodplain function, water quality, and overall instream habitat degradation to accumulate and contribute to conditions that have negatively affected water resources in the project area.

Impacts of past action in the ALWA would continue and likely increase. Under Alternative 4, reoperation and modification of storage would result in impacts to baseline conditions. An additional 13.6 acres of lands would be inundated. Mitigation measures would minimize impacts to aesthetics and wilderness character, and conservation acquisitions would occur. It is anticipated that after the initial construction phase, helicopter transport and annual operations trips would be less than current conditions under this alternative.

Improved water supply would lead to continued, ongoing residential and commercial development in the Icicle Creek Subbasin and Leavenworth area, which has been planned for as part of regional land use planning. This development could increase impacts on habitat that have resulted from past development. However, current regulations and overall instream flow benefit would minimize these impacts.

Agricultural development is not expected to increase in the project area, as there would be no increased irrigation acreage made available under the Icicle Strategy. However, the Program Alternatives would increase the reliability of water supplies, which could lead to crop changes and irrigation application methodologies. This is not expected to create cumulative impacts based on past, current, and foreseeable future actions.

The impacts of instream flow benefit would improve adaptability to climate change within the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Additionally, under this alternative there would be flexibility to manage flow based on conditions in the creek, ameliorating many of the flow impacts that are expected to result from climate change.

#### 4.27.3.5 Alternative 5

The cumulative impacts to surface water under Alternative 5 is greater than under Alternative 1. Under this alternative, streamflow in lower Icicle Creek is anticipated to increase by 195 cfs. There would also be flow increases in other portions of Icicle Creek and several tributaries. This Alternative is expected to decrease the potential for adverse impacts from low flow, passage barriers, changes in stream morphology and floodplain function, water quality, and overall instream habitat degradation to accumulate and contribute to conditions that have negatively affected water resources in the project area.

Impacts of past action in the ALWA would continue. Under Alternative 1, reoperation and restoration of storage would result in moderate, but less than significant impacts to baseline conditions. An additional 3.6 acres of lands would be inundated, but these lands had been inundated in the recent past. Mitigation measures would minimize impacts to aesthetics and wilderness character, and conservation acquisitions would occur. It is anticipated that after the initial construction phase, helicopter transport and annual operations trips would be less than current conditions under this alternative.

Improved water supply would lead to continued, ongoing residential and commercial development in the Icicle Creek Subbasin and Leavenworth area, which has been planned for as part of regional land use planning. This development could increase impacts on habitat that have resulted from past development. However, current regulations and overall instream flow benefit would minimize these impacts.

Agricultural development is not expected to increase in the project area, as there would be no increased irrigation acreage made available under the Icicle Strategy. However, the Program Alternatives would increase the reliability of water supplies, which could lead to crop changes and irrigation application methodologies. This is not expected to create cumulative impacts based on past, current, and foreseeable future actions.

The impacts of instream flow benefit would improve adaptability to climate change within the Icicle Creek Subbasin. Additionally, under this alternative there would be flexibility to manage flow based on conditions in the creek, ameliorating many of the flow impacts that are expected to result from climate change.

# 4.28 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Significant unavoidable adverse impacts are generally considered to be impacts that remain more than moderate after mitigation. Potentially significant impacts were identified for several resources in Chapter 4. Many of these impacts are related to short-term construction activities, although some long-term impacts were identified. With mitigation measures, such as compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations and the use of BMPs, most impacts would likely be less than moderate after mitigation. The following sections summarize impacts and mitigation measures.

# 4.28.1 Earth, Surface Water, Water Quality, Shorelines, and Fish

The potential for increased erosion and sedimentation resulting from increased stream flow was identified as a potential impact. However, this increased potential for erosion and sedimentation is expected to be non-significant given that increased flows would remain within the natural flow range. The potential for occurrence of these impacts would be mitigated by following the required regulatory permits for construction and operation of projects. Additional impacts include fish and redds stranding associated with releases from the Alpine Lakes. Alpine Lakes releases could be timed and managed to minimize any concerns of water quality and fish habitat impacts. Mitigation measures are expected to result in impacts being less than moderately significant.

Benefits to vegetation, riparian habitat, floodplain function, and the riverine ecosystem are anticipated to counteract these impacts. The primary long-term impact associated with the Program Alternatives is increased flow, habitat, and improved water quality.

# 4.28.2 Aesthetics, Recreation, and Wilderness

Potential impacts to aesthetics could result from construction of the COIC and the IPID pump stations if the COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange, IPID Dryden Pump Exchange Project, or IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project are implemented. The COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange Project is included in all Program Alternatives. The IPID Dryden Pump Exchanges are included in Alternative 2, 3, and 5. Potential impacts could be minimized based on siting or use of vegetation screening.

Aesthetic impacts are also possible under the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project. This project is included in Alternative 1, Alternative 4, and Alternative 5. The greatest potential long-term impact is from new equipment installed to automate lake releases. This equipment also has the potential to impact wilderness character. Designing structures to blend into the natural environment and using local construction materials can minimize these impacts. Mitigation measures are expected to result in impacts being less than moderately significant.

The Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration Project also has the potential to create visual impacts. This project is proposed under Alternative 1, 2, and 5. One potential impact is the dam replacement structure. This also has the potential to impact wilderness character. Involving an architect in the design of the facility to ensure it matches the look of the current dam structure and blends into the natural environment would help minimize this impact. The increase in lake level also has the potential to impact user experience at Eightmile Lake. However, with the modest rise in lake level, this impact would be minor. Additionally, this condition existed in the past, as recently as the 1990's. Mitigation measures are expected to result in impacts being less than moderately significant.

Storage enhancement projects proposed under Alternative 4 have the potential to impact aesthetics, wilderness character, and recreation. These impacts and specific mitigation measures would be addressed in project-level environmental review.

While impacts to wilderness character is a controversial issue, this analysis found that long-term impacts to wilderness character can be mitigated through construction techniques and timing/management of draw down at the Alpine Lakes. Additionally, benefits to wilderness character would result from fewer maintenance trips and reduced helicopter use within the ALWA.

# 4.28.3 Land Use

All land acquisitions or easements for projects proposed in the Program Alternatives would need to provide appropriate compensation in accordance with applicable state or federal regulations. Any land acquired under the Habitat Protection and Enhancement Project, which is included in all Program Alternatives, would require a willing seller.

Residential development impacts of the No-action alternative would likely be on the order of 56.1 acres of impervious surface at a minimum. It may be larger or smaller depending on the outcome of the City of Leavenworth and Ecology water right litigation. Residential development impacts of the action alternatives would increase to 264.9 acres of impervious surface because more domestic water supply would be made available. Mitigation measures are expected to result in impacts being less than moderately significant.

# 4.28.4 Climate Change

Changes in stream flow and water availability caused by climate change would constrain instream and out-of-stream uses. The Program Alternatives would provide for increased stream flow and the flexibility to adaptively manage flow in response to conditions. Mitigation measures are expected to result in impacts being less than moderately significant.

# 4.28.5 Cultural Resources

Four of the dams and water release structures at the Alpine Lakes are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. To reduce cultural resources impacts associated with the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation Project and the Eightmile Storage Restoration Project, coordination with DAHP would occur to identify appropriate mitigation. With implementation of mitigation, these projects are not anticipated to result in any significant impacts on cultural resources. Mitigation measures might include maintaining some historical infrastructure and ensuring structure design is consistent with the historical structures. Mitigation measures are expected to result in impacts being less than moderately significant.

For all projects that involve ground disturbance, additional cultural resource review would be required once specific locations for project elements are identified.

Coordination with affected tribes and DAHP would help minimize any potential impacts. Prior to construction, any potential long-term impacts affecting cultural resources would be addressed.

# 4.29 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources

This section discusses the permanent loss of or commitment of resources that would be associated with the Program Alternatives. Irretrievable and irreversible commitments are the use or removal of a resource (including time and money spent), that cannot be recovered. These commitments often apply to nonrenewable resources.

For the Program Alternatives, irretrievable commitments would include time and money. Additionally, a small amount of land that was previously submerged would be submerged again under Alternative 1, 2, and 5, and additional lands would be submerged under Alternative 4. Table 4-9 provides a summary of irreversible and irretrievable commitments associated with building the Program Alternatives.

	Direct Construction Costs (millions)	Submerged Lands (acres)
Alternative 1	\$82.0	3.6
Alternative 2	\$91.4	3.6
Alternative 3	\$89.0	0
Alternative 4	\$87.8 +	> 13.6
Alternative 5	\$177.3	3.6

 Table 4-9

 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments

Notes: Costs include 25-percent contingency. An additional 25-percent contingency was added for all projects in the wilderness area. Construction costs for Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement Project unknown at this time

In addition to the resources described in Table 4-9, Program Alternatives that result in non-wilderness uses within he ALWA has the potential to cause irretrievable commitments to wildness resources. Alternative 1, 2 and 5 include changes to already occurring or historical uses within the ALWA. Alternative 4 calls for expanded storage within the ALWA.

Each Program Alternative also includes irreversible commitments of water, soil, rock, and energy for construction of projects.

# 4.30 Environmental Commitments

Environmental commitments are measures or practices to reduce or avoid adverse effects resulting from project operations (long-term impacts). The co-leads would have the primary responsibility to ensure these met if an action is implemented. The project elements proposed in the Program Alternatives are at various stages in the planning process, so the detail of specific mitigation measures varies. Additional measures would be developed during project-level environmental review if needed. The following sections summarize major environmental commitments for the Icicle Strategy.

# 4.30.1 Earth, Surface Water, Water Quality, Shorelines, & Fish

Impacts to these resources are generally mitigated for through applicable Federal, State, and local environmental review and permitting processes. In most cases, impacts would be mitigated by following the required regulatory permits for the construction and operation of projects.

Construction facilities in accordance with all applicable design requirements, and monitoring to ensure that potential impacts do not develop during operations would minimize potential earth impacts. Dam safety permits and inspection and monitoring requirements would identify any emerging long-term issues with water storage facilities

Table 5-2 provides a list of all applicable permits for each project considered in the Program Alternatives.

## 4.30.2 Aesthetics, Recreation, and Wilderness

Involving an architect in the design of facilities would ensure they meet management objects and minimize potential impacts on aesthetics and wilderness character. Coordination and consultation with the USFS, would limit impacts on recreation and wilderness character. Projects that require a special use permit issued by the USFS may also require additional measures to project aesthetics, recreation, and wilderness character. A minimum tools analysis would be done to minimize impacts during project construction.

## 4.30.3 Land Use

All land acquisitions or easements for project proposed in the Alternatives would need to provide appropriate compensation in accordance with applicable State or Federal regulations. Any land acquired under the Habitat Enhancement project, which is included in all Program Alternatives, would require a willing seller. All changes in land use would have to comply with Chelan County's comprehensive plan and land use zoning.

# 4.30.4 Cultural Resources

Consultation with DAHP would occur to identify appropriate mitigation for impacts to cultural resources. Adherence with the National Historic Preservation Act would be required as part of the CWA Section 404 review.

For all projects that involve ground disturbance, additional cultural resource review would be required once specific locations for project elements are identified. Coordination with affected tribes and DAHP would help minimize any potential impacts.

# CHAPTER 5.0 CONSULTATION & COORDINATION

This chapter describes the consultation and coordination process the co-leads, Ecology and Chelan County, in coordination with the IWG, have taken to date and future actions that will occur. Public outreach and consultation will continue throughout the development and implementation of the Icicle Strategy.

# 5.1 Public Involvement

Public involvement allows interested and affected individuals, organizations, agencies, and other governmental entities to be consulted and included in the decision-making process. The IWG has incorporated public involvement into their quarterly meetings, which are open to the public, and have made numerous presentations at conferences, to local community groups, and individual stakeholder groups to raise awareness of the Icicle Strategy and the PEIS process. The IWG co-leads Chelan County and Ecology also solicited comments from the public on the proposed Icicle Strategy through the SEPA scoping process to help shape the alternatives considered in this document and the analysis of the impacts. Formal and informal input was used.

## 5.1.1 SEPA Scoping

The SEPA Scoping process began on February 9, 2016, when the co-leads issued a threshold determination of significance on the Icicle Strategy. Scoping is the process of soliciting input on a proposal to define the scope of the EIS. The comments received during the scoping process allowed the co-leads to identify significant issues, identify elements of the environment that could be affected, develop alternatives, and determine the appropriate environmental documents to be prepared.

Public notice of SEPA scoping was provided via publication in the Wenatchee World and Leavenworth Echo and through mailings to residents. Ecology issued a press release on February 16, 2016 to provide information about the Icicle Strategy, SEPA and the Scoping deadlines. Public comments were received through May 11, 2016. One comment letter signed by 40 organizations was received and accepted after the end of the comment period.

## 5.1.2 Public Meetings

Under WAC 197-11-410, the co-leads elected to expand the scoping process, and held a public open house in Leavenworth, Washington on April 20, 2016, at the Leavenworth Fire Hall. Approximately 70 participants attended the open house. At the meeting, the co-leads provided a presentation that included an overview of the SEPA process, the Icicle Strategy, and the base package (Alternative 1). Additionally, display materials and handouts were available. Members of the public informally discussed points of views and formally submitted comments during the meeting.

# 5.1.3 Scoping Comments

Including those submitted at the open house, a total of 49 written comments were received. Comment detail and input varied and ranged from general notes of support, general notes of disapproval, suggestions for alternatives to be considered, and concerns about specific resources or impacts. The comments received are summarized below. All comments and the comment responsiveness summary are provided in Appendix B.

### 5.1.3.1 General Comments

Comments included both general statements of support and opposition to the Icicle Strategy. Many of the general comments received were value statements on how water should be used and processed. There were comments supporting the collaborative effort and public outreach conducted and opposing the collaborative effort; comments supporting agricultural water use and comments opposed to additional agricultural water use; and comments opposed to increasing domestic water supplies and comments supporting domestic water supplies. There were also general comments that there should be more storage included in the proposal and concerns that conservation is not enough of a priority.

Several comments recommended prioritizing the Guiding Principles or including alternative projects should some of the proposed projects be deemed unfeasible. Other comments reflected concern that the SEPA checklist was not complete enough, concern over funding, and one comment opposed the role of agencies as conveners of the IWG.

There were also general comments in support of wilderness and wilderness character, and opposition to the use of the term "reservoir" to describe lakes that are currently used for water storage in the ALWA.

## 5.1.3.2 Alternatives and Projects

Many comments regarded support or opposition to a project, and requests to consider alternatives or additional projects.

#### Base Package (Alterative 1)

There was general support for many of the projects proposed in Alternative 1. These included IPID Irrigation Efficiencies Project, COIC Irrigation Efficiencies and Pump Exchange project, Domestic Conservation, LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements, Fish Passage, Fish Screen Compliance, and Water Markets. One comment received indicated the LNFH project should be prioritized and be implemented as soon as possible. Additionally, several enhancements to the domestic conservation project were recommended, mainly water reuse and bans on lawn watering.

There were also mixed comments on the Alpine Lakes Optimization, Modernization, and Automation project and the Eightmile Lakes Storage Restoration Project.

There were also comments that expressed opposition to the boulder field passage improvements, which is a component of the Fish Passage Improvement project.

#### Additional Alternatives or Projects Recommended

Several projects and alternatives were recommended during the scoping process. Recommended projects included storage enhancement projects, which several commenters expressed opposition to, and implementation of the IPID pump station project.

There were requests to provide alternatives in the PEIS rather than looking at a no action alternative and a preferred alternative. Several alternatives were proposed including an alternative that would exclude projects within the ALWA, an alternative that focused on water conservation, an alternative to remove the dams in the ALWA, and an alternative to relinquish water rights.

#### 5.1.3.3 Impacts to Resources

Comments included concerns regarding impacts to specific resources. These resources included Indian trust assets, cultural resources, Indian sacred sites, wilderness character, threatened and endangered species, groundwater, surface water, fish, shoreline, water quality, wildlife, vegetation, soil, and aesthetics. Additional concerns about the impact of climate change on water resources and the efficacy of the proposal were also raised. There were also requests to discuss current conditions and helicopter transport.

### 5.1.3.4 Permitting and Compliance with Laws

Scoping comments also included concerns over water right permitting, transfers, and relinquishment, and compliance with federal laws including ESA and wilderness regulations. There were also comments regarding the need for NEPA and project level review.

## 5.1.4 Other Meetings and Outreach

Other meetings were held to provide information and answer questions about the Icicle Strategy. These meetings included public outreach events held in Seattle, Washington at the Good Shepherd Center on February 17, 2015 and March 30, 2016, and at the Phinney Ridge Neighborhood Association on July 18, 2016.

The IWG and co-leads also conducted several outreach activities to raise awareness of the Icicle Strategy and the PEIS process, hold meetings quarterly that are open to the public, and have opportunities for public comment.

The Table 5-1 describes these outreach activities.

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Table 5-1 Outreach Efforts

	Description	Methods
Feb. 2014	Presentation, Q&A with conservation leaders in Seattle	Meeting, Presentation
Nov. 2014	Wenatchee Habitat Subcommittee	Presentation
Jan. 2015	Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team	Presentation
Dec. 7, 2015	Tree Fruit Industry Conference	Presentation
Jan. 4, 2016	First funding coordination meeting.	Meeting
Jan. 20, 2016	Wenatchee Habitat Subcommittee	Presentation
Feb. 10, 2016	UC Regional Technical Team	Presentation
Feb. 12, 2016	Legal Advertisement - SEPA DS	Public Notice
Feb. 16, 2016	PEIS/Scoping Press Release	Public Notice
Feb. 18, 2016	Capital Press article - public comment	News Article
Mar. 9, 2016	Leavenworth Echo	News Article
Mar. 30, 2016	Seattle conservation leaders	Meeting, Presentation
Apr. 5, 2016	KOHO Radio Interview	Radio Interview
Apr. 19, 2016	LNFH Alternatives Analysis Presentation - Congressional staff attendance	Presentation
Apr. 20, 2016	Public Open House	Presentation, Handouts, Posters
Apr. 21, 2016	Wenatchee World	News Article
Apr. 25, 2016	Wenatchee World	Editorial
May 4, 2016	WVC-Water Resources Class	Presentation, Discussion
May 29, 2016	KOMO News	News Article
May 29, 2016	Seattle Times – AP	News Article
June 1, 2016	Cashmere Rotary	Presentation
June 27, 2016	Congressman Reichert	Meeting and Tour at LNFH
Summer 2016	Sen. Murray, Cantwell, Congr. Newhouse	Meetings
July 18, 2016	Conservation Groups in Seattle	Meeting
July 18, 2016	Seattle conservation leaders	Presentation
Sept. 2016	Tour to Eightmile Lake	Hike, Tour infrastructure
Sept. 9, 2016	LNFH Salmon Festival VIP Tour. Included regional directors of USBOR, USFWS and USFS	Handout, LNFH Site Tour
Oct. 4, 2016	USBR and USFWS Regional Directors Meeting at LNFH	Meeting and Tour at LNFH
Oct. 19, 2016	Wenatchee Habitat Subcommittee	Presentation

#### CHAPTER 5.0 CONSULTATION & COORDINATION

	Description	Methods
Nov. 10, 2016	Water Rights Transfers Conference	Panel Presentation
Dec. 8, 2016	Columbia River Policy Advisory Group	Presentation
June 2017	American Water Resource Association – Climate Change Conference (Washington DC)	Presentation
Nov. 6, 2018	USBR and USFWS Regional Directors Meeting	Meeting
Nov. 7, 2017	American Water Resource Association National Conference (Portland, OR)	Presentation
March 27, 2018	American Water Works Association National Conference (Seattle, WA)	Presentation
June 25, 2018	Draft PEIS Informational Session	Presentation/Meeting
June 27, 2018	Draft PEIS Public Hearing	Presentation, Handouts, Posters, Court Reporter
November 2, 2018	11 <sup>th</sup> Annual Water Law Conference	Presentation

## 5.1.5 Draft PEIS Comment Period

Publication and distribution of the Draft PEIS occurred on May 31, 2018. The public comment period was 60-days and closed on July 30, 2018.

Following the release of the DPEIS, the co-leads hosted an informational session at Ecology's Northwest Regional Office in Bellevue, Washington on June 25, 2018. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an overview of the Icicle Strategy, the alternatives considered, and the DPEIS. The intent of this meeting was to provide western Washington stakeholders and members of the public the opportunity to learn more about the DPEIS and how to participate in the process. Members of the public informally discussed points of view and were provided information on where to obtain a copy of the DPEIS and how to comment.

The co-leads also hosted a formal public hearing at the Leavenworth Festhalle in Leavenworth, Washington, on June 27, 2018. This meeting included posters, a presentation, and a court reporter who was made available to receive formal public comment. The purpose of the meeting was parallel to the public meeting held June 25, 2018 and included the same presentation. Materials from the public hearing are still available on the Chelan County website.<sup>1</sup>

During the comment period, the co-leads considered 8,825 comments. Comments received before or after the comment period (May 31 to July 30, 2018) and duplicative comments that were sent by the same sender were not considered. More information about the comments received are provided in Appendix A. Full comments and responses are also provide in Appendix A.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> https://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/pages/icicle-strategy-draft-peis-public-hearing

# 5.2 Coordination and Consultation

# 5.2.1 Agencies

Chelan County and Ecology are the co-lead agencies responsible for the preparation of this PEIS and meeting lead agency obligations required by SEPA. There has also been extensive participation in the development of the Icicle Creek Strategy by other local, state, and federal agencies, as well as other stakeholders, throughout the planning process.

The following state and federal agencies have jurisdiction and expertise regarding resources with the potential to be affected by the Icicle Creek Strategy. Several of these agencies are also party to the IWG. Tribal consultation and coordination are addressed in Section 5.2.2, Tribal Consultation and Coordination.

The following agencies have provided input and information regarding the development of the PEIS and will continue to provide coordination and consultation regarding other applicable regulatory requirements as individual projects begin to move forward. Their involvement is discussed further below. Also, the following agencies along with Ecology and Chelan County have been consulted on possible permits that could be required for the different project elements listed with each of the Alternatives. Table 5-2 provides a breakdown of the possible permits and describes what project elements may trigger the permits.

### 5.2.1.1 National Marine Fisheries Service

As noted in Section 1.9, Related Permits, Actions, and Laws, NMFS, along with USFWS, is responsible for the implementation of the ESA. NMFS has jurisdiction over anadromous fish species while USFWS has jurisdiction over terrestrial species and some freshwater species. To this end, NMFS participates in the IWG and provided input on the development of the Icicle Creek Strategy with respect to listed anadromous fish. As individual projects move forward to implementation, coordination with NMFS will be completed for those projects with the potential to affect special-status species and their habitat over which NMFS has jurisdiction. For information regarding the regulations appointing this authority to NMFS, refer to Section 1.9, Related Permits, Actions, and Laws. For information regarding the potential effects on ESA-listed species and habitat, refer to Section 4.10, Threatened and Endangered Species.

### 5.2.1.2 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

In addition to its responsibilities pursuant to the ESA, USFWS manages the LNFH. USFWS also manages and operates dams and related facilities on the Upper and Lower Snow Lakes and Nada Lake. These facilities are owned and operated by USFWS to release flows for hatchery use, but improvements to the facilities are funded and implemented by USBR.

Similar to NMFS, USFWS participated in the development of the Icicle Creek Strategy as a member of the IWG and provides expertise with respect to ESA-listed terrestrial and freshwater species. As individual projects move forward to implementation, coordination with USFWS will be completed for those projects with the potential to affect species and their habitat over which USFWS has jurisdiction. For information regarding the regulations appointing this authority to NMFS, refer to Section 1.9, Related Permits, Actions, and Laws. For information regarding potential effects on ESA-listed species and habitat, refer to Section 4.10, Threatened and Endangered Species.

### 5.2.1.3 U.S. Forest Service

The USFS manages the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area and is responsible for ensuring activities are consistent with the Wilderness Act and other management requirements specific to National Forests. USFS also participated in the development of the Icicle Creek Strategy as a member of the IWG.

### 5.2.1.4 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

The EPA is the agency responsible for, among other regulations, implementation of the CWA and CAA. Although EPA delegates many of its responsibilities to Ecology within the state of Washington, EPA retains authority over permits for federal facilities, such as the LNFH.

#### 5.2.1.5 U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

LNFH, which is located on Lower Icicle Creek near Leavenworth, operates to mitigation USBR projects in the Columbia Bain. Reclamation participated in the development of the Icicle Creek Strategy as a member of the IWG.

### 5.2.1.6 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

The USACE is responsible for issuance of permits and conducting compliance related to Section 404 of the CWA, which regulates placement of dredged or fill material into wetlands, lakes, streams rivers, estuaries, and certain other types of waters of the United States. For additional information about the CWA, refer to Section 1.9, Related Permits, Actions, and Laws.

### 5.2.1.7 Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

The WDFW is also a member of the IWG and provides input regarding sensitive plant and animal species with the potential to be affected by the Icicle Creek Strategy. As individual projects move towards implementation, WDFW will also be responsible for issuing HPAs for any projects with the potential to affect state waters.

### 5.2.1.8 Washington Department of Natural Resources

WDNR is responsible for issuing leases of state aquatic lands. Leases of state aquatic lands may be required for projects that are located within tidelands, shorelands, harbor areas, and the beds of navigable waters. For additional information about WDNR's Aquatic Use Authorization, refer to Section 1.9, Related Permits, Actions, and Laws.

### 5.2.1.9 Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation

In addition to ensuring that the public interest in cultural and tribal resources is considered in the development of the Icicle Creek Strategy, the DAHP is also responsible for ensuring that subsequent federal actions are consistent with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Because this PEIS is programmatic and specific project details

#### ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

are not known at this time, subsequent cultural review and consultation would be undertaken, if needed, as individual projects are carried forward. Depending on the specific project, this could also include coordination with tribes and other interested parties.

## 5.2.2 Tribal Consultation and Coordination

#### 5.2.2.1 Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation

The Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation is a member of the IWG and has participated in the development of the Icicle Creek Strategy. In spring of 2018, the co-lead agencies began government to government consultation on this PEIS with the Yakima Nation. Additionally, as individual projects move forward, depending on the specific project, the appropriate federal lead agency will initiate formal government-to-government consultation consistent with the NHPA.

### 5.2.2.2 Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation

The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation is a member of the IWG and has participated in the development of the Icicle Creek Strategy. In spring of 2018, the co-lead agencies began government to government consultation on this PEIS with the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation. In addition, as individual projects move forward, depending on the specific project, the appropriate federal lead agency will initiate government-to-government consultation consistent with the NHPA.
#### CHAPTER 5.0 CONSULTATION & COORDINATION

Permit/Approval and Relevant Triggers		All Alternatives								
		IPID Irrigation Efficiencies	Domestic Conservation <sup>1</sup>	Tribal and Non- Tribal Fisheries	Habitat Protection and Enhancement	Instream Flow Rule Amendment <sup>1</sup>	LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements	Fish Passage Improvements	Fish Screen Compliance	Water Markets <sup>1</sup>
Clean Water Act Section 404 review	1	1		1	1		1	1	1	
Work within jurisdictional waters of the US		-			-					
Work on USES lands not covered by easement										
Endangered Species Act	_									
Federal action	2	2		2	2		2	2	2	
Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Federal action	2	2		2	2		2	2	2	
National Historic Preservation Act	2	2		2	2		2	2	2	
Federal action	-	-		-	-		-	-	-	
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act	2	2		2	2		2	2	2	
FEMA Flood Rise Analysis	2	2								
CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification	2	2		2	2		2	2	2	
ECC Liconeing	5	2		5	5		5	5	5	
Foology Dom Construction Dermit/Deview									<u> </u>	
Ecology Water Bight Dermit	1	2		4	4			4	4	
Ecology water Right Permit		5		4	4			4	4	
WDFW Hydraulic Project Approval									<u> </u>	
Work affecting bed/flow of state waters	5			5	5		4	5	5	
WDNR Aquatic Use Authorization Work within state aquatic lands				5	5		4	5	5	
Ecology NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit Construction within waters of the US/state							5			
EPA NDPES Discharge Permit for Operation							6			
Chelan County Shoreline Substantial Development Permit/Conditional Use Permit				6	6			6	6	
Chelan County Fill and Grade Permit Chelan County Building Permit	8									

 Table 5-2

 Draft Permits, Approvals, and Relevant Triggers<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>This table lists potential permits for individual projects being considered per the Icicle Creek Strategy. The permits listed are based on our current understanding of the project components and final permits would be evaluated based upon final design and project components. Table notes correspond to specific projects in the following pages.

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

	Alt. 1 / 4	Alt. 1 / 2	Alt. 2 / 3	Alt. 3		Alt. 4		Alt. 5
Permit/Approval and Relevant Triggers	Alpine Lakes Modernization, Optimization, and Automation	Eightmile Lake Restoration	IPID Dryden Pump Exchange	OCPI Legislative Change1	Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement	Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement	Upper and Lower Snow Lake Storage Enhancement	IPID Full Piping and Pump Station
Clean Water Act Section 404 review	1	1	1		1	1	1	1
USFS Special Use Permit Work on USFS lands not covered by easement.	2	2			2	2	2	
Endangered Species Act Federal action	3	3	2		3	3	3	2
Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Federal action	3	3	2		3	3	3	2
National Historic Preservation Act Federal action	3	3	2		3	3	3	2
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Federal action	3	3	2		3	3	3	2
FEMA Flood Rise Analysis Modifications to floodplain		3			3	3	3	
CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification	4	3	3		4	4	4	3
FCC Licensing	5							
Ecology Dam Construction Permit/Review		4			5	5	5	
Ecology Water Right Permit	6	5	4		6	6	6	4
Ecology Sand and Gravel Permit		6			7		7	
WNDR Burn Permit		7			8	7	8	
WDFW Hydraulic Project Approval Work affecting bed/flow of state waters	7	8	5		9	8	9	5
WDNR Aquatic Use Authorization Work within state aquatic lands	7	8	5		9	8	9	5
Ecology NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit Construction within waters of the US/state		9	6		10	9	10	6
EPA NDPES Discharge Permit for Operation								
Chelan County Shoreline Substantial Development Permit/Conditional Use Permit Work within state shorelands	8	10	7		11	10	11	7
Chelan County Fill and Grade Permit / Chelan County Building Permit		11	8		12	11		8

 Table 5-2 (cont.)

 Draft Permits, Approvals, and Relevant Triggers<sup>1</sup>

 Chelan County Fill and Grade Permit / Chelan County Building Permit
 11
 8
 12
 11
 8

 <sup>1</sup>This table lists potential permits for individual projects being considered per the lcicle Creek Strategy. The permits listed are based on our current understanding of the project components and final permits would be evaluated based upon final design and project components. Table notes correspond to specific projects in the following pages.

### NOTES:

#### COIC Efficiencies

- 1. Depending on specific activities within waters of the US, compliance is anticipated to be addressed through a Nationwide Permit (NWP).
- 2. Corps permit evaluation will address consistency with these regulations.
- 3. Streamlined review (e.g., approval letter) issued when CWA NWP conditions are adhered to.
- 4. Required to address the change point of diversion and instream flows.
- 5. Compliance handled through the JARPA review process and expected to be minimal.
- 6. General permit anticipated, requiring compliance with general conditions.
- 7. County approval likely required. Project-level SEPA evaluation (e.g., SEPA checklist) completed by COIC.
- 8. COIC submittal required prior to construction.

IPID Irrigation Efficiencies – Additional environmental permits/approvals may be required to implement projects identified in updated conservation plans.

- 1. Depending on the specific modifications, work on the IPID canals may be exempt from CWA compliance.
- 2. Not required if considered exempt from Corps jurisdiction.
- 3. Required for putting water into a trust.

#### Domestic Conservation

1. Proposed activities largely within existing developed areas or not resulting in physical changes. Aside from Programmatic EIS review for funding, no additional environmental permits/approval likely required.

<u>Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries</u> – Required environmental permits/approvals would depend on the specifics of project activities that have not yet been determined; however, it is anticipated that work affecting waters of the US and state would trigger the following types of permits/approvals.

- 1. Depending on specific activities within waters of the US, compliance is anticipated to be addressed through a NWP.
- 2. Corps permit evaluation will address consistency with these regulations.
- 3. Streamlined review (e.g., approval letter) issued when CWA NWP conditions are adhered to.
- 4. Required to address the change point of diversion and instream flows.
- 5. Compliance handled through the JARPA review process and expected to be minimal.
- 6. County approval likely required. Project-level SEPA evaluation (e.g., SEPA checklist) completed by project applicant(s).

<u>Habitat Protection and Enhancement</u> – Required environmental permits/approvals would depend on the specifics of project activities that have not yet been determined; however, it is anticipated that work affecting waters of the US and state would trigger the following types of permits/approvals.

- 1. Depending on specific activities within waters of the US, compliance is anticipated to be addressed through a NWP.
- 2. Corps permit evaluation will address consistency with these regulations.
- 3. Streamlined review (e.g., approval letter) issued when CWA NWP conditions are adhered to.
- 4. Required to address the change point of diversion and instream flows.
- 5. Compliance handled through the JARPA review process and expected to be minimal.
- 6. County approval likely required. Project-level SEPA evaluation (e.g., SEPA checklist) completed by project applicant(s).

#### PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Instream Flow Rule Amendment

1. Administrative changes. Aside from PEIS review for funding, no additional environmental permits/approval likely required. SEPA compliance is required for agency rules. Ecology could rely on the original SEPA determination for Chapter 173-545 WAC, this PEIS, or a separate SEPA action.

#### LNFH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements

- 1. Depending on the specific activities that would affect waters of the US, compliance is anticipated to be addressed through a NWP.
- 2. Federal action for the project by USBR and USFWS would ensure compliance with these federal regulations.
- 3. Streamlined review (e.g., approval letter) issued when CWA NWP conditions are adhered to.
- 4. Compliance handled through the JARPA review process and expected to be minimal.
- 5. EPA NPDES permit required for updates to hatchery operations.
- 6. Permits may not be required. Need to confirm with Chelan County. It is possible that Ecology review if required as indicated in Note 4 would suffice to support the County's approval.

#### Fish Passage Improvements / Fish Screen Compliance

- 1. Depending on specific activities within waters of the US, compliance is anticipated to be addressed through a NWP.
- 2. Corps permit evaluation will address consistency with these regulations except for projects involving federal agencies as proponents (e.g., LNFH fish screen) where those agencies would serve as federal lead.
- 3. Streamlined review (e.g., approval letter) issued when CWA NWP conditions are adhered to.
- 4. Required to address the change point of diversion and instream flows.
- 5. Compliance handled through the JARPA review process and expected to be minimal.
- 6. County approval likely required. Project-level SEPA evaluation (e.g., SEPA checklist) completed by project applicant(s).

#### Water Markets

1. Administrative changes. Aside from PEIS review for funding, no additional environmental permits/approval are likely required other than water right permitting.

#### Alpine Lakes Modernization, Optimization, and Automation Project

- USACE NWP / NEPA Categorical Exclusion (CatEx) are the likely level of regulatory compliance for this project. Compliance with General Conditions 20 would require completion of a preconstruction notification (PCN), acknowledging potentially eligible resources pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act; however, given the nature of the activities, it is anticipated that minimal review would be required and would most likely apply only to activities proposed at Eightmile Lake. PCN is fulfilled by filling out the Washington State JARPA.
- 2. USFS special use permit is likely required at Snow Lake and Square Lake, and possibly Colchuck Lake, Eightmile, and Klonaqua.
- 3. Corps permit evaluation will address consistency with these regulations. Review is anticipated to be relatively straightforward for the proposed project activities. USFS would most likely serve as the federal lead agency responsible for demonstrating applicable compliance with federal regulations at lakes where a special use permit is deemed necessary.
- 4. Streamlined review (e.g., approval letter) issued when CWA NWP conditions are adhered to.
- 5. Federal Communications Commission (FCC) approval may be required for radio repeater placement. Federal review consistency likely to be addressed by work completed by Corps or USFS as indicated in Note 3.
- 6. Required for adding instream flows as secondary uses.
- 7. Compliance handled through the JARPA review process and expected to be minimal.
- 8. May not be required. Need to confirm with Chelan County. IPID would be the applicant, but presumably PEIS and related federal permits/approvals would provide information needed to make permit decision if required.

#### CHAPTER 5.0 CONSULTATION & COORDINATION

#### Eightmile Lake Restoration Project

- 1. Corps NWP / NEPA CatEx are the likely level of regulatory compliance for this project. Compliance with General Conditions 20 would require completion of a PCN, acknowledging potentially eligible resources pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act; however, given the nature of the activities, it is anticipated that minimal review would be required. PCN is fulfilled by filling out the Washington JARPA.
- 2. USFS special use permit may be required. If permit is required, USFS would likely serve as the federal lead agency responsible for federal consultation under NEPA.
- 3. Corps permit evaluation will address consistency with these regulations.
- 4. Streamlined review (e.g., approval letter) issued when CWA NWP conditions are adhered to.
- 5. Ecology review requiring submittal of engineering plans unless dam is considered "minor."
- 6. Required for adding instream flows as secondary uses.
- 7. Needed if on-site gravel would be quarried for construction to save costs.
- 8. A permit to burn cleared logs would only be required if it exceeded the specifications (i.e., fire content, size, and timing limitation) set forth by the WDNR.
- 9. Compliance handled through the JARPA review process and expected to be minimal.
- 10. General permit anticipated, requiring compliance with general conditions.
- 11. SSDP may not be required. Need to confirm with Chelan County. Past O&M activities have most often resulted in the County issuing approval versus a formal SSDP.
- 12. Permits may not be required. Need to confirm with Chelan County. It is possible that Ecology review if required as indicated in Note 4 would suffice to support the County's approval.

#### IPID Dryden Pump Exchange

- 1. Depending on specific activities within waters of the US, compliance is anticipated to be addressed through a NWP.
- 2. Corps permit evaluation will address consistency with these regulations.
- 3. Streamlined review (e.g., approval letter) issued when CWA NWP conditions are adhered to.
- 4. Required to address the change point of diversion and instream flows.
- 5. Compliance handled through the JARPA review process and expected to be minimal.
- 6. General permit anticipated, requiring compliance with general conditions.
- 7. County approval likely required. Project-level SEPA evaluation (e.g., SEPA checklist) completed by COIC.
- 8. IPID submittal required prior to construction.

#### **OCPI Legislative Change**

1. Administrative changes. Aside from PEIS review for funding, no additional environmental permits/approval required.

#### PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement

- 1. Corps Nationwide Permit / NEPA CatEx are the likely level of regulatory compliance for this project. Compliance with General Conditions 20 would require completion of a PCN, acknowledging potentially eligible resources pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act; however, given the nature of the activities, it is anticipated that minimal review would be required. PCN is fulfilled by filling out the Washington JARPA.
- 2. USFS special use permit is likely required. If permit is required, USFS would likely serve as the federal lead agency responsible for federal consultation under NEPA.
- 3. Corps permit evaluation will address consistency with these regulations.
- 4. Streamlined review (e.g., approval letter) issued when CWA NWP conditions are adhered to.
- 5. Ecology review requiring submittal of engineering plans unless dam is considered "minor."
- 6. Required for adding instream flows as secondary uses.
- 7. Needed if on-site gravel would be quarried for construction to save costs.
- 8. A permit to burn cleared logs would only be required if it exceeded the specifications (i.e., fire content, size, and timing limitation) set forth by the WDNR.
- 9. Compliance handled through the JARPA review process and expected to be minimal.
- 10. Water quality compliance would be required and addressed by obtaining a general construction permit.
- 11. SSDP may not be required. Need to confirm with Chelan County. Past O&M activities have most often resulted in the County issuing approval versus a formal SSDP.
- 12. Permits may not be required. Need to confirm with Chelan County. It is possible that Ecology review if required as indicated in Note 4 would suffice to support the County's approval.

#### Upper Klonaqua Lake Storage Enhancement

- 1. Corps Nationwide Permit / NEPA CatEx are the likely level of regulatory compliance for this project. Compliance with General Conditions 20 would require completion of a PCN, acknowledging potentially eligible resources pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act; however, given the nature of the activities, it is anticipated that minimal review would be required. PCN is fulfilled by filling out the Washington JARPA.
- 2. USFS special use permit is likely required. If permit is required, USFS would likely serve as the federal lead agency responsible for federal consultation under NEPA.
- 3. Corps permit evaluation will address consistency with these regulations. Review is anticipated to be relatively straightforward for the proposed project activities.
- 4. Streamlined review (e.g., approval letter) issued when CWA NWP conditions are adhered to.
- 5. Ecology review requiring submittal of engineering plans unless dam is considered "minor."
- 6. Required for adding instream flows as secondary uses.
- 7. A permit to burn cleared logs would only be required if it exceeded the specifications (i.e., fire content, size, and timing limitation) set forth by the WDNR.
- 8. Compliance handled through the JARPA review process and expected to be minimal.
- 9. Water quality compliance would be required and addressed by obtaining a general construction permit.
- 10. SSDP may not be required. Need to confirm with Chelan County. Past O&M activities have most often resulted in the County issuing approval versus a formal SSDP.
- 11. Permits may not be required. Need to confirm with Chelan County. It is possible that Ecology review if required as indicated in Note 4 would suffice to support the County's approval.

#### CHAPTER 5.0 CONSULTATION & COORDINATION

#### Upper and Lower Snow Lake Storage Enhancement

- 1. Corps Nationwide Permit / NEPA CatEx are the likely level of regulatory compliance for this project. Compliance with General Conditions 20 would require completion of a PCN, acknowledging potentially eligible resources pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act; however, given the nature of the activities, it is anticipated that minimal review would be required. PCN is fulfilled by filling out the Washington JARPA.
- 2. USFS special use permit is likely required. If permit is required, USFS would likely serve as the federal lead agency responsible for federal consultation under NEPA.
- 3. Corps permit evaluation will address consistency with these regulations. Review is anticipated to be relatively straightforward for the proposed project activities. USFS may act as federal lead responsible for consistency review at lakes where a special use permit is deemed necessary.
- 4. Streamlined review (e.g., approval letter) issued when CWA NWP conditions are adhered to.
- 5. Ecology review requiring submittal of engineering plans unless dam is considered "minor."
- 6. Required for adding instream flows as secondary uses.
- 7. Needed if on-site gravel would be quarried for construction to save costs.
- 8. A permit to burn cleared logs would only be required if it exceeded the specifications (i.e., fire content, size, and timing limitation) set forth by the WDNR.
- 9. Compliance handled through the JARPA review process and expected to be minimal.
- 10. Water quality compliance would be required and addressed by obtaining a general construction permit.
- 11. May not be required. Need to confirm with Chelan County. 2009 activities at Nada Lake did receive County approval although no permit was issued.

#### IPID Full Piping and Pump Exchange Project

- 1. Depending on specific activities within waters of the US, compliance is anticipated to be addressed through a NWP.
- 2. Corps permit evaluation will address consistency with these regulations.
- 3. Streamlined review (e.g., approval letter) issued when CWA NWP conditions are adhered to.
- 4. Required to address the change point of diversion and instream flows.
- 5. Compliance handled through the JARPA review process and expected to be minimal.
- 6. General permit anticipated, requiring compliance with general conditions.
- 7. County approval likely required. Project-level SEPA evaluation (e.g., SEPA checklist) completed by COIC.
- 8. IPID submittal required prior to construction.

## CHAPTER 6.0 REFERENCES

## References

Adams, K., 2012, Status of the Benthic Macroinvertebrate Community in the Wenatchee River, 2010, Washington State Department of Ecology, Environmental Assessment Program, Olympia, WA, February 2012, Website available at https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/summarypages/1203016.html.

American Community Survey, 2014, American Community Survey Data, Website accessed on October 28, 2016, https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml.

- American Whitewater, 2017, online at https://www.americanwhitewater.org.
- Ames, K.M., D.E. Dumond, J. Galm, and R. Minor, 1998, Prehistory of the Southern Plateau, in Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 12, Plateau, ed. D. E. Walker, pp. 103-119, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Ames, K.M., and H.D.G. Maschner, 1999, Peoples of the Northwest Coast, Thames and Hudson, London.
- Anchor Environmental, LLC, 2007, Needs and Alternatives Analysis, Icicle Creek Subbasin Storage Study, March 2007.
- Anchor QEA, 2011, Water Storage Report Wenatchee River Basin, prepared for Chelan County Natural Resources Department, February 2011.
- Anchor QEA, 2012, Appraisal Study: Peshastin Irrigation District Pump Exchange Project, December 2012.
- Anchor QEA, 2015, Icicle and Peshastin Irrigation Districts Pump Exchange Summary of Additional Analyses, March 27, 2015.
- Anchor QEA, 2015b, Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Pump Back Preliminary Assessment, March 18, 2015.
- Anchor QEA, 2015c, Alternatives Evaluation Study Public release Version Cascade Orchards Irrigation Company.
- Anchor QEA, 2015d, Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Effluent Pump Back Preliminary Assessment.
- Anchor QEA, 2015e, Icicle and Peshastin Irrigation Districts Pump Exchange, Summary of Potential Operations and Maintenance Funding Strategies
- Anchor QEA, 2015f, Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Tribal Fishery Analysis, Draft

- Anchor QEA, 2018, Icicle and Peshastin Irrigation Districts Comprehensive Water Conservation Plan. Prepared for Icicle and Peshastin Irrigation District under the direction of Trout Unlimited, August 2018.
- Anchor QEA and Aspect Consulting, LCC, 2015, Appraisal Study: Eightmile Lake Storage Restoration, Prepared for Chelan County Natural Resources Department, March 2015.
- Anchor QEA, Aspect Consulting, LLC, and Washington Water Trust, 2015, Alternatives Evaluation Study – Public Release Version, Cascade Orchards Irrigation Company, December 2015.
- Anglin, D.R., J.J. Skalicky, D. Hines, and N. Jones, 2013, Icicle Creek Fish Passage Evaluation for The Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Columbia River Fisheries Program Office, Vancouver, WA.
- Aspect Consulting, LLC (Aspect), 2013, Wenatchee Reserve Account Review, Chelan County Natural Resources Department.
- Aspect, 2013b, Wenatchee Reserve Alternatives: Follow-up to December 9, 2013 Meeting.
- Aspect, 2014, Bathymetry and Topographic Survey of Upper Klonaqua Lake and Conceptual Release Options draft memorandum, November 18, 2014.
- Aspect, 2014b, Icicle Creek Conservation Plan Survey, November 20, 2014.
- Aspect, 2014c, Upper Klonaqua Lake Conceptual Review.
- Aspect, 2016, Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Water Supply Action Plan, April 22, 2016.
- Aspect, 2017, Icicle Creek Flow Augmentation Pilot Study and Alpine Lakes Automation Feasibility Study.
- Aspect and Anchor QEA, 2015, Appraisal Study: Alpine Lake Optimization and Automation, March 20, 2015.
- Bakun, W.H., R.A. Haugerud, M.G. Hopper, and R.S. Ludwin, 2002, The December 1872 Washington State Earthquake, Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, Vol. 92, No. 8, pp. 3239–3258, December 2002.
- Beals, T. and R. Lampman, 2016, Distribution and Occupancy of Pacific Lamprey in Six Major Columbia River Subbasins within the Yakama Nation Ceded Lands: Summary from 2009-2015 Surveys, Report to the Bonneville Power Administration, March 2016.

- Beals, T. and R. Lampman, 2016b, Summary of Pacific Lamprey Salvage Efforts from Dryden Diversion Maintenance Operations (Wenatchee River, Dryden, WA), Report to the Bonneville Power Administration, March 2016.
- Beidl, J., 2010, Icicle Road Relocation Project Section 106 Compliance Form, Report on file at DAHP, Olympia, Washington.
- Bentley, J., 2010, Hiking Washington's History, University of Washington Press, Seattle.
- Bundy, B., 2017, Draft Cultural Resources Discipline Report, Prepared for Chelan County Natural Resources Department, January 2017.
- Burtchard, G.C., 2007, Holocene Subsistence and Settlement Patterns: Mount Rainier and the Montane Pacific Northwest, Archaeology in Washington 13: 3-44.
- Capellini, M. M. J., 2001, Movements of bull trout (Salvelinus confluentus), spring Chinook (Oncorhynchus tshawytcscha), and steelhead (O. mykiss) in Icicle Creek, Washington, July 7, 2001.
- Chapman, D. 1989, Summer and Winter Ecology of Juvenile Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Trout in the Wenatchee River, Washington, Chelan County PUD, Washington.
- Chatters, J., and D. Pokotylo, 1998, Prehistory: Introduction, in Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 12, Plateau, ed. D. E. Walker, pp. 73-80, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.
- Chelan County, 1975, Shoreline Master Program.
- Chelan County, 1979, Shoreline Master Program, Revised 1979.
- Chelan County, 2009, Shoreline Inventory and Analysis.
- Chelan County, 2010, Draft Shoreline Master Program.
- Chelan County, 2014, Icicle Strategy SEPA Checklist.
- Chelan County, 2014b, Resolution No. 2014-116, http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/public-works/documents/2014-116.pdf.
- Chelan County, 2016, Chelan County GIS, Website accessed on Accessed October 27, 2016, http://maps.co.chelan.wa.us/chelancountyGIS/.
- Chelan County, Icicle Creek Work Group Operating Procedures, online at: http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/files/naturalresources/documents/Planning/icicle\_work\_group/FINAL%20IWG%20Operating %20Procedures%202016.pdf.

- Chelan County, Icicle Creek Instream Flow Committee, online at: http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/pages/icicle-creek-instream-flowcommittee.
- Chelan County Code, Chapter 7.35, Noise Control, Chelan County, Washington.
- Chelan County Code, Chapter 11.86, Geologically Hazardous Overlay District (GHOD), Chelan County, Washington.
- Chelan County Natural Resources Department and Washington State Department of Ecology Office of the Columbia River, 2016, Basin Study Proposal, Icicle Creek Subbasin, Washington: 2016 Bureau of Reclamation WaterSMART, June 22, 2016.
- Cheney, E.S., 2007, The Chiwaukum Structural Low on the Eastern Flank of the Cascade Range, Northwest Geological Society - Society Field Trips in Pacific Northwest Geology; September 22-23, 2007 field trip guidebook published by the Northwest Geological Society.
- City of Leavenworth, 2013, https://www.codepublishing.com/WA/Leavenworth/html/Leavenworth13/Leavenw orth1390.html.
- City of Wenatchee, 2014, Shoreline Master Program, October 31, 2014.
- Climate Impacts Group (CIG), 2009, The Washington Climate Change Impacts Assessment: Evaluating Washington's Future in a Changing Climate, June 2009.
- CIG, 2004, Physical Geography and Mean PNW Climate of the Twentieth Century, Accessed March 3, 2017, http://www.cses.washington.edu/pnwimpacts/CDTheme.htm.
- Cooper, M. 2006. Fish Production Review of the Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Complex, 2005. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mid-Columbia River Fishery Resource Office, Leavenworth, WA.
- Columbia River Data Access in Real Time (DART), 2016, Website accessed October 26, 2016, http://www.cbr.washington.edu/dart/query/adult\_annual\_sum.
- Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, 2009, Title XXXII (32) Fisheries Code, Revised April 15, 2009.
- Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation and U.S. Government, 1855, Yakama Nation Treaty of 1855, June 9, 1855, 12 Stat., 951, Ratified March 8 1859, Proclaimed April 18, 1859.
- Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (CTCR), 2011, Colville Tribal Member Salmon and Steelhead Fishing Regulations, Resolution No. 2011-260.

- CTCR, 2016, Memorandum from M. Rayton to R. Freidlander, and Kirk Truscott, Icicle Creek Provisional Creel Monitoring Summary; May 13 to July 3, 2016.
- Council on Environmental Quality, 1997, Considering Cumulative Effects Under the National Environmental Policy Act, January 1997.
- Denthier, D.P., P.L. Heller, and S.A. Safioles, 1979, Reconnaissance Data on Lakes in the Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area, Washington, U.S. Geological Survey Water Resources Investigation Open-File Report 79-1465, 201 pp.
- Dion, N.P., G.C. Bortleson, J.B. McConnell, and L.M. Nelson, 1976, Reconnaissance Data on Lakes in Washington, Volume 5: Chelan, Ferry, Kittitas, Klickitat, Okanogan, and Yakima Counties. U.S. Geological Survey Water Supply Bulletin 43, Vol. 5.
- Dominguez, L., P. Powers, E. S. Toth, and S. Blanton, 2013, Icicle Creek, Boulder Field Fish Passage Assessment, Prepared for Trout Unlimited-Washington Water Project, Wenatchee, WA.
- Dragovich, J.D., R.L. Logan, H.W. Schasse, T.J. Walsh, W.S. Lingley Jr., D.K. Norman, W.J. Gerstel, T.J. Lapen, J.E. Schuster, and K.D. Meyers, 2002, Geologic map of Washington--Northwest quadrant: Washington Division of Geology and Earth Resources Geologic Map GM-50.
- EcoAssets and Trout Unlimited, 2013, Icicle Creek Boulder Field Fish Passage Assessment.
- Federal Highway Administration, 2006, Construction Noise Handbook; FHWA-HEP-06-015, U.S. Department of Transportation Research and Innovative Technology Administration, John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, Environmental Measurement and Modeling Division, Acoustics Facility, Prepared for U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, Office of Natural and Human Environment, August 2006.
- Forsgren Associates, Inc. and Trout Unlimited, 2014, Icicle Irrigation District Instream Flow Improvement Options Analysis Study, July 22, 2014.
- Franklin, J.F., and C.T. Dyrness, 1973, Natural Vegetation of Oregon and Washington, United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, General Technical Report PNW-8.
- Fraser, G.S., 2014, Summary of Icicle Creek Temperature Monitoring, 2014, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Leavenworth WA.
- Fraser, G.S., 2015, Summary of Icicle Creek Temperature Monitoring, 2015, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Leavenworth WA.

- Galbreath, P.F., M.A. Bisbee Jr., D.W. Dompier, C.M. Kamphaus, and T.H. Newsome 2014, Extirpation and Tribal Reintroduction of Coho Salmon to the Interior Columbia River Basin, Fisheries, 39:77-87.
- Gayeski, 2015, Genetic population structure of rainbow trout in upper Icicle Creek, Wild Fish Conservancy, Presentation to the Icicle Work Group, March 6, 2015.
- Gilliom, R.J., D.P. Dethier, S.A. Safioles, and P.L. Heller, 1980, Preliminary Evaluation of Lake Susceptibility to Water-Quality Degradation by Recreational Use, Alpine Lakes Wilderness Area, Washington, U.S. Geological Survey Water Resources Investigation Open-File Report 80-1124.
- Golder Associates, 2005, WRIA 45 Summary of Groundwater/Surface Water Interaction and Groundwater Resource References.
- Grabert, G.F., 1968, North-Central Washington Prehistory, Department of Anthropology, University of Washington, Reports in Archaeology 1, Seattle, Washington.
- Granger, R., 2017, Cascade Orchards Irrigation Company Proposed Pump Station, Prepared for Washington Water Trust, January 12, 2017.
- Gresens, R.L., 1983, Geology of the Wenatchee and Monitor Quadrangles, Chelan and Douglas Counties, Washington. Washington Department of Natural Resources, Division of Geology and Earth Resources. Bulletin 75. 1983.
- Griffith, J. S., 1988, Review of competition between cuthroat trout and other salmonids, in R.E. Gresswell, Status and Management of Interior Stocks of Cuthroat Trout, American Fisheries Society Symposium, 4:140.
- Grubb, M.L. (Icicle Peshastin Irrigation District), 2016, Personal communication by phone with Barbara Bundy, Anchor QEA, LLC, on October 24, 2016.
- Hall, M., 2012, Spring Chinook Salmon Passage at the Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, 2012, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Leavenworth, WA.
- Hall, M., 2013, Summary of Icicle Creek Temperature Monitoring, 2012. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Leavenworth, WA.
- Hall, M., 2013b, Summary of Icicle Creek Temperature Monitoring, 2013. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Leavenworth, WA.
- Hall, M, W. Gale, and M. Cappellini, 2014, Steelhead Use of Icicle Creek: A Review, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Leavenworth, WA.
- Hall, M., and K. Henry, 2012. Summary of Icicle Creek Temperature Monitoring, 2011. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Leavenworth, WA.
- Hall, M., and B. Kelly-Ringel, 2011, Summary of Icicle Creek Temperature Monitoring, 2005-2010, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Leavenworth, WA.

- Hillman, T.W., 1989, Nocturnal predation by sculpins on juvenile chinook salmon and steelhead, Final Report to Chelan County Public utility District, Wenatchee. Chapter in Chapman, D., 1989, Summer and Winter Ecology of Juvenile Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Trout in the Wenatchee River, Washington, Chelan County PUD, Washington.
- Hillman, T., M. Miller, M. Johnson, C. Moran, J. Williams, M. Tonseth, C. Willard, S. Hopkins, B. Ishida, C. Kamphaus, T. Pearsons, and P. Graf, 2016, Monitoring and evaluation of the Chelan and Grant County PUDs hatchery programs: 2015 annual report, Report to the HCP and PRCC Hatchery Committees, Wenatchee and Ephrata, Washington.
- Hobbs, W. and M. Friese, 2016, Wenatchee River PCB and DDT Source Assessment, Washington State Department of Ecology, Olympia, WA. Publication No. 16-03-029. Website accessed on October 19, 2016, https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/summarypages/1603029.html.
- Jantzer, A. (Icicle Peshastin Irrigation District), 2016, Personal communication in person with Barbara Bundy, Anchor QEA, LLC, on July 15, 2016.
- Johnsen, A., and M.C. Nelson 2012, Surveys Pacific Lamprey Distribution in Wenatchee River 2010-2011, Final, USFWS, Leavenworth, WA, Available at https://www.fws.gov/leavenworthfisheriescomplex/MidColumbiaFWCO/pdf/Surve ys%20Pacific%20Lamprey%20Distribution%20in%20Wenatchee%20River%2020 10-2011%20Final.pdf.
- Klohn Leonoff, Inc., 1993, Icicle and Peshstin Irrigation Districts Comprehensive Water Conservation Plans.
- Kraig, E. and T. Scalici, 2016, Washington State Sport Catch Report 2014, WDFW Fish Program, July, 2016, Website available at http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/01835/.
- Landres, P., C. Barns, J.G. Dennis, T. Devine, P. Geissler, C.S. McCasland, L. Merigliano, J. Seastrand, and R. Swain. 2008. Keeping it Wild: An Interagency Strategy to Monitor Trends in Wilderness Character Across the National Wilderness Preservation System. 81 pages. USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-212, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Landres, P., W. Vagias, and S. Stutzman, 2012, State of Science, Using wilderness character to improve wilderness stewardship, PARKScience, National Park Service.
- Layton, D., G. Brown, and M. Plummer, Valuing Programs to Improve Multi-Species Fisheries, University of Washington, April 1999.

- Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB), 2004, Lower Columbia Salmon and Steelhead Recovery and Subbasin Plan: Technical Foundation Volume III Other Species, Chapter 5 Pikeminnow, May 2004, Available from: http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/subbasinplanning/lowerColumbia/plan/2004\_05/.
- Maitland, T., 2016, Personal communication with Dan Haller, November 16, 2016.
- Marsh, K., 2007, Drawing Lines in the Forest, Creating Wilderness Areas in the Pacific Northwest.
- McMillen Jacobs and DJ Warren and Associates, 2016, Leavenworth Fisheries Complex Planning Report, prepared for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, August 2016.
- Mehringer, P.J., and F.F. Foit, Jr., 1990, Volcanic Ash Dating of the Clovis Cache at East Wenatchee, Washington, National Geographic Research 6(4): 495-503.
- Mierendorf, R.R., 1986, People of the North Cascades, National Park Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Seattle.
- Mierendorf, R.R., 2004, Archaeology of the Little Beaver Watershed, North Cascades National Park Service Complex, Whatcom County, Washington, Report submitted to the Skagit Environmental Endowment Commission.
- Miller, J., 1998, Middle Columbia River Salishans, in Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 12, Plateau, ed. D. E. Walker, pp. 253-270, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C.
- Monte, P.W, A.F. Hamlet, M.P. Clark, and D.P. Lettenmaier. 2005. Declining Mountain Snowpack in Western North America. American Meteorological Society. 86, no. 1: 39-49.
- Montgomery Water Group, Inc., 2004, Icicle Creek Target Flow Report for Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, Chelan County Natural Resources Department.
- Montgomery Water Group, Inc., 2004b, Water Management Plan for Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery
- Montgomery Water Group, Inc., 2006, Multi-Purpose Water Storage Assessment in the Wenatchee River Watershed, Chelan County Natural Resources Department.
- Montgomery Water Group, Economic and Engineering Services, and Pacific Groundwater Group, 2003, Wenatchee River Basin Watershed Assessment, Prepared for Wenatchee Watered Planning Unit and Chelan County Natural Resources Program.

- Mosey, T., 2009, Dryden Irrigation Canal 2009 dredging operations and juvenile lamprey rescue, Public Utility District No. 1 of Chelan County, Wenatchee, WA, April 29, 2009.
- National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015, Biological Opinion for Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery.
- National Marine Fisheries Service, 2018, Biological Opinion for Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), 1995, Peak Flows from Floods of November 28-30, 1995, online at: https://www.nwrfc.noaa.gov/floods/nov\_1995/flood\_nov\_1995.shtml.
- NOAA, 2016, 5-year Review: Summary and Evaluation of Upper Columbia River Steelhead Upper Columbia River Spring-run Chinook Salmon.
- National Park Service, Wilderness, online at https://wilderness.nps.gov/faqnew.cfm
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), 1975, Soil Survey of Chelan Area, Washington, Parts of Chelan and Kittitas Counties, United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service, 1975.
- NRCS, 2007. Soil Survey of Cashmere Mountain Area, Washington, Part of Chelan and Okanogan Counites, United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2007.
- NRCS, 2016, Web Soil Survey, Website accessed in October 2016, http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm.
- NRCS, 2017, Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) database for Kittitas County Area, U.S. Department of Agriculture, online at: http://SoilDataMart.nrcs.usda.gov/.
- Natural Systems Design, 2017, Lower Icicle Creek Geomorphic and Hydraulic Assessment for the Identification of Protection and Restoration Actions, Chelan County.
- NatureServe, 2015, NatureServe: An Online Encyclopedia of Life, Website accessed August 24 and 25, 2015, http://explorer.natureserve.org/servlet/ NatureServe?init=Species.
- NatureServe, 2016, NatureServe: An Online Encyclopedia of Life, Website accessed October 20, 2016, http://explorer.natureserve.org/servlet/NatureServe?init=Species.
- Nelson, M.C., A. Johnsen, and R.D. Nelle, 2011, Seasonal Movements of Adult Fluvial Bull Trout and Redd Surveys in Icicle Creek, 2009 Annual Report

- North Central Washington Economic Development District, online at: http://www.ncwedd.com/.
- Northwest Power and Conservation Council, 2004, Wenatchee Subbasin Plan, Prepared by Chelan County and the Yakama Nation for the NPCC, May 28, 2004.
- Noson, L.L., A. Qamar, and G.W. Thorsen, 1988. Washington State Earthquake Hazards. Washington Division of Geology and Earth Resources Information Circular 85.
- O'Brien, M., 2016, Personal communication with Kim Marcotte, September 23, 2016.
- Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA), 2013, Technical Manual Chapter 5: Noise, August 15, 2013.
- Parker, S.S., 2014, Declaration of Steven S. Parker, United States District Court Eastern District of Washington, Wild Fish Conservancy v. Dave Irving.
- Parker, P.L., and T.F. King, 1998, Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties, National Register Bulletin 38, U.S. National Park Service, Washington, DC.
- Peven, C.M., 2003, Population structure, status and life histories of upper Columbia steelhead, spring and late-run chinook, sockeye, coho salmon, bull trout, westslope cutthroat trout, non-migratory rainbow trout, pacific lamprey, and sturgeon, Wenatchee, Washington.
- Pfeifer, B, M. Swayne, and B. Curtis, 2001, High Lakes Fishery Management Program, Prepared by Parametrix for WDFW, September, 2001, http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/01131/wdfw01131.pdf.
- Plotnikoff, R. W., and S.I. Ehinger, 1997, Using Invertebrates to Assess the Quality of Washington Streams and to Describe Biological Expectations, Washington State Department of Ecology, Environmental Investigations and Laboratory Services Program, Olympia, WA, Publication No. 97-332, September 1997, https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/summarypages/97332.html.
- Riemen, Richard, Icicle Creek Watershed Council, 2017, Estimated Effects of Climate Change on Icicle Creek. Unpublished raw data.
- Ringel, B. K., 1997, Analysis of Fish Populations in Icicle Creek, Trout Creek, Jack Creek, Peshastin Creek, Ingalls Creek and Negro Creek (Etienne Creek), Washington 1994 and 1995.
- Ringel, B.K., 2007, Progress Report, Icicle Creek Water Temperatures, November 1, 2005 October 31, 2006.
- Robinson & Noble, 1989, Advance Project Plan, Well Rehabilitation, Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery.

- Rosenberg, D.M. and V.H. Resh, 1993, Introduction to freshwater biomonitoring and benthic macroinvertebrates, In D.M. Rosenberg and V.H. Resh, eds. Freshwater Biomonitoring and Benthic Macroinvertebrates, Chapman & Hall, New York, NY, pp. 1-9.
- Schalk, R.F, 1984, Prehistoric Land Use in the Montane Coniferous Forest, in Environment, Archaeology, and Land Use Patterns in the Middle Kootenai River Valley, ed. Alston V. Thoms, pp. 37-67, Center for Northwest Anthropology Project Report No. 2, Department of Anthropology, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington.
- Scott, D. W., 2002. "Untrammeled," "wilderness character," and the challenges of wilderness preservation. Wild Earth 11(3/4):72–79.
- Speulda, L., 1997, National Register of Historic Places Nomination, On file at DAHP, Olympia, Washington.
- Tabor, R.W., V.A. Frizzell, Jr., J.T. Whetten, R.B. Waitt, D.A. Swanson, G.R. Byerly, D.B. Booth, M.J. Heatherington, and R.E. Zartman, 1987, Geologic Map of the Chelan 30-Minute by 60-Minute Quadrangle, Washington, United States Department of the Interior Geological Survey, Miscellaneous Investigations Series Map 1-1661.
- Tabor, R.W., R.B. Waitt, V.A. Frizzell, Jr., D.A. Swanson, G.R. Byerly, and R.D. Bentley, 1982, Geologic Map of the Wenatchee 1:100,000 Quadrangle, Central Washington, United States Department of the Interior Geological Survey, Miscellaneous Investigations Series Map 1-13311.
- The Watershed Company, 2005, Lower Icicle Creek Habitat Assessment.
- The Watershed Company, 2005b, Lower Icicle Creek Reach Level Assessment.
- The Watershed Company and ICF International, 2009, Draft Shoreline Inventory and Analysis Report for Shorelines in Chelan County and Cities of Cashmere, Chelan, Entiat, Leavenworth, and Wenatchee, Prepared for Chelan County, March 3, 2009.
- The Watershed Company and ICF International, 2010, Final Shoreline Restoration Plan for Shorelines in Chelan County and Cities of Cashmere, Chelan, Entiat, Leavenworth, and Wenatchee, Prepared for Chelan County, May 10, 2010.
- Tohver, I., 2016, Impacts of Climate Change in the Columbia Basina and Implications for Recovery of Aquatic Habitats, Presentation at the Upper Columbia Science Conference, Wenatchee, Washington, January 28, 2016.
- Uehara, J., 2005, Management of Washington's High Lakes, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Fish Program, December 2005.

- Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board, 2007, Upper Columbia Spring Chinook and Steelhead Recovery Plan.
- Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board, 2014, A Biological Strategy to Protect and Restore Salmonid Habitat in the Upper Columbia Region.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1985, Instream Flow Study Report for Icicle Creek.
- U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR), 2005, Instream Flow Assessment of Icicle Creek, Washington.
- USBR, 2010, Groundwater Conditions at the Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, Leavenworth, Washington.
- USBR, 2010b, Brief History of the Bureau of Reclamation, Website accessed in October 2016, http://www.usbr.gov/history/2011NEWBRIEFHISTORY.pdf.
- USBR, 2012, Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Final Value Analysis.
- USBR, 2014, Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Icicle Creek Rapid Geomorphic Assessment.
- USBR, 2014b, Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Groundwater Model Update Technical Memorandum.
- USBR, 2018, Snow Lake Water Control Structure FONSI and EA.
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2015, Community Survey data.
- U.S. Congress, 1976, Alpine Lakes Area Management Act of 1976, Public Law 94-357.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), 2012, 2012 Census of Agriculture, Fact Sheet, National Agricultural Statistics Service.
- USDA, 2014, Climate Change Vulnerability and Adaptation in the North Cascades Region.
- U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), 1984, Manual 8400 Visual Resource Management, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Washington D.C. 20240, April 5, 1984.
- DOI, 1995, Departmental Manual, Series: Intergovernmental Relations, Part 512.2: American Indian and Alaska Native Programs, Chapter 2: Departmental Responsibilities for Indian Trust Resources, December 1, 1995.
- DOI, 2000, Principles of the Discharge of the Secretary's Trust Responsibility, Order No. 3215, Signature date April 28, 2000.
- U.S. Department of Transportation, 2015, Guidelines for the Visual Impact Assessment of Highway Projects.

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 1978, Protective Noise Levels; Condensed Version of EPA Levels Document, November.
- EPA, 1986, Quality Criteria for Water 1986, Office of Water Regulations and Standards, Washington, D.C. EPA 440/5-86-001, May, 395 pp.
- EPA, 2010, Washington State Ambient Air Quality Standards.
- EPA, 2016, Summary of Noise Control Act, Website accessed on October 25, 2016, https://www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/summary-noise-control-act.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), 1998, Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; Determination of threatened status for the Klamath River and Columbia River Distinct Population Segments of Bull Trout, Federal Register 63:31647-31674, June 10, 1998.
- USFWS, 2006, Biological Assessment for Operation and Maintenance of Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery.
- USFWS, 2009, Snorkel survey results for adult spring Chinook Salmon and Bull Trout in Icicle Creek, Memorandum to files, from FRO Hatchery Staff, USFWS, Mid-Columbia Fish and Wildlife Conservation Office, Leavenworth, WA.
- USFWS, 2009b, Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, Proposed Flow Management Operations for 2009-2014.
- USFWS, 2010, Best Management Practices to Minimize Adverse Impacts to Pacific Lamprey (Entosphenus tridentatus), April 2010.
- USFWS, 2012, Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Discharge Monitoring Reports
- USFWS, 2013, Icicle Creek Fish Passage Evaluation for The Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery.
- USFWS, 2013b, Icicle Creek Instream Flow and Fish Habitat Analysis for the Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery.
- USFWS, 2014, The Alpine Lakes: Water from the Mountains, Website accessed in October 2016, https://www.fws.gov/leavenworthfisheriescomplex/LeavenworthNFH/AlpineLakes. cfm#AlpineLakes.
- USFWS, 2015, Bull Trout Recovery Plan.
- USFWS, 2015b, Mid-Columbia Recovery Unit Implementation Plan for Bull Trout (Salvelinus Confluentus), Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office, USFWS, Portland Oregon, Website available at https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery \_plan/Final\_Mid\_Columbia\_RUIP\_092915.pdf.

### PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

USFWS, 2016, Leavenworth Fisheries Complex Planning Report.

- USFWS, 2016b, Snorkel survey results for adult spring Chinook Salmon and Bull Trout in Icicle Creek, 2016, Memorandum to interested parties, from Hayley Potter, USFWS, Mid-Columbia Fish and Wildlife Conservation Office, Leavenworth, WA.
- USFWS, 2016c, Assessing Fish Passage at Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery using DIDSON Sonar, Memorandum from Hayley Potter to interested parties, May 5, 2016.
- USFWS, 2016d, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Wetlands Mapper for National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Map Information, Website accessed on July 7, 2016, http://wetlandsfws.er.usgs.gov.
- USFWS, 2016e, USFWS IPAC Endangered Species Information for Planning and Conservation, Website accessed on July 7, 2016, http://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/.
- USFWS, 2016f, Listed and Proposed Endangered and Threatened Species and Critical Habitat; Candidate Species; and Species of Concern in Chelan County as Prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Central Washington Field Office, Revised August 1, 2011, Website accessed on July 7, 2016, https://www.fws.gov/wafwo/pdf/ChelanCounty080111.pdf.
- U.S. Forest Service (USFS), 1979, Alpine Lakes Area Acquisitions, Final Environmental Statement.
- USFS, 1981, Alpine Lakes Area Land Management Plan.
- USFS, 1996, Landscape Aesthetics: A Handbook for Scenery Management, Agriculture Handbook Number 701, December 1995.
- USFS, 2003, Forest Service Manual: FSM-2300 Recreation Wilderness, and Related Resource Management: Landscape Management, May 2, 2003.
- USFS, 2012, Alpine Lakes Air Quality Report.
- USFS, 2013, Visibility Data Summary: Alpine Lakes Wilderness, WA, June.
- USFS, 2016, Alpine Lakes Wilderness Web Site, accessed on July 7, 2016, http://www.wilderness.net/index.cfm?fuse=NWPS&sec=wildView&WID=8.
- USFS, 2016b, A Brief History of the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest, Website accessed in December 2016, https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/okawen/aboutforest/?cid=fsbdev3\_053644
- USFS, 2017, An Enduring Resource: Wilderness Brochure, Website accessed on March 17, 2017,

https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5407053.pdf.

- USFS, 2017b, Alpine Lakes Wilderness: Okanogan-Wenatchee Web Site, https://www.fs.usda.gov/recarea/okawen/recarea/?recid=79432.
- Vannote, Robin L., G. Wayne Minshall, Kenneth W. Cummins, James R. Sedell, and Colbert E. Cushing, 1980, The River Continuum Concept, Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 37(1): 130-37.
- Varela & Associates, Inc., 2011, City of Leavenworth, Water System Plan.
- Varela & Associates, Inc., 2018, City of Leavenworth, Water System Plan.
- Walker, D.E., 1998, Introduction, in Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 12, Plateau, ed. D. E. Walker, pp. 1-7, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Walker, D.E., and R. Sprague, 1998, History until 1846, in Handbook of North American Indians, Volume 12, Plateau, ed. D. E. Walker, pp. 138-148, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), 1982, Wenatchee River Basin Instream Resource Protection Program (IRPP), Including Proposed Administrative Rules (WAC 173-545) and Supplemental EIS, WIRPP Series #26, December, 1982, Reprinted July, 1983.
- Ecology, 1995, Initial Watershed Assessment Water Resources Inventory Area 45 Wenatchee River Watershed.
- Ecology, 2007, Groundwater Data Summary for the Wenatchee River Watershed Total Maximum Daily Load Study.
- Ecology, 2007b, Wenatchee River Watershed (WRIA 45) Fecal Coliform Bacterial Total Maximum Daily Load: Water Quality Improvement Report, Publication No. 07-10-009, March, Website accessed on October 28, 2016, https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/0710009.pdf.
- Ecology, 2007c, Wenatchee River Watershed Temperature Total Maximum Daily Load: Water Quality Improvement Report, Publication Number 07-10-045, July, Website accessed on October 28, 2016, https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/0710045.pdf.
- Ecology, 2007d, Mission Creek Watershed DDT Total Maximum Daily Load: Water Quality Improvement Report, Publication Number 07-10-046, July, Website accessed on October 28, 2016, https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/0710046.pdf.

- Ecology, 2009, Wenatchee River Watershed Dissolved Oxygen and pH Total Maximum Daily Load: Water Quality Improvement Report – Revised, Publication Number 08-10-062, August, Website accessed on October 28, 2016, https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/0810062.pdf.
- Ecology, 2010, Regional Haze, State Implementation Plan, Publication No 10-02-041, December.
- Ecology, 2011, Guidance for Processing and Managing Trust Water Rights, GUID-1210.
- Ecology, 2012, Water Quality Standards for the Surface Waters of the State of Washington, Chapter 173-201A WAC, Amended May 9, 2011, Revised January 2012, Publication Number 06-10-091, Website accessed on October 19, 2016, https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/0610091.pdf.
- Ecology, 2012b, Addendum to Wenatchee River Watershed Dissolved Oxygen and pH Total Maximum Daily Load, WRIA 45, Publication Number 08-10-062Addendum1, March, Website accessed on October 28, 2016, https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/0810062addendum1.pdf.
- Ecology, 2015, Washington State Implementation Plan Revisions, Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter – Addressing requirements for the 2006 24-hour National Ambient Air Quality Standard, March.
- Ecology, 2016, 2016 Columbia River Basin Long-Term Water Supply and Demand Forecast.
- Ecology, 2016b, Water Quality: Total Maximum Daily Load. Website accessed on October 25, 2016. http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/tmdl/tmdlstrategy.html.
- Ecology, 2016c, Water Quality: Currently EPA Approved Assessment, Website accessed on October 26, 2016, http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/Wq/303d/ currentassessmt.html.
- Ecology, 2016d. Water Quality Improvement Projects (TMDLs) WRIA 45: Wenatchee, Website accessed November 15, 2016, http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/tmdl/TMDLsbyWria/tmdl-wria45.html.
- Ecology, 2016e, Washington State Lakes Environmental Data, Website accessed on October 25, 2016, https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/coastalatlas/tools/LakeDetail.aspx.
- Ecology, 2016f, Water Quality Assessment Categories, Website accessed on October 26, 2016, http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/303d/WQAssessmentCats.html.

- Ecology 2016g, Water Quality Permitting and Reporting Information System (PARIS) Facility Summary: Leavenworth Water Treatment Plant, Website accessed on October 28, 2016, https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/wqreports/public/f?p=110:1000:2942523915020897::N O:RP:P1000\_FACILITY\_ID,P1000\_FACILITY\_NAME:17477858,LEAVENWO RTH% 20WATER% 20TREATMENT% 20PLANT.
- Ecology, 2016h, Washington State Water Quality Assessment 303(d)/305(b) List Listing ID: 5790, Website accessed on October 31, 2016, https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/approvedwqa/ApprovedSearch.aspx?LISTING\_ID=579 0.
- Ecology, 2016i, 2016 Ambient Air Monitoring Network Report, Publication No. 16-02-001, May.
- Ecology, 2016j, Maintenance Areas, Available from: http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/air/sips/designations/maintenance\_areas.htm. Accessed October 25, 2016.
- Ecology, 2016k, Status of Shoreline Master Plan Programs, Website accessed on October 28, 2016, http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/shorelines/smp/status.html#W.
- Ecology, Laws & Rules, Noise Pollution, online at: http://www.ecy.wa.gov/lawsrules/noise.html.
- Ecology, Office of Columbia River Overview, online at: http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wr/cwp/cr\_overview.html.
- Ecology, Water Quality, Water Quality Assessment and 303(d) List, online at: http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/Wq/303d/index.html.
- Ecology, Water Resources Explorer, online at: https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/waterresources/map/WaterResourcesExplorer.aspx.
- Ecology and Anchor QEA, 2010, Draft Feasibility Study, Campbell Creek Reservoir.
- Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (WDFW), 2008, Priority Habitat and Species List, Updated June 2016, Olympia, WA, 177 pp. http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/00165/wdfw00165.pdf.
- WDFW, 2009, PHS County Distribution List, Website accessed on July 7, 2016, http://wdfw.wa.gov/hab/phslist.htm.
- WDFW, 2010, Spring Chinook Adult Management in the Wenatchee River Basin Addendum to the Wenatchee River Hatchery Genetic Management Plans, October 19, 2010.

- WDFW, 2016, Trout Fishing in Washington's High Elevation Lakes, Website accessed October 26, 2016, http://wdfw.wa.gov/fishing/washington/highlakes/, Updated June 2014.
- WDFW, 2016b, SCoRE Interactive Map, Website accessed October 26, 2016, https://fortress.wa.gov/dfw/score/score/maps/map\_details.jsp?geocode=wria&geoar ea=WRIA45\_Wenatchee.
- WDFW, 2016c, Sockeye (Red) Salmon, Website accessed 10/26/16, http://wdfw.wa.gov/fishing/salmon/sockeye/columbia\_river.html, (No date provided on website contents).
- WDFW, 2016d, WDFW PHS online, Website accessed on July 7, 2016, http://wdfw.wa.gov/mapping/phs/.Bbroa.
- WDFW, 2016e, Sport Fishing Rules Pamphlet Corrections and Updates, July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017. Online at http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/01818/wdfw01818.pdf.
- WDFW, 2016f, Interim Progress Report 11-26-16, unknown author(s), unknown project name (to title on the document), Emailed from Jeremy Cram, WDFW to Mary Jo Sanborn, Chelan County on January 23, 2017.
- Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR), 2008, Cascadia Deep Earthquake, Washington Division of Geology and Earth Resources Open File Report, 2008-1.
- WDNR, 2017, Division of Geology and Earth Resources, Washington Interactive Geologic Map, online at: http://www.dnr.wa.gov/geologyportal.
- Washington Employment Security Department, 2015. Chelan and Douglas County Profiles, Online at: https://fortress.wa.gov/esd/employmentdata/reportspublications/regional-reports/county-profiles/chelan-and-douglas-counties-profile. Accessed October 30, 2016.
- Washington State Legislature, 2008, Chapter 173-160 WAC, Minimum Standards for Construction and Maintenance of Wells.
- Washington State Legislature, 2008, Chapter 173-545 WAC, Instream Resources Protection Program – Wenatchee River Basin, WRIA 45, Adopted January 12, 2008.
- Washington State Legislature, 2012, Chapter 173-400-110 WAC, New source review (NSR) for sources and portable sources.
- Washington State Office of Financial Management, 2015, Estimates of April 1 population by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin, Website accessed on October 28, 2016, http://www.ofm.wa.gov/pop/asr/default.asp.

- Washington State Office of Financial Management, online at: http://www.ofm.wa.gov/localdata/chel.asp.
- Washington State University, 2016, Columbia Basin Supply and Demand Forecast, Prepared for Washington State Department of Ecology, December 2016.
- Waters, T.F., 1982, Annual Production by a Stream Brook Charr Population and by its Principal Invertebrate Food, Environmental Biology of Fishes 7(2): 165-170.
- Wenatchee River Watershed Steering Committee, 1998, Wenatchee River Watershed Action Plan.
- Wenatchee Watershed Planning Unit, 2006, Phase III Wenatchee Watershed Management Plan, April 2006.
- Wenatchee World. Jun 20, 2015. Record Low Flows in the Wenatchee River. Accessed April 25, 2017 from: http://www.wenatcheeworld.com/news/2015/jun/20/recordlow-flows-in-wenatchee-river/.
- Wilma, D., 2006, Chelan County Thumbnail History, Website accessed in October 2016, http://www.historylink.org/File/7624.
- Wilzbach, M.A., K.W. Cummins, and J.D. Hall, 1986, Influence of Habitat Manipulations on Interactions Between Cutthroat Trout and Invertebrate Drift, Ecology, 67(4): 898–911.
- WRIA 45 Planning Unit, 2006, Wenatchee Watershed Management Plan, Publication number 043-1284.203.
- Wurster, F., 2006, The Management Recommendations for Reservoir Releases from Upper Snow Lake: Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery.
- WW Wheeler and Associates, 2009, Safety Evaluation of Existing Dams (SEED) Inspection.
- Wydoski, R.S., and R.R. Whitney, 2003, Inland fishes of Washington, Second edition, revised and expanded, Bethesda: American Fisheries Society in association with the University of Washington Press.
- Yakama Nation, 2016, Tribal History, Website accessed in October 2016, http://www.yakamanation-nsn.gov/history3.php.

# **Co-Lead Agencies**

NAME	ROLE					
WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY						
G. Thomas Tebb	SEPA Responsible Official, Study Oversight					
Melissa Downes	Input, Oversight, Document Review					
Tyler Roberts	Document Review					
CHELAN COUNTY						
Mike Kaputa	SEPA Responsible Official, Study Oversight					
Mary Jo Sanborn	Input, Oversight, Document Review					

## **Consultant Team**

NAME	ROLE	EDUCATION & LICENSURE	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE
ASPECT CONSULTI	NG LLC		
Ryan Brownlee	Water Resources and Utilities	B.S. Civil Engineering; Licensed Professional Engineer (PE)	17
Emelie Crumbaker	GIS	B.S. Civil Engineering; Geographic Information Systems Professional (GISP)	17
Taylor Dayton	Hydrology and Climate Change	B.S. Biochemistry; M.S. Civil Engineering; Engineer in Training (EIT)	4
Will Guyton	EIS Editor and Production	A.A. Business	19
Dan Haller	Lead SEPA EIS Consultant; Technical Reviewer; Water Resources; Land Use	B.S. Civil Engineering M.S. Environmental Engineering; PE, Certified Water Rights Examiner (CWRE)	22
Mike Maisen	EIS Editor	B.A. English	18
Joe Morrice	Water Resources and Geology	B.S. Geology M.S. Hydrology/Hydrogeology; Licensed Geologist (LG), Licensed Hydrogeologist (LHG)	21

NAME	ROLE	EDUCATION & LICENSURE	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE
ASPECT CONSULT	ING LLC		
Meghan O'Brien	Climate Change; Water Resources; Land Use	B.A., Geography M.S., Cultural and Environmental Resource Management; CWRE	11
Jordan Sanford	Recreation and Fisheries	B.S. Marine Science	18
Pete Stroud	SEPA EIS Consultant; Technical Reviewer	B.A. Geology; Licensed Geologist LG, Licensed Engineering Geologist (LEG)	35
Bill Sullivan	Geology and Geomorphology	B.S. Geology M.S. Geology; LHG, CWRE	13
Wendy Valdez	Graphic Design and Project Support	A.A.S. Information Technology; Graphic Design Certificate	23
ANCHOR QEA			
Barbara Bundy	Cultural Resources	Ph.D. Anthropology	20
Betsy Severtsen	Aesthetics	M.L.A, M.S. Natural Resources, B.A. Geography	11
Calvin Douglas	Natural Resources	P.W.S., B.S. Wildlife Biology	20
David Rice	Lead Engineer, Project Manager	M.S. Civil Engineering, B.S. Civil Engineering	19
Kim Marcotte	SEPA Planner	M.S. International Agricultural Development/M.S. Environmental Horticulture, B.S. Economics, B.S. Spanish	15
Larissa Rohrbach	Senior Fisheries Scientist	M.S. Aquatic and Fishery Sciences B.S., Biology	11
Matt Kuziensky	Water Quality	Master of Environmental Science B.A. Botany Professional Wetland Scientist	25
Nikole Stout	Water Quality	B.S. Biology	1
PETALS to PROTO	NS		
Christine M. Louchs-Jaret	Outside Reviewer/Editor	B.S. Botany and Environmental Studies M.S. Technical Communication	25