

From: winnie becker [<mailto:winnbec@netscape.net>]
Sent: Saturday, May 07, 2016 7:57 PM
To: Mike Kaputa <Mike.Kaputa@CO.CHELAN.WA.US>
Subject: Dam Building and New Water Rights

Dear Mike,

Please preserve the Alpine Lakes Wilderness. To build dams and change water rights would not be in keeping with the wilderness.

The EIS should include a "Wilderness Protection" alternative. The increase of water removal from the Alpine Lakes Wilderness is not in keeping with protecting the wilderness which is so very important for generations to come. Water should be obtained from sources outside the Wilderness. The Wilderness Protection alternative should comply with all the provisions in the Forest Service's administrative Alpine Lakes Wilderness Management Plan, including: " Except as provided for in Section 4(D)(4) of the Wilderness Act, watersheds will not be altered or managed to provide increased water quantity, quality or timing of discharge.

The Wilderness Protection alternative should evaluate public purchase (buy-back) of private water rights in the Alpine Lakes, which would allow removal of dams and other structures from the lakes to restore the area to its true natural character.

The EIS should include "Water Right Relinquishment" alternative. The alternative should analyze existing water rights to the Alpine Lakes and acknowledge those rights that have been relinquished or abandoned.

The EIS should include an alternative that recognizes IWG members" water rights are limited to the purposes for which they were initially granted (irrigation is an example) and cannot be redirected to other purposes (such as suburban development).

The EIS should include a "Water Conservation" alternative that emphasizes aggressive water conservation measures by the city of Leavenworth, Icicle-Peshastin Irrigation District, the Leavenworth fish Hatchery and other water users. This alternative should evaluate water markets that facilitate selling and trading of water rights.

The Water Conservation alternative should evaluate a transfer of water rights from IPID to Leavenworth for properties within the city limits that have now converted from orchards to residential properties. This alternative should analyze how appropriate reductions in water usage (that is, not using agricultural water quantities for lawn irrigation) would save that would then be available for other Leavenworth needs.

The Water Conservation alternative should evaluate how IPID spills large quantities of water back into the Wenatchee River at the end of several of its canals. The alternative should evaluate how this 19th century irrigation practice could be replaced with modern pumping and piping technologies. The EIS should work to reduce water demand as an alternative to water supply.

The EIS should include a "Water Right Change" alternative. This alternative would evaluate improving Icicle Creek flows by moving IPID's point of diversion downstream (to the Wenatchee River). This

measure, which would add 100 cfs of water to Icicle Creek every year, would convert the IPID diversion from gravity flow to pumping (requiring electrical power). This alternative should therefore analyze renewable energy options to supply that power, including solar, wind and in-canal hydroelectric.

The EIS should discuss the hydrological and biological impacts of the current drawdowns of the lakes, and any proposed changes. The analysis should include a review of scientific literature on the impacts of water removals upon wildlife, vegetation, soil and wilderness values.

The EIS should analyze each proposed action's site-specific impacts, past practices and the restoration, mitigation and funding that are needed in the future. At each site, proposed construction activities and proposed water diversions need to be spelled out in detail.

The EIS should provide a detailed operations, maintenance and environmental monitoring for the water infrastructure, and analysis of the wilderness impacts of specific maintenance actions including helicopter use.

The EIS should fully explain the purpose and need for water these projects would provide.

The EIS should fully explain what human activities caused the degraded conditions (such as low instream flows in Icicle Creek) that the projects seek to improve.

The EIS should analyze adequacy of proposed instream flows to support spawning, rearing and migration of steelhead and bull trout.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Winnie Becker