

# 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. The materials from the public open house are still available on the Chelan County website.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.co.chelan.wa.us/natural-resources/pages/sepa-public-open-house>

### 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 A.

#### 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 (Alternative 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**

	<b>Description</b>	<b>Methods</b>
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
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

### **5.1.5 Draft PEIS Comment Period**

---

Publication and distribution of the Draft PEIS occurred at the end of May or beginning of June. The distribution begins a 60-day public review and comment period. Written comments will be accepted by Chelan County through the comment period. Comments on this draft document will be considered by the co-leads and the IWG to help shape the final PEIS.

## **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 Basin. 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 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.

**ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN**  
**PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**Table 5-2**  
**Draft Permits, Approvals, and Relevant Triggers<sup>1</sup>**

Permit/Approval and Relevant Triggers	All Alternatives									
	COIC Irrigation Efficiencies	IPID Irrigation Efficiencies	Domestic Conservation <sup>1</sup>	Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries	Habitat Protection and Enhancement	Instream Flow Rule Amendment <sup>1</sup>	LNPH Conservation and Water Quality Improvements	Fish Passage Improvements	Fish Screen Compliance	Water Markets <sup>1</sup>
<b>Clean Water Act Section 404 review</b> Work within jurisdictional waters of the US	1	1		1	1		1	1	1	
<b>USFS Special Use Permit</b> Work on USFS lands not covered by easement.										
<b>Endangered Species Act</b> Federal action	2	2		2	2		2	2	2	
<b>Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act</b> Federal action	2	2		2	2		2	2	2	
<b>National Historic Preservation Act</b> Federal action	2	2		2	2		2	2	2	
<b>Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act</b> Federal action	2	2		2	2		2	2	2	
<b>FEMA Flood Rise Analysis</b> Modifications to floodplain	2	2								
<b>CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification</b>	3	2		3	3		3	3	3	
<b>FCC Licensing</b>										
<b>Ecology Dam Construction Permit/Review</b>										
<b>Ecology Water Right Permit</b>	4	3		4	4			4	4	
<b>Ecology Sand and Gravel Permit</b>										
<b>WNDR Burn Permit</b>										
<b>WDFW Hydraulic Project Approval</b> Work affecting bed/flow of state waters	5			5	5		4	5	5	
<b>WDNR Aquatic Use Authorization</b> Work within state aquatic lands	5			5	5		4	5	5	
<b>Ecology NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit</b> Construction within waters of the US/state	6						5			
<b>EPA NPDES Discharge Permit for Operation</b>							6			
<b>Chelan County Shoreline Substantial Development Permit/Conditional Use Permit</b> Work within state shorelands	7			6	6			6	6	
<b>Chelan County Fill and Grade Permit</b> <b>Chelan County Building Permit</b>	8									

<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.



**Table 5-2 (cont.)  
Draft Permits, Approvals, and Relevant Triggers<sup>1</sup>**

Permit/Approval and Relevant Triggers	Alt. 1 / 4	Alt. 1 / 2	Alt. 2 / 3	Alt. 3	Alt. 4			Alt. 5
	Alpine Lakes Modernization, and Optimization, and Automation	Eightmile Lake Restoration	IPID Dryden Pump Exchange	OCPI Legislative Change <sup>1</sup>	Eightmile Lake Storage Enhancement	Upper Klonauqua Lake Storage Enhancement	Upper and Lower Snow Lake Storage Enhancement	IPID Full Piping and Pump Station
<b>Clean Water Act Section 404 review</b> Work within jurisdictional waters of the US	1	1	1		1	1	1	1
<b>USFS Special Use Permit</b> Work on USFS lands not covered by easement.	2						2	
<b>Endangered Species Act</b> Federal action	3	2	2		2	2	3	2
<b>Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act</b> Federal action	3	2	2		2	2	3	2
<b>National Historic Preservation Act</b> Federal action	3	2	2		2	2	3	2
<b>Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act</b> Federal action	3	2	2		2	2	3	2
<b>FEMA Flood Rise Analysis</b> Modifications to floodplain		2			2	2	3	
<b>CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification</b>	4	2	3		3	3	4	3
<b>FCC Licensing</b>	5							
<b>Ecology Dam Construction Permit/Review</b>		4			4	4	5	
<b>Ecology Water Right Permit</b>	6	5	4		5	5	6	4
<b>Ecology Sand and Gravel Permit</b>		6			6		7	
<b>WNR Burn Permit</b>		7			7	6	8	
<b>WDFW Hydraulic Project Approval</b> Work affecting bed/flow of state waters	7	8	5		8	7	9	5
<b>WDNR Aquatic Use Authorization</b> Work within state aquatic lands	7	8	5		8	7	9	5
<b>Ecology NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit</b> Construction within waters of the US/state		9	6		9	8	10	6
<b>EPA NPDES Discharge Permit for Operation</b>								
<b>Chelan County Shoreline Substantial Development Permit/Conditional Use Permit</b> Work within state shorelands	8	10	7		10	9	11	7
<b>Chelan County Fill and Grade Permit / Chelan County Building Permit</b>		11	8		11	10		8

<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.

**ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN**  
**PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

**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.

Tribal and Non-Tribal Fisheries – 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).

Habitat Protection and Enhancement – 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).

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

1. 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.
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.

**ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN**  
**PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

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.

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. 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. Ecology review requiring submittal of engineering plans unless dam is considered "minor."
5. Required for adding instream flows as secondary uses.
6. Needed if on-site gravel would be quarried for construction to save costs.
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. General permit anticipated, requiring compliance with general conditions.
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.

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.

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. 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. Ecology review requiring submittal of engineering plans unless dam is considered “minor.”
5. Required for adding instream flows as secondary uses.
6. Needed if on-site gravel would be quarried for construction to save costs.
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.

#### Upper Klonauqua 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. Corps permit evaluation will address consistency with these regulations. Review is anticipated to be relatively straightforward for the proposed project activities.
3. Streamlined review (e.g., approval letter) issued when CWA NWP conditions are adhered to.
4. Ecology review requiring submittal of engineering plans unless dam is considered “minor.”
5. Required for adding instream flows as secondary uses.
6. 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.
7. Compliance handled through the JARPA review process and expected to be minimal.
8. Water quality compliance would be required and addressed by obtaining a general construction permit.
9. 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.
10. 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 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. 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.

## **ICICLE CREEK SUBBASIN**

### **PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

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.