

# APPENDIX F: PUBLIC AND LCFRB TAC COMMENTS ON DRAFT PLAN

## Overview

Comments from the public meetings and from the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) are included in the table below. Responses to the comments and a description of any changes made to the document to address the comments are included in the table. The comments are presented in the tables below which are organized by 1) public comments received, 2) general meeting discussions (questions and answers) and, 3) LCFRB - TAC comments

### Public Comments

Commenter	Comment	Response
Keith Isaacson	If habitat restoration is to work, you must have the harvest management on the main stem Columbia. It is not working with any positive effect. Overharvest of salmon and steelhead commercially has dramatically reduced numbers to for escapement.	Habitat restoration is just one of a number of actions that will be required to recover Lower Columbia salmon and steelhead to healthy, harvestable levels. Success will require that actions address habitat protection, estuary conditions, predation, hydropower impacts and harvest and hatchery effects. A detailed discussion of the various factors affecting the recovery of salmon and steelhead is contained in the Lower Columbia Salmon Recovery Plan.
Keith Isaacson	Mining of rock on the east fork of the Lewis is detrimental to habitat restoration.	Past mining practices have altered channel conditions and adversely affected important habitat for salmon and steelhead. This restoration plan identifies several opportunities to improve these degraded habitat conditions.
Rick Malinowski	Nice job of conducting the meeting to prevent public in-put.	Public comments were taken by project staff at the work stations. Public comment forms were available at meetings. These forms could be left with staff or mailed to the LCFRB. Participants at the meetings were also advised that they could submit comments to the LCFRB electronically or by mail.
Sandra Bennett	We had a clear sand and gravel bottom when we first bought our riverfront property. Then we begin to have a buildup of silt and lost all the crawdads & minnows. Two years ago the silt began to wash away (after Storedahl's stopped mining).	Thank you for the information.

<p>Maggie Stone</p>	<p>I am very much interested in restoring salmon and natural habitat to our wild rivers. I live on Dean Creek, which I understand is part of the restoration plan that you are working on. I have been learning about the land from such classes the county has been offering (“Living on the Land” WSU extension service), and am in the process of planning to take out some evasive species (English Ivy and blackberry) and plant natives.</p> <p>RE: Dean Creek What I understand about Dean Creek from the meeting and your website, is that there are numerous ponds and dams on it from landowners, numerous evasive species growing along its banks, and that the creek water splays out and seeps into the ground at the end of its journey to the Lewis River.</p> <p>It is obvious to me that no fish fry that made its way down Dean Creek would survive at the end of the road if there is no creek bed to carry it to the Lewis. I know you know this. But it seems that rebuilding the stream bed would be the only solution. My question is: Are the landowners on either side not willing to allow that to happen? What needs to be done to help this along? I am also concerned about the ponds and dams that could cause warming to the waters. I know that there is a recreational swimming pool on the west side of Dean Creek that you probably know about, but isn't there some state</p>	<p>Work is underway to improve channel and habitat conditions along lower Dean Creek near the mouth (Clark County property). Lower Dean Creek does flow above ground into the East Fork Lewis except for during dry periods. In most years, during the primary migration seasons, juvenile and adult fish are able to migrate through this section.</p> <p>There is private land between J.A. Moore Road and the County land downstream. At this point in time, we do not know the specifics of whether the landowners are willing to participate in restoration efforts.</p> <p>Ponds and dams on the tributaries are believed to create temperature and passage problems and objectives to address these issues are included in the Strategy. The LCFRB has no regulatory authority and attempts to work with interested parties to address these issues. Such dams and ponds frequently fall under the regulatory authority of the Washington Department of Ecology or the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.</p> <p>Mining of rock or gravel is a regulatory issue guided by county land use regulations and associated state and federal laws. This habitat strategy is non-regulatory. Its implementation is dependent on volunteer landowners. The strategy attempts to identify restoration measures to address the adverse impact of past mining on fish habitat in several areas. Citizen and community support is critical to the protection and restoration of the East Fork Lewis and its tributaries. We recommend you continue to stay active and advise County and State elected officials of your concerns and what you would like to see happen in the East Fork Lewis watershed. If you are interested in supporting or participating in habitat restoration efforts such as those identified in the strategy, please contact the LCFRB for a list of</p>
---------------------	---	---

<p>regulations against such things, since it is right on Dean. I read that you don't have authority, but doesn't the state?</p> <p>RE: Storedahl's Determination to mine right next to the Lewis River on the 100 year flood plain. I have kept an eye on this for many years, and when I read an article in The Columbian on Feb. 24 about it, it made me angry. The article was right above the salmon restoration article about the Mar. 3 and 4 meetings; quite a contradiction to put them right together. It said our county commissioners are planning to approve a zone change that will allow Storedahl to mine the flood plain. How can they change the zone of a flood plain to not be a flood plain? It is or it isn't. I am angry that our government could let this slip through a crack of the legal system. I realize that you have a complicated plan for that area of the Lewis, and you may be up against a "hard rock," so if there is anything citizens can do to help, please let me know.</p>	<p>organizations active in the East Fork.</p>
--	---

<b>General Meeting Discussion</b>	
<p>Who decided what projects to put in the draft document?</p>	<p>The East Fork Lewis River Work Group determined the projects to be included in the draft strategy document. The Work Group includes representatives from federal and state agencies, local government, the Cowlitz Tribe, local nonprofit organizations (e.g., Fish First, Lower Columbia River Fish Enhancement Group, and Columbia Land Trust) and several interested landowners.</p>

<p>“Sound science” is referenced in the plan; where does it come from? Is it regulatory agencies?</p>	<p>The strategy is based on the best available science and technical information. The consulting team was selected by the Work Group for its knowledge and experience in fish biology, habitat needs and restoration, watershed and river processes, and engineering. The East Fork Lewis has been the subject of many scientific and technical studies and assessments. The Work Group used this available information as a basis for identifying habitat needs and restoration opportunities. Finally, the Work Group members themselves brought a variety of scientific and technical skills to the planning effort.</p>
<p>How are results of a project evaluated?</p>	<p>Currently, the state Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) and the LCFRB cooperatively monitor projects to ensure they are successfully completed. The SRFB also randomly selects project for effectiveness monitoring. The LCFRB is currently working with federal and state resource agencies, local governments, and project sponsors to develop a more comprehensive monitoring program for the region.</p>
<p>Some groups do their own monitoring work. Does the Fish Recovery Board?</p>	<p>Some project sponsors do attempt to monitor the projects. Project grants rarely include funding to conduct monitoring or evaluation of projects. This is true of grants by state Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB), which funds many of the habitat projects in the Lower Columbia. The LCFRB is currently working with federal and state resource agencies, local governments, and project sponsors to develop a more comprehensive, yet affordable, monitoring program for the region.</p>
<p>Does the Fish Recovery Board decide who they contract with?</p>	<p>Project sponsors are generally free to select their consulting and construction contractors pursuant to the terms and conditions of their grant. For many of the Lower Columbia projects, the state Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) is the primary granting agency.</p>

	<p>Sponsor and partner qualifications and capabilities are considered by the LCFRB and its Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in evaluating projects for funding by the SRFB. If the TAC and Board feel that a sponsor or contractor identified in the grant proposal is not qualified to or capable of undertaking the project, the project will not be recommended for funding.</p>
--	---

<b>LCFRB TAC Comments</b>	
<p>The temperature data chart references DEQ instead of Ecology---Oregon isn't monitoring temp in WA.</p>	<p>Corrected</p>
<p>The write-up on the Daybreak ponds avulsion study completely misses the work done in the Daybreak HCP and Technical Appendix C. That analysis includes planform, hydrology, sediment transfer, etc. Also, the cost is too low. Storedahl spent several hundred thousand dollars for the analysis. In addition, the Services have approved the avulsion protection and avoidance measures in the HCP and WDFW issued a HPA for the work which will likely be completed this summer.</p>	<p>Conceptual Design project #EF-A-02 (Daybreak Ponds Avulsion Risk Assessment) references the work done in the Daybreak HCP. The East Fork Work Group discussed these efforts and concluded that the HCP analysis should be reviewed, and updated or expanded as appropriate. This is partially due to changes that have occurred to the river channel since the HCP work was conducted. Nevertheless, the EFWG acknowledges that activities related to the HCP are moving forward, and that any work associated with EF-A-02 must take these activities into consideration.</p> <p>The cost estimate for this assessment was developed using professional judgment and takes into consideration the analysis work that has already been performed at the site.</p>
<p>In the objectives section for Segments 1 through 5, I think the plan should be revised in all the Section 8's to change the strategy for LWD to read..."to ensure they remain in place and functional and to withstand a 100-year flood event", instead of the 50-year event as stated. We have had too many 100-year events in the past 5 years or so already and we need to be sure the LWD structures are going to stay.</p>	<p>The design flood of 50-years was removed from the Objectives section. The magnitude of the design flood is handled as a specific design criterion to guide the engineering for a particular project. The magnitude of the design flood may depend on various considerations, including the function of the structures to be placed, nearby infrastructure or property that may be at risk, and the objectives of project stakeholders. In some cases, designing for</p>

	<p>less than a 100-year event may be appropriate, and in other cases, designing for a 100-year event or even greater (i.e. the probable maximum flood) may be necessary.</p>
<p>In the objectives section for Segments 4 through 7, the document does not address objectives or strategies for the following:</p> <p>A. Identification of existing spawning habitat capacity (except for Chum).</p> <p>B. Identification of spawning carrying capacity presently.</p> <p>C. Identification of preservation of key spawning habitat areas (except Chum).</p> <p>D. Identification of key areas to enhance or create spawning areas (except Chum).</p>	<p>In the Objectives section (Appendix A), Segment objectives attempt to focus on the key life history stages and associated habitat attributes for Chinook, chum, coho and steelhead. EDT assisted in evaluating current and potential population performance and habitat capacity. EDT was also used in evaluating the relative importance of life history stages in each segment, but was supplemented by other data or information where available. For example, key spawning areas for all species were identified using WDFW redd surveys.</p> <p>Specific projects opportunities were identified to address spawning as well as other key life history stages for each species.</p>
<p>Spawning habitat availability should be a primary consideration in the plan, and except for Chum, it is missing. Creating or preserving rearing habitat is important, but it goes hand-in-hand with spawning habitat.</p>	<p>Spawning habitat is one of the primary objectives. In order to better highlight the importance of spawning habitat, a new objective that specifically addresses spawning habitat was added to these segments.</p>
<p>I am a little disappointed that the Plan seems to focus an inordinate amount of attention on Chum, to the exclusion of the other salmon species, and it appears to lean heavily toward riparian, fine sediments, LWD and bank stabilization to protect private landowners. There is a distinct lack of focus on instream habitat in vision and scope, and relies too much on EDT data instead of quantifiable field surveys by fish habitat biologists, not just hydrogeomorphologists.</p>	<p>The plan addresses habitat preservation and enhancement for all life-stages for all salmon species.</p> <p>Stabilizing private property is not an objective in the plan and is not an objective of project concepts.</p> <p>Instream habitat is a primary focus of the plan and is a component of numerous projects that have been identified.</p> <p>Field survey data collected by habitat biologists is used to characterize existing conditions and was used to develop the reach-level objectives. EDT and other data sources (provided by multiple technical disciplines) were also used. EDT data is presented at the beginning of the reach-</p>

	<p>level objectives in order to provide context. It is the most comprehensive information that is available on life-stage limiting factors.</p>
<p>Measurement and Monitoring. The Plan does not include any mention or focus on habitat measurement and monitoring to track any progress of effort against plan implementation in the future. If the goals, objectives and strategies are ever expected to work, then there has to be some type of objective before/after measurement to assess whether the goals were indeed met.</p>	<p>We have expanded our monitoring objective in the main body of the plan to reflect these comments. In addition, the LCFRB is completing a Restoration Monitoring Plan as part of the updated Recovery Plan which will be available to all project proponents to provide monitoring guidance and planning.</p>