

# Kittitas VSP Work Plan – Technical Panel Comment/Response Matrix

February 2018 State Review Draft

Comment No.	Commenter	Section No.	Page No.	Line No.	Comment	Response																								
1	Tech Panel 3/30/18	2.2	14	Table 2-2	Percentages in this table should add up to 100%.	<p>Update the table as follows to clarify percentages:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Agricultural Type</th> <th>% of Agriculture in County</th> <th colspan="2">Primary Crops/Livestock</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Irrigated</td> <td>6.550%</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hay</li> <li>Small grains</li> </ul> </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetables</li> <li>Seed crops</li> <li>Livestock</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Dryland</td> <td>&lt;1%</td> <td colspan="2"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wheat</li> <li>CRP</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Orchards/Vineyards</td> <td>&lt;1%</td> <td colspan="2"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tree fruit (e.g., apples)</li> <li>Vineyards</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rangeland</td> <td>6.449%</td> <td colspan="2"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cattle</li> <li>Sheep</li> </ul> </td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>13.100%*</b></td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>*Agricultural lands cover approximately 13% of the County.</i></p>	Agricultural Type	% of Agriculture in County	Primary Crops/Livestock		Irrigated	6.550%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hay</li> <li>Small grains</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetables</li> <li>Seed crops</li> <li>Livestock</li> </ul>	Dryland	<1%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wheat</li> <li>CRP</li> </ul>		Orchards/Vineyards	<1%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tree fruit (e.g., apples)</li> <li>Vineyards</li> </ul>		Rangeland	6.449%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cattle</li> <li>Sheep</li> </ul>		<b>Total</b>	<b>13.100%*</b>		
Agricultural Type	% of Agriculture in County	Primary Crops/Livestock																												
Irrigated	6.550%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hay</li> <li>Small grains</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetables</li> <li>Seed crops</li> <li>Livestock</li> </ul>																											
Dryland	<1%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wheat</li> <li>CRP</li> </ul>																												
Orchards/Vineyards	<1%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tree fruit (e.g., apples)</li> <li>Vineyards</li> </ul>																												
Rangeland	6.449%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cattle</li> <li>Sheep</li> </ul>																												
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.100%*</b>																													
2		3.1.3	33	442	<p>Ecology comment on element E (i):</p> <p>The work plan states: Characteristics and functions overview: CARAs provide protections to public drinking water supplies by providing sufficient area for water to filter through the soil column. In addition, CARAs affect groundwater quality and hydrology by providing adequate groundwater infiltration."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The definition of functions and values of Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas is fundamentally incorrect - They mention the value of the ground filtering pollutants, and this is not the function and value of CARAs.</li> <li>The functions and values of Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas are to provide clean, safe, available drinking water.</li> </ul>	<p>Update as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CARAs provide <del>protections-clean and safe</del> public drinking water supplies by <del>providing-protecting areas near public drinking water supplies from contamination through ground infiltration. sufficient area for water to filter through the soil column.</del> <del>In addition, CARAs affect groundwater quality and hydrology by providing adequate groundwater infiltration.</del></li> </ul>																								
3	Tech Panel 3/30/18	5.2	64	944	<p>Update the text to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Setting anticipated disenrollment rate</b> of agriculture lands that may not continue to maintain the stewardship practice past the required lifespan or following the end of a contract, or for other disenrollment reasons. Disenrollment or abandonment of practices can be monitored to <del>adjust reduce</del> this rate further based on actual data.</li> </ul>	Update text per comment.																								

**Kittitas VSP Work Plan – Technical Panel Comment Response Matrix**

2018 February State Review DRAFT

Comment matrix updated:

Comment No.	Commenter	Section No.	Page No.	Line No.	Comment	Response				
4	Tech Panel 3/30/18	5.3	78	Table 5-10	Include Categories 2 through 5 when tracking 303(d) listings.	<p>Update Table 5-10, row 2, per comment as follows:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Maintain or improve surface water and groundwater quality</td> <td>Ensure stewardship practices employed with the goal of protecting or improving water quality are effective</td> <td>Water quality stations</td> <td>Change in Category <del>4 and 2</del> through 5 303(d) listings, focused on parameters that potentially have an agricultural source.</td> </tr> </table>	Maintain or improve surface water and groundwater quality	Ensure stewardship practices employed with the goal of protecting or improving water quality are effective	Water quality stations	Change in Category <del>4 and 2</del> through 5 303(d) listings, focused on parameters that potentially have an agricultural source.
Maintain or improve surface water and groundwater quality	Ensure stewardship practices employed with the goal of protecting or improving water quality are effective	Water quality stations	Change in Category <del>4 and 2</del> through 5 303(d) listings, focused on parameters that potentially have an agricultural source.							
5	Tech Panel 3/30/18	6.1	81	1231	<p>Update text to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <u>initial</u> tracking timeframe for this Work Plan is the first 10 years of implementation.</li> </ul>	Update text per comment.				
6	Tech Panel 4/9/2018	6.2	83	1284	<p>Ecology comment on element C and L(i):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text box on p. 83 - clarify if this means that the participation goal is &gt;10% consistent with the outreach goals in appendix E.</li> <li>Please clarify if the participation baseline is 10% as noted on p. 83.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text box on page 83 estimates that approximately 10% of the County's producers are reporting stewardship practices. The producer participation goal is to promote new enrollments or new reporting as described in Table 5-8. Additionally, the KCCD will conduct outreach to 10% of the County's producers annually to promote participation, as described in Appendix E – Outreach Plan.</li> <li>10% is an approximation on the current level of participation and provided for context. Participation is monitored based on historic enrollment in stewardship strategies and maintaining historic enrollment as described in Section 5.2.1.</li> </ul>				
7	Tech Panel 4/9/2018	6.3	72	1284	<p>Commission comment on element J:</p> <p>Some discussion found in Section 6.3 See also WP page 72, Section 5.4 - adaptive management only at the 5 year interval. Unclear if this is meaningful for the CA's of interest.</p>	<p>Progress and adaptive management measures will be reported with the 2-year status reports and 5-year progress reports, as noted in Section 6.3; however, monitoring and tracking will be conducted annually for participation in stewardship practices, which will also be verified through monitoring and visual recognition.</p> <p>Update Section 6.3, page 86, line 1336 to 1336 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring will focus on the measurable benchmarks <u>and indicators</u> described in Section 5 and will include <u>informal periodic</u> evaluations <u>at least</u> every 2 years <u>in support of the 5-year performance review, and to determine if any adaptive management measures are needed prior to the 5-year review.</u></li> </ul> <p>Add to Section 6.3, page 87, paragraph starting on line 1343 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the Watershed Group determines goals have not been met, they must propose and submit an Adaptive Management Plan for achieving the goals and benchmarks. <u>While adaptive management actions will be included with the 2-year status reports and 5-year progress reports. The the monitoring and</u> adaptive management process <u>is</u> outlined in Section 5 <u>will be applied on an ongoing basis as needed.</u> Monitoring indicators will inform the long-term viability of the Adaptive Management Plan, based on goals for protecting critical area functions. Monitoring will focus on the measurable benchmarks and goals also described in Section 5.</li> </ul>				
8	Tech Panel 3/30/18	6.3	86	1331	Note that reports will meet any new standards for VSP as funding allows.	Update the text per comment as follows:				

**Kittitas VSP Work Plan – Technical Panel Comment Response Matrix**

2018 February State Review DRAFT

Comment matrix updated:

Comment No.	Commenter	Section No.	Page No.	Line No.	Comment	Response
						“The 2-year status and 5-year performance reports would be developed by KCCD under the direction of the Watershed Group. Draft reports would be prepared and presented to the Watershed Group for review and comment. <a href="#">Reports will meet refined standards for VSP from lessons learned as part of implementation, as funding allows.</a> Comments would be addressed and edits made to the reports, which would then be approved by the Watershed Group after they are satisfied that the reports are accurate and complete.”
9	Tech Panel 4/9/2018	App B-2			Ecology comment on element D:  Community planning areas, please clarify if and how the community planning areas are going to be used in outreach efforts.	Outreach efforts will be targeted to meet protection and performance objectives identified for each community planning area. Appendix B-2 describes protection and enhancement objective and associated key stewardship practices for each community planning area. The Rapid Watershed Assessments included in B-2 also identifies performance objectives (acres) for key practices for each community planning area.
10	Tech Panel 4/9/2018	App B-2			Ecology comment on element L(ii):  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please describe what the relationship is between the conservation cost tables in App. B-2 and tables 4-3 and 4-4. consistent language between the tables would be helpful. for example how do progressive practices and RMS practices (a definition of them would be helpful) related to the NRCS practices. are the tables in appendix b-2 meant to capture practices that are not NRCS funded or NRCS practice.</li> <li>• For CARAs an average CPPE score is not as relevant as actually counting practices to avoid contamination of ground water.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The conservation cost table from Appendix B-2 is from the NRCS Rapid Watershed Assessment (RWA) tool which is based on national standards. The use of terms in the spreadsheet is unique to NRCS and is not intended to be consistent with VSP terms (e.g., baseline). The RWA was prepared as a planning tool to help implementers (i.e., KCCD) gauge the level or magnitude of effort to meet performance objectives for future enhancements. These costs on unrelated to practices summarized in Table 4-3 and 4-4, which is based on practices that have been implemented since 2011. Progressive and RMS are NRCS terms used to describe the level of conservation treatment and includes NRCS practices that could be implemented on properties that already have practices in place.</li> <li>• Comment noted. The Work Group could consider this in future reporting efforts.</li> </ul>