Kittitas VSP Draft Work Plan – Comment Response Matrix

November to January Draft Work Plan Comment matrix updated: 1/16/2018

| Comment N | Commenter | Section No. | Page No. | Line No. | Comment | Proposed Response | Further Discussion Needed? |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| Draf | : Work Plan | | | | | | |
| 1 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | Cover | | | Can we get a cover photo with ag adjacent to a more functional critical area? Shrub steppe with grazing? | Cover will be updated to include multiple photos. | |
| 2 | Lila Hanson | All | | | Can we have definitions, index either in final draft or worksheets | Will be included in future versions. | |
| 3 | Lila Hanson | TOC | iii | | Appendices – Can we (or do we) have these – especially B and E | These are being prepared and will be ready for review in January. | |
| 4 | Lila Hanson | TOC | iii | | Figures – What is VSP Crosswalk? Even after looking at p. 17 and 34 I don't understand that term | Remove the term VSP Crosswalk from figures 3-1 and 4-1 (jargon term). | |
| 5 | Lila Hanson | 1 | 1 | 4 | Replace "provides for" with "forces" | Replace "provides for" with "requires." | |
| 6 | Lila Hanson | 1 | 1 | 5 | Replace "planning" with "regulation to benefit urban over rural people" | The intent of the GMA is to facilitate comprehensive planning to concentrate urban growth, reduce sprawl, promote natural resource industries, protect the environment, etc. These polices benefit both urban and rural areas. | |
| 7 | Lila Hanson | 1 | 1 | 5 | Insert "now" after GMA | The GMA has always required development of regulations that protect critical areas. | |
| 8 | Lila Hanson | 1 | 1 | 6 | After the "to" add "regulate critical areas on agricultural lands although agriculture was original exempt" | Add as first sentence of second paragraph: Prior to 2011, agricultural activities were exempt from critical areas protection regulations under the GMA. | |
| 9 | Lila Hanson | 1 | 1 | 7 | Change "In 2011" to "21 year later" | The year 2011 is important throughout the document because it is the year which correlates to baseline conditions, this is why it is pointed out here. | |
| 10 | Justin Bezold (TU) | 1 | 2 | All | Page 2 seems cluttered with the boxed and un-boxed text under the figure. Is the figure appropriate for this type of document? | Comment noted. | |
| 11 | Lila Hanson | 1 | 2 | 25-30 | In box strike out "traditional" and "to protecting critical areas" | VSP does provide an alternative because without VSP, or if VSP fails, counties are required to protect critical areas using traditional methods. | |
| 12 | Lila Hanson | 1 | 1-2 | 1-30 | Enough of my take on this. I do understand the friendlier gauge will go over better with the bureaucratic thinkers – Sort of a "tell it like it is" vs. "go along to get along" with our establishment governor. Won't pursue this throughout the document but don't want to be required to agree to statements I believe to be misleading. | Comment noted. | |
| 13 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 1 | 2 | 31 | Is construction of new barns or ag facilities included in Ag Activities and covered by VSP? | Construction of new barns requires a building permit. Therefore, it would go through traditional critical areas review under the County permit process and is not under VSP. | |
| 14 | Jack Clerf | 1.2.1 | 3 | sidebar | Include direct seeding and no-til in "Practices"? | Revise as noted. | |
| 15 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 1.2 | 3 | 38 | Add Yakama Nation to list. | Revise as noted. | |
| 16 | Lila Hanson | 1 | 3 | 45-48 | Happy to see boldface here – will that remain in final? | Yes, that will remain. | |
| 17 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 1 | 4 | 61 | Have we seen the VSP Overview and Checklist yet? | No, a draft will be provided at the December Watershed Group Meeting. | |

| Comment No. | Commenter | Section No. | Page No. | Line No. | | | Further Discussion |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|--|--|-----------------------|
| 18 | Justin Bezold | 1 | 4 | 66 | Comment The work plan organization might be more useful presented to the reader | Proposed Response Comment noted. | Needed? |
| | (TU) | ' | 4 | 00 | earlier in the section. Otherwise we can rely on a table of contents. | Comment noted. | |
| 19 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 1 | 4 | 79 | Development "of" the workplan | Revise as noted. | |
| 20 | Lila Hanson | 2 | 6 | 99 | Can middle sentence be boldface – same as 2-9-170 | Revise as noted. | |
| 21 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 1 | 6 | 101 | Wenatchee National Forest should be Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest throughout the document | Revise as noted. | |
| 22 | Lila Hanson | 2 | 6 | 103 | Influence of winds | Add sentence to end of paragraph: | |
| | | | | | | Additionally, private lands are influenced by high winds, especially in the Yakima River Valley. | |
| 23 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 2 | 6 | 106 | Remove comma and fix verb agreement | Revise as noted. | |
| 24 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 2 | 7 | Text box | Lake Cle Elum Dam | Revise as noted. | |
| 25 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 2 | 7 | 142 | Proposed "the" final | Revise as noted. | |
| 26 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 2 | 7 | 149 | County should not be capitalized. This error is repeated throughout the entirety of the first four sections. | County is used as an abbreviated version of Kittitas County. A reference will be added after the first mention on page 1. | |
| | | | | | | "as an alternative to managing agricultural activates in <u>Kittitas</u> County <u>(County)</u> under" | |
| 27 | Lila Hanson | 2 | 7 | 149 | Obvious error in mixing up east and west 7" in east (vantage) and 129" in west (pass) | Revise as noted. | |
| 28 | Jack Clerf | 2.1.1 | 7 | 149, 150 | Areas of precipitation are reversed | Revise as noted. | |
| 29 | Justin Bezold (TU) | 2 | 7 | 149- 150 | "western" and "eastern" portions of the county should be switched. | Revise as noted. | |
| 30 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 2.1.1 | 7 | 149- 150 | Western/eastern swapped. | Revise as noted. | |
| 31 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 2 | 8 | Fig 2.1 | The hydro layer on the south side of the river and in badger pocket are missing some streams; the legend and notes (public land) don't pertain to what is shown and/or isn't easily recognized as displayed. | Maps will be included in full page size to provide additional detail. The hydrography layer used was not the Washington Department of Natural Resources version. That version will be used in the new map. | |
| 32 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 2 | 8 | 160 | Please add a quick line to define where you're including shrub-steppe lands as they're important for habitat and grazing | Revise as noted. | |
| 33 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 2.1.2 | 8 | 162 | Add reference to shrub-steppe habitat. | Revise as noted. | |
| 34 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 2 | 8 | 164 | Insert comma after River | Revise as noted. | |
| 35 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 2 | 8-9 | 163- 167 | What do the soils tell us about ag or critical areas? Is there more discussion later on? The figure 2.2 (with loam, etc.) doesn't relate back to the text. | The soils map and description is intended to provide background information on the County prior to the discussion of baseline conditions. | |

2

| Comment No. | Commenter | Section No. | Page No. | Line No. | Comment | Proposed Response | Further Discussion Needed? |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------|----------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| 36 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 2 | 9 | 168 Fig 2-2 | Hydro layer seems incomplete for south of Yakima River and Badger Pocket. Please check all figures | The hydrography layer used was not the Washington Department of Natural Resources version. That version will be used in a revised map and all maps will be full page sized. | |
| 37 | Lila Hanson | 2 | 9 | 170 | Could this also be boldface with public land similarly in bold face when cited? | Revise as noted. | |
| 38 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 2 | 9 | 178 | Wenas & Quilomene wildlife areas are in Kittitas County too in addition to several river access sites. Even portions of Oak Cr Wildlife Area are in Kittitas County | Add these wildlife areas to list. The VSP does not require discussion of public access opportunities, therefore, this is not a complete list. | |
| 39 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 2 | 10 | 183 | Where does irrigated pasture fit into the four categories? It appears to not be included. | Irrigated pasture is considered an irrigated agricultural activity. Add livestock to Table 2-2 under Irrigated and add "and pasture" after irrigated crops to line 184. | |
| 40 | Lila Hanson | 2 | 10 | 187 | What about urban and UGA? Is 1,494,400 really 100%, not noted as such | This is the total county area including UGAs and urban areas. Add footnote to clarify. | |
| 41 | Lila Hanson | 2 | 11 | 189 | box above – wildland fire prone areas are not critical areas under GMA | Correct, reference to wildfire prone areas is relating to agricultural viability. | |
| 42 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 2 | 11 | 190 Fig 2-4 | Hydro layer, but is Eaton included in Rangeland? It should be. Did much of the Eaton Ranch not show up in the accounting for percentages if it's not shown here? | Yes, the rangeland in the shrub-steppe areas of the County (including the Yakima Canyon area south of Ellensburg) were included this figure. These lands were difficult to inventory initially because they were not included in either the Farm Service Agency or Washington State Department of Agriculture data. Tax parcel data with Department of Revenue codes were used to supplement the other data in order to capture the lands that were not included. The revised agricultural land cover data will be displayed in updated maps and tables. | |
| 43 | Lila Hanson | 2 | 11 | 194 | Insert "non-public" before "lands" at the end of sentence | This is referring to the percentage of the entire county not just non-public lands. | |
| 44 | Justin Bezold (TU) | 2 | 12 | 195- 200 | The paragraph reads oddly, specifically the sentence starting "Irrigated, dryland, and " | Revise as noted. | |
| 45 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 2.2 | 12 | 201- 206 | How are hobby farms without income accounted for? | According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Census of Agriculture there are 326 farms in Kittitas County with sales of less than \$1,000 per year. A new row will be added to Table 2-3 to reflect this. | |
| 46 | Justin Bezold (TU) | 2 | 12 | 207- 217 | Table placement? Seems odd but the content is beneficial to a reader | Comment noted. | |
| 47 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 2 | 12 | 207 | I still don't see irrigated pasture as a land use. | See response to comment 39. | |
| 48 | Lila Hanson | 2 | 12 | 208 | Are horse keeping enterprises considered "agricultural activities"? | If such operations are "producing, breeding, or increasing agricultural products, including livestock" then they are considered agricultural activities. See definition of agricultural activities on page 2. | |
| 49 | Lila Hanson | 2 | 12 | 213 | Last sentence after "consumption" say "or add to groundwater" | Need to clarify what this comment is referring to. | Υ |
| 50 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 2 | 12 | 213 | It's worth mentioning in this inset that even on good water years, we are over appropriated and water supply is a concern for ag viability and fish and wildlife resources. (there are 2 page 12s) | Revise to say: In-dry-some years, | |
| 51 | Lila Hanson | 2 | 12 | 217 | Do we know % of farms that earn a family living wage? | We do not have these data. The Census of Agriculture states the average net cash income per farm is approximately 5.1 million. However, the distribution of income between farms is not shown in the data. | |
| 52 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 2 | 12 | 224 | Suggest referencing the most recent County CAO for designation and identification of critical areas in the county. Keeping the language such that VSP will reference the most up to date CAO will help keep it current. | Add note saying that that CAO is currently being updated. Revise CA definitions to match draft CAO. | |

| Comment No. | Commenter | Section No. | Page No. | Line No. | Comment | Proposed Response | Further Discussion Needed? |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| 53 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 2 | 12 | 226 | I'd refer to the most recent draft CAO and/or stick with Commerce descriptions or RCW for each critical area. If customized, please include PHS reference within the HCAs to include riparian, shrub steppe, and biodiversity corridors, update CARAs as draft maps currently exist, GHAs will change to include alluvial fans and CMZs in addition to landslide and other erosion hazards, FFAs can and should incorporate local knowledge and ground water flooding as well. It's important for the group to remember we don't need to redefine critical areas through VSP; that has already been done. | See response to comment 52. | |
| 54 | Justin Bezold (TU) | 2 | 12-13 | n/a | Critical areas definitions are well laid-out and easy to understand. | Comment noted. | |
| 55 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 2.3.1 | 12 | | CARA box. See 10/2017 Draft CAO and associated maps. | See response to comment 52. | |
| 56 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 2.3.1 | 13 | | Geo-haz box. See 10/2017 Draft CAO and associated maps. | See response to comment 52. | |
| 57 | Jack Clerf | 2.3.2 | 14 | all | Grant County specifically relates critical area functions to area situations and practices. Does Kittitas County need this too? | Relevant information was moved to Section 3 in the Kittitas Work Plan to reduce repetition. | |
| 58 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 2 | 14 | 243 | Add "Functioning" to the start of Critical areas also help moderate | Revise as noted. | |
| 59 | Lila Hanson | 2 | 14 | 265 | Human habitats are not a concern of CAO (add that sentence) | Add to beginning of paragraph: Critical areas only address habitat for fish and wildlife species. | |
| 60 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 2.4 | 14 | 268 | Maybe describe why (and for what purposes) you identified these four planning areas in the work plan narrative. Are there priority areas for funding purposes (N Kittitas County, Kittitas Valley, Kittitas Valley Rangeland and Columbia)? | To be added when Community Areas are finalized. | |
| 61 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 2 | 14-15 | | I realize this is still a work in progress and we're still defining the areas but a couple thoughts—describing why we broke the areas out like we did will be important and Table 2-5 is confusing because there is rangeland listed in both Kittitas Valley Categories and it's unclear what irrigated means in the rangeland column. Anna's description of the areas at the meeting made more sense to me. | Remove rangeland from Community Area names and revise based on discussion at the November Watershed Group Meeting. | |
| 62 | Lila Hanson | 2 | 15 | 275 | Can Table 2-5 add a column on public land | Public land is not included in VSP. | |
| 63 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 2 | 15 | 275 | Irrigated pasture? | See response to comment 39. | |
| 64 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 3 | 16 | 278 | Change to "Establishing baseline conditions is necessary to measure changes in the critical areas protected under the VSP." | Revise with: Establishing baseline conditions is necessary to measure changes in the critical areas functions and values protected under the VSP. | |
| 65 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3 | 16 | 281 | Protecting "and enhancing" critical area functions and values | Enhancement is included in the second bullet. | |
| 66 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3 | 16 | 287 | "On Agricultural lands," any improvement of critical areas functions and values | Revise as noted. | |

| Comment No. | Commenter | Section No. | Page No. | Line No. | Comment | Proposed Response | Further Discussion Needed? |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------|----------|--------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| 67 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 3 | 16 | 289 | Consider providing an example. For instance, if a wildfire burns 250 acres of shrub-steppe rangelands, 250 acres is subtracted from baseline. | Methods for determining how to track and report these changes will be determined through the adaptive management process. The Work Plan provides a framework, but does not dictate exactly how this will be complete due to the uncertainty in funding and resources that will be available in the future. | |
| 68 | Jack Clerf | 3 | 16 | 289- 292 | Baseline conditions outside of VSP; Changes are monitored and reported? Why? How? | These changes are not specifically required to be reported through VSP; however, if changes to baseline conditions do occur that are not the result of agricultural practices these will be discussed through the adaptive management process. | |
| 69 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 16 | 291 | Does this sentence remain in final doc? Should be "would be" be "are" | Yes, this is referring to the adaptive management process that will occur in the years after this plan is approved. Change "would" to "will." | |
| 70 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 16 | 296 | Better word than "dictate"? Maybe require lead to | Change "dictate" to "direct." | |
| 71 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1 | 17 | 303 | The overlap of ag activities and critical areas may actually be pretty big in Kittitas County. Much of the rangeland is within mapped shrub-steppe polygons which is a priority habitat supporting many local species. The irrigated portions of the valley are basically big alluvial fans with streams spreading across much of the valley floor. These coupled with frequently flooded areas cover a pretty good portion of the ag lands. This isn't to say that ag and these CAs aren't co-existing relatively well in many cases, but to say there is minimal overlap seems inaccurate. | Update PHS discussion. | |
| 72 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1 | 17 | Map inset | Thanks for including this inset about maps being coarse scale-that's important for all landowners (and regulators) to understand. We suggest changing case-by-case to site specific basis and eliminating the "through farm stewardship or similar planning" portion of the sentence. | Revise as noted. | |
| 73 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 17 | 311 | "targeted"? discussed | Change "targeted" to "addressed." | |
| 74 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 17 | 314 | Could other help allow public lands to be helpers or participate? | Public lands are not included in VSP. | |
| 75 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 3 | 18 | 320 | 100% of "Total Agricultural Lands" is under the "Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area" designation? | PHS discussion will be updated. | |
| 76 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1 | 18 | Table 3.1 | Hopefully we can work together to refine the PHS data you've got and make better sense of the HCAs and figure out how we got to 100%; CARAs will cover nearly 100% of ag lands with the new draft maps, the description of GHAs will be different in the new CAO and these numbers may change as well. It'd be helpful in the text somewhere to briefly describe where the data for each CA comes from. | PHS discussion and maps will be updated. Appendix B-1 will describe the methods for the Baseline Conditions as well as provide a list of data sources. | |
| 77 | Jack Clerf | 3.1 | 18 | Table 3.1 | All ag land in Kittitas County is HCA? How was that determined? Grant County has 10% and I believe Chelan has 40. I have issue with 100% of Kittitas County ag land being declared critical area. | PHS discussion will be updated. | |
| 78 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 18 | 324 | Could "candidate habitats" be defined – maybe everyone else know but I can only guess | Add this definition: Candidate species refer to those species with sufficient evidence to propose them as either threatened or endangered under either state or federal laws. | |
| 79 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 18 | 327 | Is this 100 ft. buffer already in place | The 100-foot buffer is an approximation of the Wellhead Protection Areas. The County currently does not have updated critical areas maps. | |

| Comment No. | Commenter | Section No. | Page No. | Line No. | Comment | Proposed Response | Further Discussion Needed? |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| 80 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 3.1.1 | 19 | 332- 339 | Consider adding a table (visual) with water quality, quantity, and habitat functions listed under each function (i.e. under water quality, add sediment removal, nutrient removal, etc.). Under "habitat functions" add invertebrate habitat, Amphibian habitat, native plant richness, bird habitat, etc. | More detail what specific functions each critical area provide is included in Section 4. | recaca. |
| 81 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 19 | 339 | Could we add – wetland vegetation is sometimes weeds adding to farm costs or the type of vegetation that can reduce instream flow. | Add sentence: Non-native, weedy vegetation can hinder wetlands ability to provide these functions (particularly habitat functions) and add to farm costs. Invasive vegetation, such as reed canary grass, can form a monoculture reducing habitat complexity and increasing localized flooding. | |
| 82 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 3 | 19 | 341 | Change river valleys to waterways, or rework this statement in some other way. | Revise: These wetlands are concentrated in river valleys near streams and waterways that are | |
| 83 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1 | 19 | 343 | NWI didn't map wetlands in forested areas very well. There may be more forested wetlands within rangelands that aren't known by NWI. | Comment noted, currently the County does not have updated critical areas maps. | |
| 84 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 3.1.1 | 19 | 344 | "There are no mapped wetlands"Consider adding a footnote or sentence about the representational nature of maps that do not always accurately depict field conditions. Wetland acreage is compared to benchmark acreage of wetlands in 2011, per Kittitas County's GIS critical areas mapping, NWI, or whatever tool used to establish baseline. | This is stated in the "Use of Maps and Data" text box on page 17. | |
| 85 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 3.1.1 | 19 | 345 | How will you track changes in wetland acreage? What will the County do if they find that site conditions do not match existing maps? Consider adding this to part of the work plan narrative. | Discussion on tracking critical areas acreages is included in Section 5.3 Indicators. | |
| 86 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 19 | 349 | When habitat burns it no longer considered part of VSP? | If agricultural activities are occurring and the area provides critical areas functions and values then it would be included in VSP. | |
| 87 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1 | 19 | 349- 350 | Please remove the sentence: "When wetlands dry up in the county from improved water management practices, they are no longer considered part of VSP baseline conditions." While often this is probably true for purely irrigation induced wetlands this blanket statement seems overreaching at this point and we can't have a changing baseline if we intend to measure against it. I would defer to Ecology's wetland experts on this one and/or just leave the inset you provided on line 352, page 20. | Revise as noted. | |
| 88 | Justin Bezold (TU) | 3 | All CA maps | | Can you provide a larger map if it is rotated 90 degrees clockwise? The current size is difficult to interpret. | Appendix A: Map Folio will include full size maps. | |
| 89 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 20 | 352 | Are dried up wetlands still considered a critical area? | See "Irrigation-Influenced Wetland" text box. | |
| 90 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1.2 | 21 | inset | Some of these species don't have much overlap with ag (spotted owls, goshawks, pileated woodpeckers) and others are missing like Greater Sage Grouse and burrowing owl. I think we'd be best served to focus on listed species (state and fed) and more specifically the habitats they depend on as well as migration corridors. Streams, riparian, shrub steppe (particularly deep soils), and biodiversity areas/corridors will probably cover most of our needs for HCAs as they pertain to agriculture. | Remove species listed in comment. This is not meant to be a complete list, but to give an overview of important species in the County. | |
| 91 | Jack Clerf | 3.1.1 | 19 | 351 | Is this large wetland NE of Ellensburg based and described solely by NWI from USFWS? Confusing frequently flooded with wetland? | This is referring to many large wetlands in the area northeast of Ellensburg. Frequently flooded areas are discussed in Section 3.1.5. | |

| Comment No. | Commenter | Section No. | Page No. | Line No. | Comment | Proposed Response | Further Discussion Needed? |
|-------------|----------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| 92 | Jack Clerf | 3.1.1 | 20 | 352 | Is this "jurisdictional" determination preliminary, actual, pending, or assumed? | Jurisdictional means that they are regulated as wetlands under the CAO or VSP. However, it is not required to be stated in this section, remove the word "jurisdictional" to reduce confusion. | |
| 93 | Jack Clerf | 3.1.1 | 20 | Fig 3-2 | As mentioned in notes, there is a "potential" for critical areas presence as depicted on map. Do we want to assign critical area to locale that may not be one? Won't that skew baseline and monitoring if future assessments show initial label was wrong? | Maps and data represent the current best data for critical areas. | |
| 94 | Jack Clerf | 3.1.2 | 21 | | Do we need to mention the exclusion of irrigation delivery systems from HCA? (RCW36.70a.030(5) | Add as text box to this section. | |
| 95 | Jack Clerf | 3.1.2 | 21 | sidebar | Spotted owl, golden eagle, and gray wolves are common in Kittitas County? | See response to comment 90. | |
| 96 | Jen Nelson | 3.1.2 | 21 | 356- | This is all very general with little specificity to Kittitas County. It'd be great to | Add on line 370: | |
| | (WDFW) | | | 379 | incorporate shrub steppe into the discussion. | Shrub-steppe habitats are an important feature in the County because they provide habitat for sage grouse, ground squirrel, and other birds. The typical vegetation in these communities are open sagebrush and shrub plains with understory grasses. | |
| 97 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 21 | 377 | For curiosity sake – what is this work? Weibull? Also line 736 | Citation is included in Section 7 References: Weibull, A., Ö. Östman, and Å. Granqvist, 2002. Species richness in agroecosystems: the effect of landscape, habitat and farm management. Biodiversity and Conservation 12(7):1335-1355. | |
| 98 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 3 | 21 | 378 | This statement could work against producers as protection of crops from wildlife damage would be seen as a negative, not a positive. | Remove sentence to avoid misinterpretation. | |
| 99 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 21 | 383 | Can we know what % of this is public ownership if ag is 8% | The 8% refers to publicly owned agricultural lands, no public lands are included in this or any of the baseline condition numbers. | |
| 100 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1.2 | 21 | 383 | The stream layer on the maps is not the most accurate for the County and many of the small tributaries that intersect ag lands are not shown in Figure 3.3—so long as it's clearly stated that this map and these numbers are only showing the highest order streams and there are others, we would be OK with it although it seems like it could add confusion. | The stream layer will be updated to the Washington Department of Natural Resources version. Order of streams will be noted, as there are a significant number of lower order streams that clutter the map if included. | |
| 101 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1.2 | 21 | 384- 386 | Coho salmon are present as well and will be increasing in numbers as a coho hatchery will likely soon be constructed just outside of Ellensburg. Bull Trout and Steelhead are federally listed; chinook and coho are present throughout many of the tribs and mainstem and sockeye are in the Yakima and Cle Elum Rivers. Lamprey are also distributed throughout the County. Please ensure the number of miles of priority habitats include areas above man-made barriers—I'm not sure where the numbers come from. We're happy to set up a time to try and get more accurate mapping of the FWHCA/PHS intersections with Ag. | Updated Priority Habitat and Species data has been requested to ensure we have the most current and most comprehensive information. Updated maps will be completed and will include fish/aquatic species mentioned. | |
| 102 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 3 | 21 | 387 | Have exceeded | Revise as noted. | |
| 103 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 3 | 21 | 391 | Bacteria from livestock and wildlife using ag-lands, | Revise as noted. | |
| 104 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 3 | 21 | 391 | What "toxins from chemical inputs" have been detected above limits in irrigation water in Kittitas County? | Currently there is an approved TMDL for dieldrin and DDT in the Upper Yakima River and a TMDL in development for toxics in the Yakima River. | |
| 105 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1.2 | 21 | | For riparian systems, please also include their importance to wildlife. Eastern Washington riparian areas have very high bird and mammal diversity and use; it's not just about the fish and/or water quality. | Add language to text box. | |

| Comment No. | Commenter | Section No. | Page No. | Line No. | Comment | Proposed Response | Further Discussion Needed? |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------|----------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| 106 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 3.1.2 | 22 | 394- 395 | Add coho, sockeye and lamprey. | Revise as noted. | |
| 107 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 3.1.2 | 22 | 394- 395 | Irrigation has resulted in an "upside down" hydrograph. | Replace "Irrigation has resulted in increased summer flows in some systems (e.g., KRD North Branch Canal)" with "Many streams, particularly in the Kittitas Valley, have an upside-down hydrograph with much higher than natural flows through the irrigation season and low flows in the fall and winter due to the volume of water conveyed into the sub-basins for irrigation. Additionally, water management can result in low flows in dry years, especially in the upper reaches." | |
| 108 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1.2 | 22 | 380- 396 | Please include discussion about riparian areas. To simply call it the ribbon of green (inset) doesn't really take into account those locations where riparian vegetation has been replaced with access roads and/or crops and the impacts associated with removal of actual riparian vegetation. There is also room here to discuss crack willows and the desire to replace them with native vegetation that would be better for fish, wildlife, and agriculture/landowners. | Revise as: <u>Vegetation associated with the interaction between Located along water resources (streams and irrigation waterways) and upland vegetation. Typically associated with a specific vegetation composition that is different from upland vegetation. and form a "ribbon of green" from ordinary high water and within irrigation seepages-This vegetation has important functions for water quality, habitat and hydrology.</u> | |
| 109 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 22 | 392 | Add with urban lands | Revise as noted. | |
| 110 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 22 | 394 | Intensive development = residential or recreational what? | Add ", such as high density residential development" to the end of this sentence. | |
| 111 | Jack Clerf | 3.1.2 | 22 | 1st sidebar | Removal of LWD creates low flows during dry years? | Delete bullet. Also, see response to comment 107. | |
| 112 | Jack Clerf | 3.1.2 | 22 | 1st sidebar | LWD removed from systems due to its interference with irrigation systems. Believe it probably relates more to flood control and shore erosion | Revise last bullet to state: Large woody debris has been removed from systems due to reduced conveyance and increased bank erosion from scour | |
| 113 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1.2 | 22 | 396 inset | Consider using WDFW's PHS definition: A riparian habitat area (RHA) is defined as the area adjacent to aquatic systems with flowing water (e.g., rivers, perennial or intermittent streams, seeps, springs) that contains elements of both aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems which mutually influence each other. Riparian habitat encompasses the area beginning at the ordinary high water line and extends to that portion of the terrestrial landscape that directly influences the aquatic ecosystem by providing shade, fine or large woody material, nutrients, organic and inorganic debris, terrestrial insects, or habitat for riparian-associated wildlife. It includes the entire extent of the floodplain because that area significantly influences and is influenced by the stream system during flood events. The riparian habitat area encompasses the entire extent of vegetation adapted to wet conditions as well as adjacent upland plant communities that directly influence the stream system. | Revise as noted, add definition to beginning of paragraph. | |
| 114 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 22 | 395 | 1st Box – ribbon of green=weeds? Historically salmon? Water management? add, and flood control ??? others | See response to comment 108. | |
| 115 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 22 | 395 | Citation (Kittitas Co et al 2013) what document? | Citation is included in Section 7 References: Kittitas County, City of Cle Elum, Town of South Cle Elum, and City of Ellensburg, 2013. Kittitas County Regional Shoreline Master Program Update - Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report. Ecology Grant No. 1200054. May 2013. | |
| 116 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 22 | 396 | End of box – Do we know what riparian vegetation uses more water than is saves? | Rates of evapotranspiration (water use by vegetation) vary too widely with temperature and humidity to make a definitive statement here. The location of the vegetation also makes a big difference. The shade provided by vegetation on the south banks of streams reduces evaporation more than vegetation to the north. | |

| Comment No. | Commenter | Section No. | Page No. | Line No. | Comment | Dis | urther scussion eeded? |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|---|--|------------------------------|
| 117 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1.2 | 23 | Fig 3.3 | The distribution map should maybe include critical habitat for bull trout and steelhead since they're the ESA listed species in our County. Distributions conveyed on a map at this scale are not terribly useful. | Currently working to update maps. | |
| 118 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 3.1.2 | 24 | | PHS – add reference to threatened, endangered and sensitive species. | Revise as noted. | |
| 119 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 3 | 24 | 400 | PHS are found within 100% of ag-lands, but are mostly located in the upland range community area? I don't understand what you're trying to say. | Currently working to refine this data. | |
| 120 | Jack Clerf | 3.1.2 | 24 | 401 | 100% ag land PHS/HCA. How is that? | Currently working to refine this data. | |
| 121 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1.2 | 24 | 399- 406 | I think it'd be useful to sit down and really look at these areas together. I think we can refine these maps to make them more useful and less threatening to producers. Focusing more on habitat types and less on individual species may change how the maps look and may reflect how we'll actually be tracking progress better than by individual species. Shrub steppe habitat is an important focus, sage grouse need to be mentioned within the text and insets as they're a critical keystone species for this habitat. We'd like to see the ALI and/or WA connectivity linkage areas for sage grouse shown as a biodiversity area. New PHS maps will reflect these areas in the relatively near future. It's also important to note that rangelands provide habitat for more than just big game species just as riparian areas provide habitat for more than fish/salmonids. | Currently working to refine this data. | |
| 122 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 24 | 406 | Who has done the mapping of 5000 acres? Half mapped? | Currently working to refine this data. | |
| 123 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 24 | 407 | Remove last sentence – statewide is not this county – implication? | Revise as noted. | |
| 124 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1.2 | 25 | Fig 3.4 | Please make the sage grouse blobs much larger or convert to a corridor to avoid giving out sensitive information. Our preference would be to lump into shrub steppe, riparian, streams, and biodiversity corridors rather than call out specific species or groups of species that are incomplete and could unnecessarily alarm producers. This map also seems to include portions of public lands? | Currently working to update maps. | |
| 125 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 3.1.3 | 26 | 415 | See 10/2017 Draft CAO and associated maps. CARA will be designated. | See response to comment 52. | |
| 126 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 26 | 417 | Definition? | See response to comment 52. | |
| 127 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1.3 | 26 | 412- 418 | Strike the word "Public" as CARAs protect all drinking water. Also reference the updated draft CAO and maps that reflect draft maps covering nearly the entire county, including ag zones. | See response to comment 52. | |
| 128 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 26 | 419 | Why mention if no CARA? Is true to say "potentially for benefit to CARA" | See response to comment 52. | |
| 129 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 26 | 420 | Figure 3-5 If there are more, how were these mapped? | See response to comment 52. | |

| Comment No. | Commenter | Section No. | Page No. | Line No. | Comment | Proposed Response | Further Discussion Needed? |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| 130 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1.4 | 27 | 422- 431 | We believe this focus is too narrow for GHA; by statute, they include CMZs and alluvial fans which do intersect agricultural activities. The new draft CAO has a more comprehensive definition of GHAs. This critical area has the potential for lots of intersections with ag as an active alluvial fan can cause major erosion on a field, particularly if it's freshly tilled. This could connect directly with the ag viability piece potentially. | See response to comment 52. | |
| 131 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 3.1.4 | 27 | 432 | See 10/2017 Draft CAO and associated maps. Geo-haz will be designated. | See response to comment 52. | |
| 132 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 27 | 432 | Again if none, why this? Are all steep slopes "highly erodible land"? | See response to comment 52. | |
| 133 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1.4 | 27 | 435 | The text states that steep slopes are mostly in rangelands, but Figure 3.6 shows them mostly in Badger Pocket, within the irrigated area. | Currently working to refine this data. | |
| 134 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 27 | 437 | Landslide occurrence – often along highways and uncontrolled rivers and streams | Comment noted. | |
| 135 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 27 | 437 | Add recreation to wildfires and overgrazing? | Comment noted. | |
| 136 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 3.1.5 | 29 | 441 | Effects of climate change on floodplains? Protecting and restoring floodplains mitigation for climate change consistent with BAS. | Climate change would be considered a change in baseline conditions and any changes to indicators resulting from climate change would be addressed through the adaptive management process. Add callout box to bottom of page 18: Climate change may cause impacts to critical areas functions and values such as increasing stream temperatures and increasing the frequency and duration of floods and droughts. These types of impacts to critical areas functions and values would be considered a change in baseline conditions under the VSP since they are not attributed to changes in agricultural practices. However, stewardship practices implemented through VSP can help increase resilience to climate change impacts for both agricultural viability and critical areas functions and values. Changes in baseline conditions due to climate change will be reviewed and discussed in VSP reporting and adaptive management. | |
| 137 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 29 | 447 | How many farms are included in this? One of every 4? | We do not have data to provide this level of detail. | |
| 138 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 3.1.5 | 29 | 450 | County is currently working on new FEMA maps. | Revise to reflect this update. | |
| 139 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1.4 | 29 | 450 | A major update to the FEMA maps is currently underway. | Revise to reflect this update. | |
| 140 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 3.1.4 | 29 | inset | Typos: Cle Elum River, Manastash Creek. It's also worth mentioning here how the irrigation conveyance infrastructure (canals, ditches, laterals, etc.) also convey floodwaters. | Revise typos as noted. Add bullet: Irrigation canals can also convey floodwaters. However, these events often cause damage to irrigation systems, which is an issue for agricultural viability. | |
| 141 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 29 | 452 | Is Cle Elum River misspelled in box above – typo? | Revise as noted. | |
| 142 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 3 | 29 | 450 | Much needed changes | Comment noted. | |

| Comment No. | Commenter | Section No. | Page No. | Line No. | Comment | Proposed Response | Further Discussion Needed? |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| 143 | Jen Nelson | 3.2 | 31 | | Where do working public lands come into play? WDFW (and WDNR) has | Public lands are not included in the VSP even if agricultural practices occur on them. | - Necucu: |
| | (WDFW) | | | | worked hard to continue grazing in many locations and I'd think this fits into | Add on line 492: | |
| | | | | | the Ag viability section? Also, could be incorporated into the description of the TCF | Although agricultural activities occurring on public lands are not included in VSP, livestock grazing on public lands is an important component of agricultural viability in the County. Grazing on public lands improves habitat conditions for wildlife species, such as mule deer, as well as protects conversion of private agricultural lands to meet grazing needs. | |
| 144 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 31 | 467 | Can this table include "Asset Protection" as a concept with ability to acquire operating farms – and retention of rest of farm ownership as "details" – also processing facilities as a detail under infrastructure – also include lifestyle as element of viability | Revise as noted. | |
| 145 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 32 | 481 | New technology is often too expensive for many small farms | Comment noted. | |
| 146 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 32 | 486 | Under incentives, does "measures" mean sacrifices? Should it say so? | This is referring to grants or other programs that help pay for implementation of new agricultural practices such as sprinkler systems which have a benefit to the viability of farms. Agriculture producers are not forced to participate in incentive programs. | |
| 147 | Lila Hanson | 3 | 33 | 489 | Nearness to "Imperial City" a factor (may not be unique) raises costs, restrictions and regulations, destroys lifestyle, loses local control, promotes invasive species – on and on | Add to Threats: • Increased cost of living • Invasive species | |
| 148 | Lila Hanson | 4 | 34 | 505 | Linking Kittitas County with the entire state implies something – what? | Remove reference to "Washington State" to avoid misinterpretation. | |
| 149 | Lila Hanson | 4 | 34 | 510 | Include "control weeds" | Revise as noted. | |
| 150 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 4.1 | 35 | 528 | Change "It is important to consider implementing a suite of farming practices in order develop" To "It is important to consider implementing a suite of farming practices in order to develop." | Revise as noted. | |
| 151 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 4 | 35 | 530 | Viability with implementation | Revise as noted. | |
| 152 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 4.1 | 35 | 537 | Unsure how all the pop up boxes relate to each other or to the Section. | They provide information on how to take credit for stewardship practices including those completed outside of funded programs and examples of a common practice in the County. | |
| 153 | Lila Hanson | 4 | 35 | 540 | And vice versa? – also does this mean no farm plan required? | Participation in funded programs are considered participation in VSP. Individual Stewardship Plans are not required to participate in VSP; however, producers must report stewardship practices to the VSP Coordinator (KCCD) to be a VSP participant. The VSP Checklist is used to identify producers engaged in stewardship. The VSP Coordinator (KCCD) will use this information to understand where specific stewardship practices are being implemented so that they can be tracked under VSP. | |
| 154 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 4.1 | 36 | 543 | Suggest linking "critical area functions" to critical areas. | The link between critical area functions and critical areas is described in Section 3 in the "Characteristics and Functions" sub-section for each critical area. | |
| 155 | Heather | 4.1 | 36 | 543 | Define "Aquatic Organism Passage" (i.e. anadromous fish, excluding | Add note to table: | |
| | Kosaka (Ecology) | | | | amphibians.) | Aquatic organism passage includes practices that improve the ability of all aquatic organisms that use streams for migration. This includes anadromous fish, resident fish, and any other aquatic species which rely on in stream passage. | |
| 156 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 4 | 37 | 548 | Remove comma | Revise as noted. | |

| Comment No. | Commenter | Section No. | Page No. | Line No. | Commont | Proposed Response | Further Discussion Needed? |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| 157 | Lila Hanson | Λ | 37 | 551 | Comment Define "private sector" (including in Section 6.4.2) | Add as footnote: | iveededs |
| 131 | Liia Hanson | 4 | 37 | 551 | Define "private sector" (including in Section 6.4.2) | Private-sector activities include agri-businesses and associations serving the County such as food-processing companies, certified crop consultants, and agri-businesses. | |
| 158 | Justin Bezold (TU) | 4 | 37 | 553- 555 | The sentence may provide a reader more benefit if moved after the paragraph currently ending on line 579. | Revise as noted. | |
| 159 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 4 | 37 | 564 | Management systems, stock watering | Add comma as suggested. | |
| 160 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 4.2.1 | 39 | | Table 4-3 – Forest Stand and tree/shrub pruning? | Remove practice from table, it is not applicable to grazing in forested areas. | |
| 161 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 4 | 39 | 603 | Grant County? Should this be Kittitas County? | This should be Grant County. The Grant County Conservation District provided KCCD with information on the NRCS practices implemented in Kittitas County. | |
| 162 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 4.2.1 | 39 | Table 4.3 | Can we lump these so they make sense to the non-NRCS speaking person? A few groups like water conservation, riparian planting, grazing management, etc. would be more meaningful and helpful for me. Are the forestry practices aimed at fire wise practices (fuel breaks) or habitat improvement? Some of these may not apply to VSP. Our recommendation to lump practices into more general terms holds for other tables with similar practices too (4.4). | Group similar to groupings in Tables 5-6 and 5-7. | |
| 163 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 4.2.2 | 39 | Table 4.4 | Please update the AOP to reflect stream miles opened and include a quantity for fish screens. We had a pretty good number for 2013 that needs updated. | Do not have this data. | |
| 164 | Lila Hanson | 4 | 39 | 602 and 613 | More attention to weed control if applicable or a separate table for non-NRCS and non-KCCD activities | We do not have any data on practices implemented outside of the NRCS or KCCD. Under VSP additional efforts will be made to track all stewardship activities inside and <u>outside</u> of funded programs. | |
| 165 | Lila Hanson | 4 | 40 | 615 | Some CRP programs done with HEL | Revise:pays a yearly rental payment in exchange for farmers removing environmentally sensitive land, such as fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas or geologically hazardous areas, from agricultural production and planting species that will improve environmental quality. | |
| 166 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 4.2.3 | 40 | 619 | How much CRP? Not a critical area? | KCCD is working with FSA to get the number of acres enrolled in CRP in the County. CRP is not automatically designated as a critical area; it is considered an agricultural activity under RCW 90.58.065 (see page 2). However, it may overlap with other critical areas such as HCA. | |
| 167 | Jen Nelson (WDFW) | 4.2.3 | 40 | 620 | Lands under CRP at baseline in July 2011 should count toward the baseline conditions. The blanket statement that they are only enhancements seems inaccurateunless we didn't have any at baseline. | See response to comment 166. | |
| 168 | Lila Hanson | 4 | 40 | 627 | Should trails and roads be listed as barriers that need removing? | This is a specific description of the Yakima Tributary Access & Habitat Program, which is focused on fish passage barriers. | |
| 169 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 4.2.4 | 40 | 630 | Add Yakama Nation to list. | Revise as noted. | |
| 170 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 4 | 41 | 639 | The Integrated Plan includes seven elements that benefit agricultural viability and critical areas—fish passage, structural and operational changes to existing infrastructure, increased surface water storage, groundwater storage, enhancement of habitat, water conservation, and market reallocation. | Add to first paragraph. | |

12

| Comment No. | Commenter | Section No. | Page No. | Line No. | Comment | Proposed Response | Further Discussion Needed? |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------|----------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| 171 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 4 | 41 | 648 | Supplement and expand on efforts | Revise as noted. | Treeded. |
| 172 | Kat Satnik (KCWP) | 4 | 41 | 663 | Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project Working Group's Executive Committee | Revise as noted. | |
| 173 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 4.2.7 | 42 | 677 | Add Yakama Nation to list. | Revise as noted. | |
| 174 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | 4.2.8 | 42 | 682 | 2,137 more parcels? This is a problem for both CA protection and ag viability. How to address? | KCCD is confirming the increase in the number of parcels in the County. Agricultural lands that are converted to other uses, such as residential development, would be regulated under the County Critical Areas Ordinance. Expansion of residential development into agricultural areas is an agricultural viability concern which is included as a threat in Section 3.2. | |
| 175 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 5-1 | 46 | 740 | Table 5-1 Wetland Protection and Enhancement Goals> Key Functions> Habitat. Change, "Provides off channel refuge during high flows fish bearing stream connections" to "Provides off channel refuge during high flows and (?) fish bearing stream connections." | Revise as: Provides off channel refuge during high flows and connections to fish bearing streams. | |
| 176 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | Table 5-2 | 47 | | Habitat Row – Wording here is awkward; "Provide", "Provide", "Support". Recommend rewording for better clarity on applicability to all HAC. | The language "provides" and "supports" refers to the fact that critical areas provide and support a range of habitat functions as described in each table. | |
| 177 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | Table 5-4 | 50 | | Key Stewardship Practices – Add riparian and floodplain planting. | Revise as noted. | |
| 178 | John Marvin (Yakama Nation) | Table 5-5 | 51 | | Key Stewardship Practices – Add floodplain restoration, including dike/levee/road removal/setback, and the addition of woody materials to the stream channel. | Revise as noted. | |
| 179 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 5-2 | 53 | 794 | Change, "Under VSP, the relative changes in function affected from a given conservation practice will be tracked, e.g., a +4 increase moving to from a -2 to +2, rather than the CPPE score of +2" to, "Under VSP a +4 increase moving from a -2 to a +2, rather than the CPPE score of +2." | Revise as noted. | |
| 180 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 5-2 | 54 | 819 | Rapid Watershed Assessments: "Resource concerns and locally appropriate stewardship practices to address these concerns." I may have missed this (in Appendix C?) maybe describe why you are using community planning areas (instead of WRIAs) somewhere in the work plan narrative. | The reference should be to Appendix B-2 which provides specific information for each planning area including specific stewardship practices to be prioritized in each area. Update reference to Appendix B-2 and confirm Appendix references throughout the document. | |
| | | | | | | Add to section 2.4 Community Areas after sentence ending on line 270: Community Areas were chosen instead of WRIAs for the purposes of focusing planning efforts on areas of similar agricultural types, which facilitates goal setting, outreach, and implementation. | |
| 181 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 5.2.2 | 55 | 841 | "In predicting benchmark values for enhancement, KCCD typically assumed 70% implementation would likely occur within the first 5-year reporting timeframe (2021)and 30% would occur within the second 5-year reporting timeframe (2026.)" Are these assumptions listed or described somewhere in the plan? | Due to the known level of funding before 2021, it is assumed that much of the enhancement practices will be implemented in the next 5 years whereas funding after 2021 is less certain. Update text to read: In predicting benchmark values for enhancement, KCCD based implementation of enhancement practices on known funding in the short term assuming typically assumed 70% of implementation would likely occur within the first 5-year reporting timeframe (2021) and 30% would occur within the second 5-year reporting timeframe (2026.) | |

| Comment No. | Commenter | Section No. | Page No. | Line No. | Comment | Proposed Response | Further Discussion Needed? |
|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|---|---|----------------------------------|
| 182 | Heather | 5.3 | 58 | 876 | "Indicator data will be reviewed at least every 5 years to help focus technical | Add after sentence ending on line 894: | |
| | Kosaka (Ecology) | | | | assistance efforts and assess if the anticipated protection and/or enhancement of critical area functions is occurring." The work group should incorporate ground water quality status into the VSP biennial reports. | Groundwater quality can be monitored through groundwater monitoring stations maintained by the Washington State Department of Ecology, which can be found at https://ecology.wa.gov/Research-Data/Monitoring-assessment/Groundwater-quality-assessment | |
| 183 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 5.6 | 56 | 851 | How did you come up with Ag viability CPPE? How is a CPPE score different for say, Irrigation Water Management for soil function vs. ag viability. | NRCS maintains CPPE scores for a range of categories, the agricultural viability categories include soil health, prevention of soil loss, moisture management, weed and pest management, pollinator and beneficial organisms, and yield and fertility management | |
| 184 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 5.3 | 59 | 931 | "Indicators may not be determinative of VSP success in maintaining 2011 baseline or better conditions as affected by agricultural activities as opposed to other changes at the landscape scale such as urbanization, fire events, long term climatic events." Yes-climate change is a key stressor that could undercut some of the advances made through VSP. A section addressing climate change would be valuable. | See response to comment 136. | |
| 185 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 5.3 | 59 | 917 | For wetlands mapping, both NOAA (coastal change analysis program) and USGS NLCD (National Land Cover Database) are in the middle of a 2016 update. NLCD has not instituted any effort to improve the mapping of wetlands in their past work but will be doing so as part of their 2016 update. NOAA believes it will produce a product similar to CCAP for the interior portion of the state. You can expect NLCD data to be released Jan/Feb 2019. | Comment noted. These are the types of data that could be included in the 5-year reports if made available to KCCD. | |
| 186 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 5.3 | 59 | 915- 917 | After imagery evaluation of random sampling of areas and analysis results are summarized, what will you do with the results if you find a discrepancy? Who (Conservation district, County, technical provider) will update the maps? | Results from the imagery evaluation would be contained in the 5-year reports, but could be used more frequently to improve VSP effectiveness through adaptive management. Any updates to the mapping would be done as needed for reporting and implementation, contingent on available funding and the needs of the VSP program. | |
| 187 | 12/18 WG Meeting | 5.3 | 59 | 922 | Add definition of ground-truthing. | Add as footnote: Ground-truthing refers to the practice of comparing data received by remote sensing to existing conditions of the area to determine if remotely sensed data accurately captures characteristics of real life conditions. | |
| 188 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 5.8 | 63 | 1013 | Table 5-8 Identified cause/Adaptive Management Threshold heading. These are two distinct things, suggest inserting an extra column with measurable thresholds (can be an adaptive management action threshold, i.e. a 10% reduction of conservation practices.) | The Adaptive Management Threshold is repetitive with the metrics in Table 5-9. Replace "Identified Cause/ Adaptive Management Threshold" with "Potential Cause" Replace "Decline below the annual average enrollment rate identified in Table 5-9 in key stewardship practices" with "Decrease in passive participation in VSP" in the second row and "Decrease in either active or passive participation in VSP" in the third row | |
| 189 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 5.10 | 65 | 1025 | Indicator data source, Water quality stations. Yes, mapping well locations with groundwater quality data and producing graphs is very important for identifying locations with impaired groundwater quality and looking for trends. | Comment noted. | |
| 190 | Heather Kosaka (Ecology) | 5.10 | 65 | 1025 | "Adaptive management action: survey with outreach to ag producers along floodplains and within CARAs to determine percentage of participation in stewardship". Yes- for CARAs participation is most important in areas where ground water tends to be contaminated from activities at the land surface. Community areas (larger areas broken down into subareas) should make this easier to address. | Comment noted. | |
| VSP S | Self-Assessment C | Checklist | | | | | |

| Comment No. | Commenter | Section No. | Page No. | Comment | Proposed Response | Further Discussion Needed? |
|-------------|---------------------|-------------|----------|---|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| 191 | 12/18 WG Meeting | | 2 | Make the second paragraph of the "Policy Note" bold. | Revise as noted | |
| 192 | 12/18 WG Meeting | | 4 | Add "Since 2011" to the title of page 4 | Revise as noted | |
| 193 | 12/18 WG Meeting | | 5 | Add Kittitas County Water Purveyors and Washington Farm Bureau to "Other Local Resources" | Revise as noted | |