

Hello Watershed Group,

I am really looking forward to seeing you this Wednesday, March 8th for our third meeting. The time and place are the same:

- Mount Baker School District Administrative offices;
- meeting starts at 6 pm, please come a few minutes early for sign-in and snacks.

Attached you will find the supporting documents for this meeting including the agenda, the third draft of Goals and Principles, answers to the questions received from the last meeting's input worksheets, and the new, blank input worksheet for this meeting. Please take a moment to look these over.

If you have more time and interest, you can also view the Upper South Fork Habitat Assessment which can be found at the [sfnooksack.com](https://www.sfnooksack.com) website on the Learn More tab under Resource Documents. Here is a link:

<https://www.sfnooksack.com/resource-documents/>

This report will provide background information for the upcoming meeting's presentation from Nooksack geologist, Michael Maudlin.

Thanks for coming with your notebook in hand!

Thank you,
Erin Suda, Administrative Assistant

Watershed Group

MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, March 8th, 2017

Mount Baker School District Administrative Office Board Room

Facilitators: Lesley Rigg and Erin Suda

Goal of the Process:

- To develop a framework for talking about conservation and restoration efforts in the South Fork and engage in watershed planning.

Goals for the Meeting

- To build common understanding of habitat restoration efforts in the watershed
- To refine the list of goals, principles, and objectives
- To begin thinking about the future of this group

5:45 Arrive, Nametags, Refreshments

6:00 Welcome, Ground Rules, and Introductions (10 min)

6:10 Develop a common understanding of habitat issues and strategies in the South Fork (70 min)

7:20 Test for agreement on *Goals, Principles, and Objectives*, from our last meeting (15 min)

7:35 Consider options for the future of the Watershed Group (15 min)

7:50 Finish worksheets, wrap up (10 min)

8:00 Closing

DRAFT PROCESS		
Meeting #1	Jan. 25th	Establish why we are here, how we will work together as a group, and reflect on the stakeholder and community feedback gathered so far
Meeting #2	Feb. 22nd	Develop a common understanding of water issues in the South Fork Determine level of agreement on <i>Goals, Principles, and Objectives</i>
Meeting #3	March 8th	Continue to discuss issues and voluntary strategies Determine level of agreement on <i>Goals, Principles, and Objectives</i> Begin discussing potential future of Watershed Group
Meeting #4	March 29th	Provide feedback on the draft <i>Watershed Conservation Plan</i> and determine how to move forward. There are many other issues to discuss. What should be our approach?

South Fork Nooksack River Watershed Project

These goals and principles were developed through a process of gathering Stakeholder and Public Input in 2016. In early 2017, a community Watershed Group, composed of over 30 local residents and landowner representatives, built upon that input to develop a set of broad statements to guide and inform any agencies or other entities engaged in planning in the South Fork Nooksack River Watershed.

Long-Term Community Goals

Although we have a wide range of perspectives and interests in the South Fork Nooksack River Valley, we are looking for win-win solutions to protect our water resources for:

Our Families: We want to keep the rural way of life as we know it today and protect it for our children.

Our Farms: We want to maintain and protect productive agricultural lands and promote long-term agricultural economic viability.

Our Fish: We want to recover salmon populations and biodiversity by restoring river, wetlands, and riparian habitat, reducing stream temperatures, and ensuring that there is adequate stream flow in the summer.

Our Forests: We want to maintain and protect the forestland base and promote a sustainable forest industry with a skilled and steady local workforce.

Watershed Planning Principles

In order for us to achieve our long-range goals, we need:

- Communication, transparency, and trust between landowners, residents, agencies, and other stakeholders in the Watershed.
- Respect for the ability and knowledge of local residents to manage land and water resources wisely.
- Voluntary agreements between landowners and community partners, with incentives for landowner's efforts to improve watershed conditions.
- Shared understanding and open dialogue around data, science, resource management, and the changing climate conditions that affect our watershed.
- Public education around how farmers, foresters, fishers, and other businesses are continually improving their practices to protect and improve water quality.

South Fork Nooksack River Watershed Project

Responses to Watershed Group Questions from the 2/22/17 Meeting Input Worksheets, the “Parking Lot” Sheet, and the “Need More Information” Sheet

PROCESS QUESTIONS

- Responses provided by Holly O’Neil, Crossroads Consulting. Holly is a resident of the South Fork and is on contract with the Nooksack Indian Tribe as a consultant for public education and engagement processes. She has been a member of the project Planning Team. Her other jobs include administrative support for the Evergreen Land Trust’s Ecoforestry program, and facilitation support for the Foothills Community Food Partnership.

- 1. What is the Community Watershed Framework” vs. the “Watershed Conservation Plan”?** The “Watershed Conservation Plan,” is what the Tribe is developing under the BIA grant along with the Planning Team’s involvement. The “Community Watershed Framework” is the term the Planning Team started using to describe the bigger conversation about the watershed - all the issues that people want to talk about - that are beyond the scope of the Watershed Conservation Plan.
- 2. Will we get Oliver’s PowerPoint?** Yes, it is already on the website.
- 3. Can we get Susan’s project on Nooksack Hydrologic Model?** We will put that on the website.
- 4. Can we get all relevant reports, data etc. posted on website in one spot?** There is a ton of stuff on the website on the Resources page, and more to come. I’m not sure it is organized in a way that is very user-friendly. Take a look, and if you have any suggestions for how to make it easier to find what you want to look at, please send me an email: holly@crossroads.pro.
- 5. Can the BIA Grant application be released to this group?** Yes. These grants are very competitive and are considered proprietary, so there has been some understandable reticence to releasing the full applications. Some people had asked for grant information last fall, and Oliver provided some information, but it sounds like there are still a few people don’t feel that is adequate to meet people’s needs for transparency. So what Oliver is going to do is make a couple hard copies of the grants, and bring them to the meeting on Wednesday.
- 6. I’m still not comfortable with the process of how the lists are pared down. Who does it and how?** This process is basically a type of “qualitative research.” You hire a third party researcher/facilitator, you have them run some focus groups with some open-ended questions, and you have them create a summary of the key ideas that come out of those meetings. We had focus groups (aka Interest Groups), the community meeting, and the community survey. All of that got bundled up in your first packet, and David Roberts did that summary. You can review the details from the meetings, and see if you think there are

other key points that should be included. There is a lot of good material there. The summary key themes was offered to give the Watershed Group a jumping off point, as in: “here’s some of the key ideas that came out of the community input and engagement process, how does it match up for your understanding?” Also, we’ve got more survey results that have come in since David wrote the report, so we may want to incorporate these into our thinking.

- **Can we have access to all planning team notes, emails, grants and everything related to this process?** Yes, we will provide copies of the Planning Team meeting notes, and I appreciate the desire for transparency. Just please bear in mind - this wasn’t a governmental process. The notes are rough, the Team never approved them, and there are likely some inaccuracies. But we will either put them on the website or send them via email with that qualification. Regarding emails - before I spend time going through sixteen months of emails, I’d like to make sure this task is truly worth the effort. Would the person who is interested please tell me what in particular you are looking for?
- **Can ag and forestry be represented on Planning Team?** Yes. That is a good idea. We will invite a commercial forester and commercial farmer to attend the next Planning Team meeting, which hopefully will happen around March 16th or 17th. We will let you know when that meeting gets scheduled if you’d like to come observe.
- **Are we using consensus for decision-making?** Lesley and Erin explained that they are using a consensus *building* process. From the feedback, the colored card system seemed to work fairly well, although a few people commented that it took a bit too long. Lesley and Erin will be streamlining the approach into a three-step process, and are recommending that for a final decision, the group would have 75% of participants showing green cards.
- **How do you balance the decision-making? Who sets what they want?** I’m not quite sure what this question is - but just to make sure everybody is clear – the Planning Team will likely be disbanding after one or two more meetings, once the Watershed Conservation Plan is complete. The future of the Watershed Group is up to all of you. At the meeting on March 29th, Lesley and Erin will help you figure out how to move forward, based on what people say they think would be of value. Oliver has said the Tribe may be willing to keep paying for facilitation/administrative support of the Group, which would be great, but the decision making power – in particular, what you actually do, and what is on your agenda, and how often you meet, etc., is going to be decided by the people who want to keep being involved. Again, Lesley, Erin, and Mardi are there to provide facilitation support so that the group time is productive, and I’m on contract for another few months to provide back up support for community outreach, but let’s see what people want to do.

WATER QUALITY AND QUANTITY QUESTIONS

- Responses provided by Oliver Grah, Treva Coe, and Mike Maudlin, Nooksack Indian Tribe's Natural Resources Department

1. What mechanisms are in place related to facing ongoing stress on watershed?

The federal, state, and local regulations that may address watershed issues include: Federal Clean Water Act (CWA), State CWA, State Forest Practices, State Shoreline Master Program, and the Whatcom County's Shoreline Master Program, Critical Areas Ordinance, Flood Regulations, Land Disturbance Regulations, Development Standards, and Comprehensive Plan, to name a few. The EPA and WA Department of Ecology are currently preparing a temperature Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Improvement Plan for the SFNR, focusing on temperature exceedances, however, that effort will primarily recommend non-regulatory voluntary actions like what we are talking about with our watershed planning.

2. What is being done downstream to improve salmon habitat?

There are numerous habitat restoration and water quality improvement actions being planned or implemented downstream. These actions include: restoring the Nooksack River delta, and water quality improvement and riparian restoration and protection below the SFNR confluence with the Nooksack River. The Nooksack River Forks (above the confluence) are currently the highest priorities for salmon habitat restoration, but we are beginning to assess habitat and identify restoration strategies for the lower Nooksack River as part of an integrated floodplain management planning effort.

3. How do cesspools affect the watershed?

Leakage from on-site septic systems or community systems is harmful to our water. The State Department of Health and Whatcom County Health Department have regulatory authority over septic systems. If such systems are found to be damaged or ineffective, owners are required to fix them. Discharge of sewage into our waters is primarily a human health risk as such can cause gastrointestinal distress and disease. Sewage in streams can also impact aquatic life, including salmon.

4. Are there concrete goals we could aim? % or #? wetland areas (acres), upland tree cover (acres), ground water storage, fecal bacteria level?

The concrete goals that drive Nooksack watershed restoration efforts are Chinook recovery goals and water quality standards. Chinook recovery goals were based on an estimate of how many fish would be produced if there were "properly functioning" habitat conditions. Salmon recovery technical staff have developed targets for what constitutes "properly functioning" conditions, and we use these targets to plan voluntary habitat restoration projects – in other words, we seek to restore properly functioning conditions (log jams, floodplain connection, riparian forest, functioning wetlands) to the extent that adjacent landowners and other affected parties are willing.

5. Has qualitative research been done on the impacts of the later summer tubing crowd on the water quality/fish redds?

We are aware of the antagonistic relationship between summer tubing, salmon recovery, resource damage, and public health and safety issues. Anecdotal evidence of negative impacts to salmon is what led to the tubing closure upstream of Acme, where relatively greater numbers of Chinook spawn. We are not aware of specific research that is ongoing that addresses these issues. Perhaps this is an issue that can be taken up by the Watershed Group. Perhaps there would be interest in developing a program to manage such recreational use with or without government involvement.

6. Where is public access to the river?

One major parking area is on the south side of the Acme bridge. People can also access the river at the new Galbraith Park. Recreationists frequently park along the highway at informal pull off areas.

7. How much do restoration projects like Black Slough affect river temperature?

Temperature influences of Black Slough on the river is a function of temperature of water in the slough, flow rate of the slough (both surface and subsurface or groundwater flow), and temperature of the river and flow rate. The USGS measured water temperatures in the South Fork downstream of Saxon Rd. Bridge in 2003 and found that, while the South Fork generally continues to warm as you move downstream, there is a region of slight cooling in the vicinity of Black Slough. The authors attributed the decrease in temperature to groundwater discharge to the river. Restoration in the Black Slough drainage (either riparian plantings or restoring wetland hydrology) would generally increase the cooling effect of Black Slough.

8. What are the impacts on water quality from the Skookum Hatchery?

Discharge of pass through water from the hatchery is the only regulated point discharge for temperature that might affect water quality in the river. That point discharge has been evaluated in the yet-to-be-released draft temperature TMDL for the river. The hatchery is not required to monitor temperature of discharge water, but the hatchery intake water is often well above the numeric water quality criteria – watershed conditions upstream from the intake, and not the hatchery itself, are considered to be the greatest cause of any temperature exceedances of discharge water. The hatchery does monitor flow, total suspended solids, settleable solids, and chlorine.

9. How do engineered log jams affect downstream channels?

Engineered log jams emulate natural log jams in the river. Log jams benefit both adult and juvenile salmon by providing complex hiding cover and creating areas of slower velocity for resting. Log jams also form deep scour pools that provide important holding habitat for salmon, especially for summer migrating salmon like chinook, summer steelhead, and bull trout. These deep pools can be also provide cooler temperatures where salmon can find refuge from high temperatures elsewhere in the South Fork, either due to thermal stratification or by

facilitating the exchange of cooler groundwater as they intersect the flow of water through the bed of the river. Most large wood was removed from the river to facilitate the transport of logs and cedar bolts downstream to mills. More recently, log jams may have been removed to “prevent” flooding. The river has adjusted to the loss of large wood causing incision of the channel and reduced connectivity of the river with important floodplain areas. When restoration practitioners plan log jam projects, they work with consultants to do extensive hydraulic modeling and geomorphic assessment to evaluate the potential impacts of log jams on flooding and bank erosion. An explicit goal of restoration projects is not to increase unwanted flood risk to adjacent/downstream landowners above that which already exists – we often find it helpful to work with landowners with a long history of ownership who understand the dynamic nature of the river.

10. Who’s doing the testing?

The Nooksack Indian Tribe has been testing the SFNR for water quality since the late 1990’s. The Tribe measures stream temperature at numerous locations. Sediment and turbidity are measured at or near Potter Road bridge, Saxon Road bridge, and Hardscrabble Creek. The Tribe also measures pH, oxygen, nitrates, and phosphorous in the river as well. In 2011-12, the Tribe monitored fecal coliform levels in the river but discontinued that effort due to insufficient funding.

11. Are the aquifers losing quantity & lowering? Or not?

The aquifer system in the SFNR is very complex. So, the initial answer is both, depending on location and time of year. There are gaining reaches and losing reaches along the channel of the SFNR. Reach scale studies by the USGS have identified gaining reaches and losing reaches, but much more work is needed to identify the location of these reaches and their impact on water temperature. Also, the whole floodplain of the SFNR acts like a sponge. For instance, when a flood event occurs, flow at the Saxon Road bridge can be substantially larger than at the Potter Road bridge suggesting that the floodplain detains a lot of floodwaters while the shallow aquifer fills like a sponge. Then when flows start to subside, flow at the Potter Road bridge can be substantially higher than Saxon because the floodplain aquifer slowly releases the stored flood waters. The Nooksack Indian Tribe contracted USGS to conduct a groundwater study in the SFNR. USGS completed a conceptual framework model for the SFNR that characterizes the aquifers of the SFNR floodplain. As part of that project, they measured water levels in wells and collected well log data for other wells, and entered that information into the USGS National Water Information System, but the purpose of the study was not to evaluate change in aquifers. The project report has been posted on the website.

12. Since the S. Fork is not glacier fed and if the climate continues to warm-is there really a potential for decreased temp?

Active glaciers have disappeared from the SFNR watershed; however, there remains vestigial ice that covers approximately 270 acres in the watershed. This ice will disappear rapidly with continued climate change. So, the SFNR will be more susceptible to continued climate change in regard to higher temperatures and lower flows than

the Middle Fork and North Fork. Those rivers will have an increase in glacier melt and moderated temperatures through mid-century until the glacier mass decreases to the point that their input into the rivers is greatly diminished. In contrast, the SFNR will not have the moderating influences of glacier melt that the other forks have. As such, river temperatures will continue to rise, flows will be lower in the summer, and floods will occur more frequently and of higher magnitude with the reduced area of snow accumulation that acts like a flood control reservoir. Without the snow, there will be more runoff to the river over a shorter period of time causing an increase in flooding along with more intense and greater rainfall events during the winter. Recent climate change studies specific to the SFNR suggest that stream temperatures with climate change could be as great as 7 degrees Celsius. However, modeling suggests that restoration, provided it is sufficient size and scale, has the potential to moderate climate-change-induced temperature increases.

13. Why can't we take gravel off the river bar to reduce the sediment?

The most relevant answer is that the quantity of sediment transported down the river greatly exceeds the potential volume that could be removed through gravel extraction. As such, removal of gravel from the river or its immediate disturbance zone would have very little or no effect on reducing sediment in the river. The removal of gravel would destabilize the river in regard to the balance between flow, gradient, friction, and sediment size such that there could be downstream adverse impacts. Removing gravel can also have a significant impact to ESA-listed salmon – that's the primary reasons that bar scalping has ceased in the river. The County is currently studying the effect of gravel extraction from the Nooksack River downstream of the SFNR. In terms of impacts of sediment on salmon, it is fine sediment that is most damaging. Fine sediment and high turbidity can damage gills, suffocate incubating salmon embryos, reduce feeding efficiency (juvenile salmon are visual predators), and cause salmon to seek out clearer waters elsewhere.

14. What interest groups are interested in water quality? Water quantity? Both?

Water quality and quantity are interrelated, and there are many federal, state, and local government agencies, NGO's, tribes, and community members that focus on these topics— too many to list here. However, entities that are actively focused on flow quantity and quality include: EPA, WA Dept. of Ecology, Whatcom County, Lummi Nation, Nooksack Indian Tribe, NSEA, Whatcom Land Trust, and Whatcom CD, to name a few. Lummi and the Nooksack Tribe are involved with habitat restoration. The Nooksack Tribe has an extensive water quality monitoring program in the river and in some tributaries. The Nooksack Tribe has contracted WWU to model the effects of climate change on river flow and water quality.

15. How are landslides beneficial?

Mass failures deliver large wood material to the river, which form log jams which are beneficial to the stability of the river and that create important habitat to fish. The primary issue is the increase in the frequency and magnitude of landslides. In relation to fish, landslides can be an important source of spawning gravels, but elevated levels of fine sediments can both directly and indirectly harm aquatic organisms.

16. Is historic temperature data available for upper Nooksack or main creeks?

Yes. The Nooksack Indian Tribe collects temperature along the SFNR and many of its tributaries. The Tribe monitors temperature on 12 tributaries to the SFNR starting at Black Slough up to Wanlick Creek, and eight sites along the river from near the confluence with the North Fork Nooksack River up gradient to above Wanlick Creek. The Tribe is in the process of summarizing this information for the watershed group. Also, the recently released Quantitative Assessment and Qualitative Assessment projects for the SFNR have been posted to the website.

17. Does the increase temp. support more algae growth in the summer?

Yes, there is a positive relationship between aquatic plant growth, algae, and stream temperature. Algal blooms can reduce dissolved oxygen levels in the water, reduce water clarity (and thus feeding efficiency for juvenile salmon), and impair the production of benthic (river bottom) invertebrates that are an important source of food for juvenile salmon.

18. How do low flows relate to channel morphology vs water use?

The South Fork is subject to lower summer flow naturally due to the precipitation patterns in the Pacific Northwest. In the early historic period, wetlands were abundant on the floodplain and these likely would have increased the summer baseflow of the river. Subsequent development of agricultural drainage sped the channeling of surface water to the river and reduced floodplain water storage. The channel incision described below* is most prevalent in the upstream portion of the Acme Valley and has led to the abandonment of a large portion of the floodplain (now a terrace that is no longer inundated even at a 100-year flood) and has contributed to reduced groundwater storage. In essence, this has created a more efficient system for run-off. Water use is likely an additional stress on top of the land-use related changes

**River flow and sediment transport is a function of discharge, channel gradient, friction, sediment amount, and sediment size. When any of these factors change, the river adjusts its channel in response, usually in an adverse manner. Changes in river flow and sediment amounts along with flood control and hard armoring of banks have caused the river to incise, adversely impacting groundwater levels in adjacent floodplain areas. Incised channels tend to remove water more quickly because of reduced friction and the river has less interaction with the shallow aquifer through which it flows over and through. This can lead to less water in the channel. Less water in the channel means less habitat for fish, less water for other uses such as agriculture, and higher temperatures.*

19. Does sewer treatment have an impact on fecal coliform?

Yes. The purpose of sewage treatment is to remove harmful bacteria, such as fecal coliform, from wastes. Fecal coliform refers to a group of bacteria with species that are pathogenic to humans and other aquatic species. If bacteria laden water is released from septic systems without full treatment or partial treatment, bacteria can be

transported to surface water where beneficial uses of the water are impacted.

20.Can homeless camps cause a point of quality issue?

Homeless camps of and in themselves cannot cause a quality issue, but occupants can if they excrete wastes near to surface water. Similarly, tubers have limited bathroom access and may relieve themselves in the water or on the banks of the river. In addition, livestock, pets, leaking septic systems, and wildlife can also cause fecal coliform issues in the water.

21.Are algae blooms in the river a result of both temp. increase and bacterial increase, or primarily just bacterial increase?

Algae blooms are caused primarily by increased temperatures and increased nutrients such as from eroded materials being deposited in the river, sewage spills, etc. Bacteria in and of themselves do not substantially cause algae blooms.

22.How much impact on low water flows might be avoided by the moratorium on well drilling?

The Washington Department of Ecology and Whatcom County are currently studying the potential impact of exempt wells on streamflow. State law basically says that single family exempt wells are only exempt if they have no impact on stream flow. The assumption has been that exempt wells do not impact stream flow; however, the basis of the recent litigation is that the County does not know if exempt wells impact streamflow. It is well-recognized that groundwater withdrawals can have significant impacts on surface water flows. Although exempt wells have the potential to impact flows in the SFNR and to tributaries, there is a possibility that the density of residential development would be low along the SFNR that there would be negligible impact. Again, this is an assumption and without further study, nobody knows for sure. The County is currently trying to determine the best way to address this issue in the comprehensive plan.

23.What other uses might be effectively curtailed to positively impact the river?

There is a chance that agricultural water use management could be modified in a manner that increases flow in the river and yet provides adequate water to the farmers. The Washington Water Trust is currently studying how water might be managed in a way that both predominant uses can be facilitated. A summary report is currently being prepared that addresses these issues. That report will be part of the Watershed Conservation Plan.

24.How do we address climate change in this process?

Climate change is evaluated in regard to changes in atmospheric temperature, stream temperature, precipitation amounts, the form of precipitation (snow vs rain, etc.), snow accumulation in regard to area and depth, and changes in timing and intensity of the precipitation and streamflow. The Nooksack Indian Tribe has contracted WWU to model the impacts of continued climate change on the hydrology, temperature, and sediment dynamics of

the river. The hydrology modeling has been accomplished. The temperature and sediment modeling projects are under way. In addition, the impacts of climate change on the SFNR are evaluated in depth in the Quantitative Assessment and Qualitative Assessment project reports that have been posted on the website.

25. Are exotic species a threat?

Yes, exotic species are a threat to the aquatic ecosystem of the river. Of particular concern is Japanese knotweed. This aggressive weed is taking over many places along the river, out-competing the beneficial native species. The expansion of this species is adversely impacting salmon habitat and may even be adversely impacting water quality. There is some concern that the distribution of invasive warmwater fish species may expand upstream into the South Fork as temperatures continue to warm.

26. What are the impacts of changes in snow pack and mass wasting?

Climate change has and will continue to cause less snow to fall over a smaller area at increasingly higher elevations. The reduced area and depth of snow accumulation will mean reduced snowmelt runoff to the river, which in turn will cause a decrease in flows and increase in temperatures during the summer. With a reduced area of snow pack, which acts like a sponge to store and detain water on the landscape, there will be a larger area of exposed earth that is more susceptible to erosion and mass wasting. There is an indication that with climate change, there could be two- to four-times the magnitude of sediment transport in Puget Sound rivers caused by climate change. Thus, there is an indication that climate change will also increase the frequency and magnitude of mass wasting. This trend will increase the sediment load in the river, which in combination with changing flows, will likely cause the river to adjust its channel.

27. What is Washington State Water Trust?

The Washington State Trust Water Rights program provides a way to legally hold water rights for future uses without the water right relinquishing. Water is held in trust to benefit groundwater and instream flows, and other beneficial uses. While water is held in trust it retains its original priority date. If you are a water right holder and have all or part of a water right that you are currently not using, you can use the Program on a temporary or permanent basis, and your water is protected while benefiting people and the environment.

- [Focus on Trust Water Rights Program](#) December 2012

Two statutes govern Trust Water:

- [Chapter 90.38 RCW](#) applies to the Yakima Basin, and
- [Chapter 90.42 RCW](#) applies statewide

28. What resources are available? We are not exactly sure what this question is addressing. However, if you are asking about what help, assistance, and/or funding is available to help the Watershed Group address issues

and concerns about the SFNR, there are a lot of resources available. There are many public agencies and NGOs that are focused on the challenges of the SFNR. In addition, funding frequently becomes available from grants that can help act on voluntary measures to address issues and concerns about the SFNR. The most important resource is the community – the people who live in this valley, who care about these issues, and want to make a difference.

Questions which we did not yet have time to adequately answer:

- *How many salmon are being taken out of the river?*
- *Why create habitat for fish that will not make it up the river?*
- *What does flood data say about frequency of flooding over past 20-50 years?*
- *What are the impacts of water allocation/use and how do tributaries play to this?*

INPUT WORKSHEET SFNR Watershed Group Meeting 3.8.17

Your Name: _____

1. **WATER and HABITAT:** What additional questions, feedback, and comments do you have about water and habitat that you would like to discuss?

2. LOOKING FORWARD

- A. **Would you be interested in meeting again in about a month to review the final Watershed Conservation Plan?**

Circle one: YES NO MAYBE

- B. **What would you like to see this Watershed Group doing in the future?**

- o Continuing dialogue and education around watershed issues
- o Serving as a vehicle for our community to give feedback on various agency plans and projects
- o Developing a more comprehensive *Community Watershed Plan* to inform and guide the efforts of future policy, funding, and watershed protection efforts
- o Bringing more funding and resources to support landowners' voluntary efforts
- o Educating the public on various topics
- o Other: _____

C. How often would you be interested in meeting in the future?

- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Annually
- Not interested in meeting in the future
- Other: _____

D. Future Meetings/Topics

Which topics would you like to discuss in more depth? (check any that apply)

- Recreation on the river
- Forestry
- Farming
- Fishing
- Flooding/Floodplain management
- Wildlife
- More in-depth on water quality
- Other topic(s): _____
- Anything you would like to present? _____
- More in-depth on habitat restoration
- More in-depth on water quantity
- Washington Water Trust
- Upper watershed hydrology (Susan's work)
- Climate Change modeling (Bob's work)
- Emergency preparedness
- Manure lagoon management

3. Any other ideas or suggestions at this point, for the future of the Watershed Group?

4. What did you like best about this evening's meeting? How could it have been improved?