

Appendix IV – Station 6 - Community Responses on Storage Parsed by Workshop and Survey

1. Our community should explore storage options.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Need more information
9/18	21 ¹	2	2 ²	0	0	3
9/19	12	7	0	0	0	0
10/27	7	0	0	0	0	0
Surveys	22 ³	19	0	0	0	8
Totals	62	28	2	0	0	11

2. 9/18 responses for support for different storage opportunities in the Methow

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Need more information
Beaver dams ⁴	26	3	0	0	0	0
Beaver dam analogs	16	7	1	0	0	2
Dams	4	0	3	13	0	6
Floodplain restoration	20	6	0	1	0	2

¹ One respondent noted that instream flow must be a priority.

² The two “disagrees” called for encouraging agriculture to conserve more with no risk to water rights for agriculture.

³ Three respondents noted that they only supported natural storage options (and one of them lauded increased conservation).

⁴ One respondent commented that we need many more beavers to restore watershed health and function.

Forest management	22	6	0	1	0	2
Groundwater recharge from surface water	18	7	1	0	0	6
Off-channel reservoirs (no direct impact)	5 ⁵	3	6	0	0	13

3. 9/19 responses for support for different storage opportunities in the Methow

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Need more information
Beaver dams	12 ⁶	2	0	0	0	1
Beaver dam analogs	3 ⁷	2	1	1	1	1
Dams	2	1	1	11	0	1
Floodplain restoration	12	0	0	0	0	0
Forest management	18	0	0	0	0	0
Groundwater recharge from surface water	6	4	2	2	0	4
Off-channel reservoirs (no direct impact)	6	1	1	0	1	5

⁵ Another respondent suggested “mini-hydro for power supply.”

⁶ One respondent noted that USFS had to be involved in beaver dams as the agency is the biggest landowner in the Valley.

⁷ One respondent suggested that developers of cluster developments be required to pay for a storage option like a beaver dam analog: tying development to mitigation as in the Kittitas. Another added the note “Texas Creek” to beaver dam analogs.

Rainfall storage and other individual actions	7	0	0	1	0	1
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

4. 10/27 responses for support for different storage opportunities in the Methow

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Need more information
Beaver dams	6	0	0	0	0	0
Beaver dam analogs	3	2	2	0	0	0
Dams	0	1 ⁹	0	7	0	0
Floodplain restoration	4	2	0	0	0	1
Forest management	1	5	0	0	0	0
Groundwater recharge from surface water	4	0	0	4	0	0
Off-channel reservoirs (no direct impact)	2	4	0	0	0	0

5. Survey responses for support for different storage opportunities in the Methow

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Need more information
Beaver dams	28	11	1	0	4	3
Beaver dam analogs	11	8	4	1	10	9
Dams	5	6	6	16	4	7

⁸ The facilitator encouraged participants to add categories in response to concerns that the list was too limited. Regenerative agriculture was also added to the forest management category.

⁹ This respondent also urged that existing dams be better used.

Floodplain restoration	28	8	0	1	6	4
Forest management	23	12	1	0	4	6
Groundwater recharge from surface water	19	10	2	1	3	17
Off-channel reservoirs (no direct impact)	15	11	1	3	4	10

6. Community totals for support different storage opportunities in the Methow

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	No opinion	Need more information
Beaver dams	72	16	1	0	4	4
Beaver dam analogs	33	19	8	2	11	12
Dams	11	8	10	47	4	14
Floodplain restoration	64	16	0	2	6	7
Forest management	64	23	1	1	4	8
Groundwater recharge from surface water	57	21	5	7	3	27
Off-channel reservoirs (no direct impact)	28	19	8	3	5	28
Rainfall storage & other individual actions	7	0	0	0	0	1