

Snoqualmie Tribe (Matt Baerwalde)

Please see comments of Snoqualmie Tribe attached.



January 16th, 2026

Danielle Gallatin
Rulemaking Lead
Washington Department of Ecology
300 Desmond Drive SE
Lacey, WA 98503

Via email to: danielle.gallatin@ecy.wa.gov and submitted via comment portal

Re: Snoqualmie Tribe's comments on rulemaking for Chapters 173-507 & 173-508 WAC – Instream Resources Protection Program

Dear Danielle Gallatin,

The Snoqualmie Indian Tribe [Tribe] is a federally recognized sovereign Indian Tribe and a signatory to the Treaty of Point Elliott of 1855 in which it reserved to itself certain rights and privileges and ceded certain lands to the United States. As a signatory to the Treaty of Point Elliott, the Tribe specifically reserved to itself, among other things, the right to fish at usual and accustomed areas and the “privilege of hunting and gathering roots and berries on open and unclaimed lands” off-reservation throughout the modern-day state of Washington. Treaty of Point Elliott, art. V, 12 Stat. 928. The Snoqualmie people have stewarded the waters of Tribal ancestral lands since time immemorial, and the Tribe seeks to work collaboratively with the Department of Ecology to protect these waters, both environmental and cultural resources, for future generations.

We appreciate the time that Ecology staff spent with Snoqualmie Tribe staff to answer our questions about the draft rule amendment in on online meeting. We generally support the reasonable limitations proposed in the draft rule amendments, and we wish to see these limitations on new permit exempt wells codified in Washington Administrative Code. We do, however, have remaining concerns about the draft rule language. These include concerns about curtailment during drought emergencies, enforcement, and tracking of water use, amongst others. Essentially, while we support the limitations on withdrawals described and the designated ability for Ecology to curtail withdrawals during emergencies, the draft rule language does not provide enough certainty of protection of instream flows and basin ecology during drought emergencies, nor accountability for new PEW water users, nor does it address the various shortcomings in the watershed plans for WRIs 7 and 8 for which Snoqualmie Tribe has requested updates and improvements at every comment interval that we were afforded (please see included prior correspondence). We continue to request that Ecology fix these significant shortcomings and gaps in



watershed protection by working with affected Tribes to create rule amendment language that will increase monitoring, tracking, accountability, adaptive management, and effectiveness of offsets, ultimately helping to ensure fiscal responsibility regarding the distribution of Streamflow Restoration Act and related funds allocated by the state legislature.

We suggest that after Ecology completes this current rulemaking, Ecology should approach affected Tribes, including Snoqualmie, about additional rulemaking that will support the intent of ECY-led watershed planning to provide Net Ecological Benefit. In the case of WRIAs 7 and 8, this rulemaking should address the comments raised by Snoqualmie and others in the watershed planning groups that the final watershed plans need to include mechanisms for tracking, accountability, and adaptive management across sub-basins within the two watersheds. Plan-listed offset projects should be updated over time to reflect changes on the land in ownership, management, hydrology, and/or other key factors affecting project feasibility and effectiveness; this should include specific updates, done in collaboration with affected Tribes, to the slapdash, perfunctory efforts that were used to identify sites for and list alleged offset benefits of several listed Managed Aquifer Recharge projects in the Snoqualmie basin. Without these updates to tracking, accountability, and the plan-listed offset projects (which receive preferential treatment in terms of Streamflow Restoration Act grant proposals and which do not occur unless sponsors such as Tribes speculatively take the considerable initiative needed to develop these proposals), Snoqualmie Tribe remains skeptical that the Streamflow Restoration Act and the IRP Program will collectively be able to protect Snoqualmie Ancestral Lands from the impacts of additional permit exempt withdrawals in WRIAs 7 and 8.

Sincerely,

DocuSigned by:

Michael Ross

Michael Ross

Deputy Executive Director of External Affairs



11/21/2024

Angela Johnson
Department of Ecology Water Resources Program
PO Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600
360-742-6743

Submitted online via <https://wr.ecology.commentinput.com?id=hPEtkSFx2g>

RE: Snoqualmie Tribe's comments on SEPA DNS for Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs) 7 (Snohomish) and 8 (Cedar-Sammamish-Lake Washington) Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Plans (watershed plans)

Dear Angela Johnson,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the WRIAs 7 and 8 watershed plans.

The Snoqualmie Indian Tribe ["Tribe"] is a federally-recognized sovereign Indian Tribe and a signatory to the Treaty of Point Elliott of 1855 in which it reserved to itself certain rights and privileges, and ceded certain lands to the United States. As a signatory to the Treaty of Point Elliot, the Tribe specifically reserved to itself, among other things, the right to fish at usual and accustomed areas and the "privilege of hunting and gathering roots and berries on open and unclaimed lands" off-reservation throughout the modern-day state of Washington. Treaty of Point Elliot, art. V, 12 Stat. 928." The Snoqualmie Tribe was a member of the WRIA 7 (Snohomish) and WRIA 8 (Cedar-Sammamish-Lake Washington) Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Planning Committees.

Snoqualmie Tribe is concerned that the watershed plans, as written, may result in significant impacts to WRIAs 7 and 8. This is largely because even though Ecology plans to submit reports to the legislature in 2027 which will detail the number of Permit Exempt Wells (PEWs) that have been installed since the onset of RCW 90.94, this report will not characterize the impacts of these wells on the WRIAs nor on the subbasins in which they were installed. The report is also not required nor expected to characterize what PEW-impact offsets have been established. And since there is no enforcement or accountability built into these watershed plans or into ECY's policies regarding RCW 90.94, there remains the distinct possibility that significant impacts will occur in the WRIAs. Ecology should take this opportunity to revise the plans to ensure that appropriate tracking, enforcement, and accountability are built into each watershed plan. Indeed, RCO's Review Panel

recommended the inclusion of “mechanisms for monitoring, assessment, accountability, and adaptation to ensure successful implementation of the plan,” but Ecology has declined to address this clear deficiency in the plan. This could result in significant, unaddressed impacts in the WRIAs, and the mere existence of watershed plans without accountability and adaptive mechanisms gives a false sheen of environmental protection.

Of further concern to the Tribe, in WRIA 7 in particular, some subbasins are projected to have large deficits in potential identified offsets, while others, typically lower in the basin, have large surpluses. Of course, none of the offsets have come to fruition, so they don’t actually exist, but what these numbers tell us is that some subbasins are likely to have significant impacts from PEWs that will more than likely not be offset within the subbasin.

And, other plan details which the Snoqualmie Tribe previously commented on requesting resolution, still remain unresolved, such as 198 AFY of offset “credit” given to Upper Snoqualmie MAR projects, when these projects should never have been included in the plan, and were rejected by the WRIA committees in the form they have been included. These MAR projects are likely infeasible and are not grounded in best available science, and similar highly speculative MAR projects were rejected in WRIAs 13 and 14 for the same reasons. Just as MAR using natural streamflow in natural areas was rejected from those plans, these MAR projects should not be included in the WRIA 7 plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Matthew J Baerwalde', followed by a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Matthew J Baerwalde
Senior Environmental Policy Analyst
Snoqualmie Tribe



12/11/2023

Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office
PO Box 40917
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

Sent via electronic mail to Julia McNamara, Board Liaison, at julia.mcnamara@rco.wa.gov

RE: Snoqualmie Tribe's comments on the Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Plan Review Report (WREPRR) and match requirements for discussion at the December 13th, 2023 SRFB meeting

Dear Salmon Recovery Funding Board Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide comments on the Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Plan Review Report (WREPRR) and other topics.

The Snoqualmie Indian Tribe ["Tribe"] is a federally-recognized sovereign Indian Tribe and a signatory to the Treaty of Point Elliott of 1855 in which it reserved to itself certain rights and privileges, and ceded certain lands to the United States. As a signatory to the Treaty of Point Elliot, the Tribe specifically reserved to itself, among other things, the right to fish at usual and accustomed areas and the "privilege of hunting and gathering roots and berries on open and unclaimed lands" off-reservation throughout the modern-day state of Washington. Treaty of Point Elliot, art. V, 12 Stat. 928." The Snoqualmie Tribe was a member of the WRIA 7 (Snohomish) and WRIA 8 (Cedar-Sammamish) Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Planning Committees.

The Tribe previously provided comments to RCO on the WREPRR, and we appreciate that the review panel(s) recommended the inclusion of "mechanisms for monitoring, assessment, accountability, and adaptation to ensure successful implementation of the plan," which aligns with our comments on the prior draft. We believe that these elements will be critical to a successful implementation of offsets and achievement of Net Ecological Benefit for both WRIAs 7 and 8. However, we remain deeply concerned that the review panels for the various watershed plans being considered are applying different standards to different plans, resulting in a blatant inconsistency that will result in continued degradation of the Snoqualmie basin. We are referring to the double standard being applied to Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) projects across different plans.

The review panels for WRIAs 13 and 14 expressed their deep concern for MAR projects that divert natural surface flows (stream flow) and claim offset benefits for doing so, but the review panel for WRIA 7 did not apply the same logic and accountability. The Tribe shares this concern, and we point out that the same concerns relevant to the plans for WRIAs 13 and 14 must be applied equally to WRIA 7 for the Snoqualmie offset projects, including for the MAR projects, for equitable treatment of tribes and citizens across watershed boundaries.

The Current WREPRR (Item 5 in the meeting materials, Attachment A), contains the following language for WRIA 13:

While managed aquifer recharge facilities that accept stormwater or treated wastewater appear appropriate, managed aquifer recharge facilities that withdraw flow from streams rely on hydrologic manipulations of natural resources and natural processes that have questionable feasibility and benefits. (p. 14)

Alteration of natural stream hydrology is a high-priority limiting factor in WRIA 13. Streamflow is important for supporting riparian vegetation and wetlands that provide shading, wildfire breaks, food web support, and flood and sediment attenuation functions. Yet the plan's water offsets seem to rely on further alterations of natural stream hydrology instead of seeking solutions that reverse such alterations to offset permit-exempt well withdrawals. (p. 15)

The plan should use caution when replicating natural annual hydrographs through further manipulation of natural stream hydrography (i.e., stream withdrawals to source managed aquifer recharge projects). Instead, the plan should develop and evaluate projects that reduce alterations of natural stream hydrology and avoid further manipulation of natural stream processes. (p. 17)

Identical, or nearly identical language is included in the WREPRR for the WRIA 14 plan, which appears to have been reviewed by the same team. However, no such language is included for the WRIA 7 plan, which appears to have been reviewed by a different review team. The evaluations are clearly inconsistent given that the WRIA 7 plan commits 198 AFY of offset quantity to Snoqualmie MAR projects, all of which would be sourced from natural streamflow and would manipulate the natural stream hydrograph, including during months when native fish, including protected salmonids, are spawning. The Tribe continues to be deeply concerned that that these unstudied Snoqualmie MAR projects, to be built in active floodplains and channel migration zones, would actually result in ecological harm, rather than benefit. Any benefit from such projects remains "questionable," as the WRIA 13/14 reviewers put it, but the impacts of Permit Exempt Wells are certain, and are accruing. We share the concerns that the reviewers of the WRIA 13 and 14 plans have about MAR using natural streamflow, and we request that no comparatively relaxed double standard be applied to the Snoqualmie in WRIA 7, merely because a different set of reviewers may have

applied a different set of standards and/or values to the resources that the Snoqualmie people rely upon.

As concerns about manipulation of natural hydrologic systems are acknowledged in the plan review for WRIAs 13 and 14, the same concerns also apply to the Snoqualmie River Watershed Surface Water Storage offset project, which currently is associated with 77 AFY of offset credit. However, this too is based on unstudied project concepts with questionable benefits, and which rely upon manipulation of natural streamflow and natural hydrologic features. As described in the plan,

Ten potential water storage projects, ranging in capacity from 77 to 3,331 AFY, were selected for further analysis. These sites include off-channel storage reservoirs, on-channel storage reservoirs, and projects that would result in raising the level of an existing lake to create additional storage capacity. (March 2022 WRIA 7 WRE Final Plan from Ecology to SRFB)

Here, many of the same concerns apply regarding hydrologic manipulation, and about development within the floodplain and channel migration zone, apply as for those expressed for MAR above. The Tribe strongly believes that on-channel storage reservoirs will have negative ecological impacts and should not be considered part of an effort to achieve Net Ecological Benefit. For example, the “existing lake” being considered is a natural impoundment with documented beaver presence and valuable wetland features which would be impacted by the increased inundation that would result from the feature’s manipulation for increased “storage.” Off-channel storage reservoirs are another version of manipulating natural streamflow, a concern that was portrayed negatively by the WRIA 13/14 reviewers. The same concerns apply in the Snoqualmie and in WRIA 7. The Snoqualmie River basin hydrograph has been highly compromised by landscape and land management alteration, and by climate change. We believe that the best path forward for the Snoqualmie basin, and the path supported by Traditional Ecological Knowledge as well as Western science, is not to build more and higher manmade dams, but as the WRIA 13/14 reviewers urged: “Instead, the plan should develop and evaluate projects that reduce alterations of natural stream hydrology and avoid further manipulation of natural stream processes.”

Due to the concerns raised by the WRIA 13 and 14 reviewers, and by the Tribe (as well as other Committee members during the WRE Planning process), we request that the offset credit (198 and 77 AFY) for these projects be stricken from the WRIA 7 plan. This would help to restore consistency and equitable treatment between basins (and those who rely upon those basins, such as the Snoqualmie people) across the state. The benefits related to these projects are far too questionable and unstudied to be included, while the impacts of PEWs are certain. The Snoqualmie MAR and Snoqualmie Surface Water Storage projects would require hardening of shorelines, construction of infrastructure in active floodplains and channel migration zones, and diversion of natural streamflow out of rivers and streams—we would expect that this is not something the SRFB would want to support and condone, as these types of actions are clearly counter to a process-based restoration approach that is supported by TEK and Western science.

Regarding the proposal to waive matching funding requirements that is currently before the SRFB: the Tribe strongly encourages the Board to waive matching funding requirements for SRFB-funded projects. Tribal staff have experienced firsthand the additional work, cost, and lost opportunities that accompany grant fund matching requirements, from both project sponsor and project reviewer perspectives. We suggest that the entirety of the SRFB (and most other) grant review processes provides more than enough scrutiny and vetting to ensure the highest possible chances of project success and making good investments of scarce restoration dollars. From our experience and observations, eliminating matching requirements results in more grant funding going to project implementation and less going to project administration and overhead, the latter greatly increased to navigate matching requirements. Given the scarcity of restoration funding in relation to the massive, demonstrated need, we urge SRFB to eliminate the match requirement which will help project implementing partners to put more grant funds toward project features that truly support salmon recovery.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Matthew J Baerwalde', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Matthew J Baerwalde
Environmental Policy Analyst
Environmental and Natural Resources Department
Snoqualmie Tribe
mattb@snoqualmietribe.us
425-495-4111



10/12/2023

Megan Duffy
Director, Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office
PO Box 40917
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

Sent via electronic mail to rco-director@rco.wa.gov

RE: Snoqualmie Tribe's comments on the Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Plan Review Report (WREPRR)

Dear Director Duffy,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide comments on the Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Plan Review Report.

The Snoqualmie Indian Tribe ["Tribe"] is a federally-recognized sovereign Indian Tribe and a signatory to the Treaty of Point Elliott of 1855 in which it reserved to itself certain rights and privileges, and ceded certain lands to the United States. As a signatory to the Treaty of Point Elliot, the Tribe specifically reserved to itself, among other things, the right to fish at usual and accustomed areas and the "privilege of hunting and gathering roots and berries on open and unclaimed lands" off-reservation throughout the modern-day state of Washington. Treaty of Point Elliot, art. V, 12 Stat. 928." The Snoqualmie Tribe was a member of the WRIA 7 (Snohomish) and WRIA 8 (Cedar-Sammamish) Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Planning Committees.

As RCO is aware, the Snohomish and Cedar-Sammamish basins are home to ESA-protected salmon and steelhead and resident coldwater fish populations, which contribute to important regional and international fisheries as well as the physical, cultural and mental health, vitality, and well-being of the Snoqualmie People. These watersheds have been degraded over the years due to development, channelization, and reduction in summer flows due to agricultural, residential, and commercial use of the basin's water. Fish runs have been severely reduced, and some species are on the verge of disappearance from the watersheds.

Climate forecasts indicate that the Snoqualmie River basin and the Cedar-Sammamish basin will transition from transient-snow-basins to rain-dominated basins before the end of the century, resulting in higher winter flows, lower summer flows, and higher water

temperatures during the summer. These impacts, coupled with increasing demand for domestic, agricultural, and industrial water supply, are expected to further degrade the productivity of cold-water fish habitat. Focused planning and adaptation work is needed to address future climate forecasts, ensure a reliable water supply for the Tribe, the environment, and other water users, to reverse diminishing trends in native fish populations, and to manage the river basins' water to support both instream and out of stream uses. Unfortunately, the WRIA 7 (Snohomish) and WRIA 8 (Cedar-Sammamish) WRE plans do not provide the necessary level of assurance that the impacts of Permit Exempt Wells (PEWs) will be mitigated (or in the parlance of the plans, "offset") over the course of the planning period, which will end in 2038. We urge RCO to modify the plans as the Snoqualmie Tribe worked tirelessly to do while the Committees worked to meet the deadline imposed upon them, so that at a minimum, there are mechanisms in place for monitoring, assessment, accountability, and critically, **adaptation**, if the offset projects considered in the plans are not being implemented effectively, as the plans project.

Monitoring and assessment, and adaptive management, were originally included in the Draft WRIA 7 and WRIA 8 Plans, but, disappointingly, Ecology removed those sections, likely because Ecology views such elements as an additional burden upon the agency. As the state agency responsible for managing water resources, however, it is incumbent upon Ecology to ensure that WAC mandated minimum instream flows are met and that new development is not illegally and unfairly further impacting water and aquatic resources, and it is unclear how they can meet this responsibility given the high uncertainty around many of the WRIA 7 and 8 WRE offset projects, including lack of project sponsors, lack of adequate funding for projects within basins and across the state, and lack of confidence in offset project effectiveness, even if they are constructed. Furthermore, without this component, nobody is tracking the rate, location, and on-the-ground actual impacts to streamflow from new and future PEWs. Consider the current legislative push to enable quicker development, streamline permitting, etc., to meet housing demand at a vastly increased pace. None of that was considered in the WRE planning processes.

Both the WRIA 7 and 8 committees spent considerable time and effort discussing how to monitor and assess WRE Plan status and effectiveness up until 2038, even without funding or other support from Ecology or the legislature (which we asked for and did not receive). We urge RCO to look to the draft plans from which Ecology stripped those parts. Therein lie clever proposed solutions that the Committee considered for this clearly desperately needed, but curiously and discouragingly absent component. For example, RCO's comment summary table notes broad concerns for both WRIAs 7 and 8 that the plans do not fully offset subbasin-by-subbasin impacts. At a minimum, this must be monitored; ideally, it would be adaptively managed. Unfortunately, neither plan contains these components.

Snoqualmie Tribe is concerned that the Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Plan Review Report glosses over a critical flaw in the WRE Plans: namely, that some of the offset projects identified as needed to offset the expected impacts of PEWs, are ultimately unproven in their feasibility, and untested and unevaluated in their ability to provide any actual mitigation/offset water or net ecological benefit. RCO's comment summary table for WRIA 7 notes that "[e]stimates may be high for water offsets - state assumptions clearly.

Consider stating assumptions of water offset clearly.” This statement downplays a major flaw; without the Managed Aquifer Recharge projects included in the WRIA 7 plan, it cannot meet its needed offset quantity, but confidence is very low in the ability of MAR to provide meaningful offset, let alone the large offset quantities that Ecology proposes. These offset deficiencies persist, in spite of clear concerns with the technical merits and feasibility of MAR projects in Western Washington post-glacial transient-snow basins such as the Snohomish and Cedar-Sammamish, which are also already moving toward a precipitation-driven hydrographs as a result of climate change. The result of all this is far too much uncertainty.

During the WREC process, the WRIA 7 Committee had strong concerns about the technical merits of the Snoqualmie MAR projects. The offset quantities proposed for each MAR project was agreed upon by the committee to be included at a much lower number than what is in the plan that ECY puts forth. The WRIA 7 Snoqualmie MAR sites were picked by an ECY staff person by looking for public land near the river. This sole criteria was used because it is more feasible to implement projects on public land. However, this lone criterion fails to account for any other critical technical aspects, such as: soils, hydrology, saturation, phenology, biota, life histories and ecology, climate change, etc. Furthermore, the offset quantities that ECY are simply the predicted maximum possible annual diversions at those locations, equating all diversion at all times of year as all the same “offset” water. This is clearly an overly crude concept that is ecologically deficient—the concept that all water diverted at all the considered sites, at all times of year, will re-enter the stream at a beneficial time of year, and in an appropriate sub-basin. All of this is absolute conjecture, completely unknown, and most likely untrue, which is why the members of the WRIA 7 technical subcommittee were vocal with their discomfort with it, and why they modified it from the overly optimistic numbers that ECY proposed.

RCO should not be comfortable using ECY’s offset quantities for Snoqualmie MAR projects, which are not founded in scientific findings and methodology. We suggest RCO apply further scrutiny and modification to this component of the plan, and consult with local experts such as Tribes and other WREC members as to how to plausibly strive to meet offset targets. MARs using natural streamflow as the source water in the Snoqualmie/Snohomish are completely unproven as to their efficacy for providing offset water or ecological benefit—not at the subject sites nor at any site, since none have been sufficiently considered. Snoqualmie Tribe is more comfortable with the MAR proposed in the WRIA 8 plan, since it proposes to use reclaimed water (and has a project sponsor), not to divert streamflow directly for MAR, which is a critical difference.

As to project sponsors—only a small subset of projects in either plan have identified sponsors, and these sponsors must compete with others (and themselves) across the state for funding to implement projects. Projects in King and Snohomish Counties are more expensive than anywhere else in the state, as well. All of this adds more than considerable uncertainty to the plan, which is why monitoring and adaptive management were originally included by the Committees. As is, the WRE Plans include zero assessment and zero accountability. Without them, Snoqualmie Tribe is not optimistic that the basins will meet

their offset requirements. Rather, we anticipate that streamflows will continue to diminish in part because of the impacts of PEWs, and watershed conditions will continue to degrade.

We respectfully request that RCO look to the draft plans that the WRIAs 7 and 8 WRE Committees produced. Look for the innovative sections about code changes, collaboration across agencies and groups to fill in water resource planning gaps (like including WA Department of Health), where we encouraged thoughtful solutions to obvious problems with Washington State's failed water management policies. For example, the Committee included specific, well-thought out recommendations to fund and implement science-based adaptive management monitoring programs for water offset and habitat projects in the WRE program. The Committee recommended an increase in available funding for projects and policy implementation. We recognized the need for and encouraged statewide policies that protect streamflow throughout the state, by upgrading the tracking database for permit-exempt wells, encouraging connections to public water sources, initiating permit-exempt well metering, delivering water conservation education in non-urban areas, and implementing mandatory water conservation measure for permit-exempt well users during statewide drought events. If additional enforcement capacity is determined to be needed to effectively implement those actions, we also recommended funding staff pertinent to those programs. Additionally, we urged the inclusion of salmon recovery experts in the Streamflow Restoration Competitive Grant review process. We stand by all these recommendations today as critical to Plan success.

Please look to the above listed areas of the Draft Plans prepared by the Committees to help give the WREPs a chance of success between now and 2038, and please give more scrutiny to the offset projections of the offset projects in the plans, especially MAR projects in the glacially created watersheds that are pervasive across Western Washington. Streamflow-sourced MAR projects in these systems have not been widely accepted as a universally beneficial approach and requires a great deal more investigation before being included so specifically in such an important water resource management plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Matthew J Baerwalde', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Matthew J Baerwalde
Environmental Policy Analyst
Environmental and Natural Resources Department
Snoqualmie Tribe

