



WRIA 9 WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM FORUM

BURIEN COMMUNITY CENTER

Thursday, February 8, 2018

4:00 to 6:30 p.m.

REVISED AGENDA

		Page Number		
I.	Welcome & Introductions		Marlla Mhoon, Co-Chair Councilmember, City of Covington	4:00-4:05
II.	Public Comment		Marlla Mhoon	4:05-4:15
III.	Approval of Meeting Summary <i>Action: Approve November 9, 2017 Meeting Summary</i>	2	Marlla Mhoon	4:15
IV.	Technical Briefing #6: Contaminants and Salmon <i>Action: Approve Contaminants and Salmon white paper as an Addendum to the Science Foundation informing the Salmon Habitat Plan Update</i>	5	Matt Goehring, Planning and Technical Coordinator Jenée Colton, Water Quality Planner, King County	4:15-4:35
V.	Habitat Indicators: Necessary Future Conditions & Implementation Targets <i>Action: Approve Necessary Future Conditions and Implementation Targets for priority habitat indicators as part of the Salmon Habitat Plan Update.</i>	9	Matt Goehring	4:35-4:55
VI.	Celebrating Jay Covington		Marlla Mhoon	4:55-5:00
●	Break: Light Dinner will be provided			5:00-5:15
VII.	NOAA Fisheries Request for Comments/Draft WRIA 9 Comment Letter: Duwamish-Green Hatcheries Draft Environmental Impact Statement for 10 Salmon and Steelhead Hatchery Programs <i>Action: Decide what to do with the WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum comments on the DEIS and Hatchery Programs</i>	13	Doug Osterman, Salmon Recovery Manager Gino Lucchetti, Fisheries Biologist Consultant Jay Covington, Chief Administrative Officer, City of Renton Marlla Mhoon	5:15-6:25
VIII.	Wrap Up/Next Steps		Doug Osterman	6:25-6:30

Next Watershed Ecosystem Forum Meeting: Thursday, May 10, 2018, 4:00 to 6:30 p.m.

Tukwila Community Center



WRIA 9 WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM FORUM

BURIEN COMMUNITY CENTER

Thursday, February 8, 2018
4:00 to 6:30 p.m.

AGENDA

		Page Number		
I.	Welcome & Introductions		Marlla Mhoon, Co-Chair Councilmember, City of Covington	4:00-4:05
II.	Public Comment		Marlla Mhoon	4:05-4:15
III.	Approval of Meeting Summary <i>Action: Approve November 9, 2017 Meeting Summary</i>	2	Marlla Mhoon	4:15
IV.	Technical Briefing #6: Contaminants and Salmon <i>Action: Approve Contaminants and Salmon white paper as an Addendum to the Science Foundation informing the Salmon Habitat Plan Update</i>	5	Matt Goehring, Planning and Technical Coordinator Jenée Colton, Water Quality Planner, King County	4:15-4:35
V.	Habitat Indicators: Necessary Future Conditions & Implementation Targets <i>Action: Approve Necessary Future Conditions and Implementation Targets for priority habitat indicators as part of the Salmon Habitat Plan Update.</i>	9	Matt Goehring	4:35-4:55
VI.	Celebrating Jay Covington		Marlla Mhoon	4:55-5:00
☉	Break: Light Dinner will be provided			5:00-5:15
VII.	Framing WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat and Hatchery Issues		Jay Covington, Chief Administrative Officer, City of Renton	5:15-5:25
VIII.	NOAA Fisheries Request for Comments/Draft WRIA 9 Comment Letter: Duwamish-Green Hatcheries Draft Environmental Impact Statement for 10 Salmon and Steelhead Hatchery Programs <i>Action: Decide what to do with the WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum comments on the DEIS and Hatchery Programs</i>	13	Marlla Mhoon Dennis Robertson, Management Committee Chair, Councilmember, City of Tukwila Gino Lucchetti, Fisheries Biologist Consultant	5:25-6:25
IX.	Wrap Up/Next Steps		Doug Osterman, Salmon Recovery Manager	6:25-6:30

Next Watershed Ecosystem Forum Meeting: Thursday, May 10, 2018, 4:00 to 6:30 p.m.

Tukwila Community Center

WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum Meeting Summary

Renton City Hall // November 9, 2017, 4:15 – 6:36 p.m.

Members Present		Affiliation
1.	Councilmember (CM) Bill Peloza, Meeting Chair	City of Auburn
2.	Al Barrie	Mid-Sound Fisheries Enhancement Group (MSFEG)
3.	CM Kathryn Campbell	City of SeaTac
4.	Jay Covington	City of Renton
5.	CM Bob Edgar	City of Burien
6.	Noel Gilbrough	MSFEG
7.	Mike Mactutis	City of Kent
8.	Joe Miles	WA Department of Natural Resources (WA DNR)
9.	CM Erika Morgan	City of Black Diamond
10.	Joan Nolan	WA Department of Ecology
11.	Lisa Parsons	Washington Environmental Council
12.	James Rasmussen	Green/Duwamish Watershed Alliance
13.	Brandy Reed	King Conservation District
14.	Stewart Reinbold	WA Department of Fish and Wildlife

Alternates Present		Affiliation
15.	Maiya Andrews	City of Burien
16.	Jonathan Loos	American Rivers
17.	Tom Malphrus	Covington Water District
18.	Kathy Minsch	City of Seattle
19.	Loren Reinhold	City of Des Moines
20.	Ron Straka	City of Renton
21.	Greg Volkhardt	Tacoma Public Utilities

Other Attendees Present		Affiliation
22.	Katie Beaver	King County
23.	Karen Bergeron	WRIA 9 Habitat Project Coordinator
24.	Maggie Gipson	City of Auburn
25.	Matt Goehring	WRIA 9 Planning and Technical Coordinator
26.	Kollin Higgins	King County
27.	Janne Kaje	King County
28.	Leah Kintner	Puget Sound Partnership
29.	Tara Luckie	Environmental Science Center (ESC)
30.	Megan Moore	King County
31.	Jessica Olmstead	WA DNR
32.	Doug Osterman	WRIA 9 Salmon Recovery Manager
33.	Larry Reymann	ESC

I) Welcome and Introductions

Meeting Chair Bill Peloza called the meeting to order at approximately 4:15 pm.

II) Public Comment

Noel Gilbrough spoke on a need for adequate signage to explain the restoration efforts at two project sites, North Winds Weir and Cecil B. Moses.

James Rasmussen reported on an ongoing situation with a Superfund site on the Duwamish. He said a roundtable caucus is being formed to determine decisions on river cleanup, and that WRIA 9, as an important source of input, should have a voice in this process. Doug Osterman, WRIA 9 Salmon Recovery Manager, replied he would research the situation and follow up.

III) “Salmon Heroes” Program at Environmental Science Center (Presentation)

Dr. Tara Luckie of the Environmental Science Center (ESC) presented on their “Salmon Heroes” hands-on student education program. The full presentation by Dr. Luckie, including her contact information, can be located online [here](#).

Chair Peloza praised the program, and pledged to reach out to the Auburn school district to get them involved. Dr. Luckie and Larry Reymann indicated plans to work with more non-profits and other entities, such as the City of Renton, and that they are interested in field trips further upstream in the watershed.

WRIA 9 WEF Meeting Summary

November 9, 2017

IV) Approval of Prior Meeting Summary (Action Item)

Jay Covington motioned to approve the meeting summary for the August 10, 2017 WEF meeting. Noel Gilbrough seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. Kathy Minsch noted one error; a mention of the “Clallam” tribe should be “S’Klallam.”

V) Green/Duwamish Urban Waters Federal Partnership (Action Item)

Action: Approve the Green/Duwamish UWFP as a member of the WRIA 9 WEF.

Doug Osterman said Tracy Stanton of the Green/Duwamish UWFP sent her thanks to the WEF for their participation in UWFP and for voting for the UWFP to win the Sammie award. He recommended, per the statement in the cover memorandum for tonight’s meeting packet, the WEF to consider adding the UWFP as a member of the WEF, with Ms. Stanton as their delegate.

Noel Gilbrough motioned to accept the UWFP as a new WEF member, with Ms. Stanton as delegate. Kathy Minsch seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

VI) Technical Briefing #5: Green River Temperature and Salmon

Kollin Higgins, Environmental Scientist for King County DNRP, presented findings from the “Green River Temperature and Salmon” white paper, on behalf of its author, fellow KC Environmental Scientist Josh Kubo. Its findings detail the increasing negative impacts of higher water temperatures at multiple stages of the salmon life cycle, and future consequences of climate change on the watershed. The full paper is available for review [here](#), and the presentation is available for view [here](#).

Kathryn Campbell asked, since water begins heating up high in the watershed below Howard Hanson Dam, if there is a way to control flow from the dam in peak seasons to reduce temperatures. Mr. Higgins answered that while there are mechanisms in place for such an action, including frequent conference calls among agencies and the tribe, in which balancing the needs and priorities of multiple species of salmon and steelhead using releases from the Dam are discussed. Greg Volkhardt said in the spring a large amount of water at the Hanson reservoir is designated for steelhead, and some in the fall is designated for Chinook. He reiterated Mr. Higgins’ point about balancing priorities. He added that there is still a desire for more water to protect the fish.

Lisa Parsons asked about studies of impacts of springs coming into the Green. Mr. Higgins said measurements clearly indicate cold water input into the river in the Gorge reach and that there is ample infiltration and discharge from sub-surface springs near Enumclaw. Ms. Parsons voiced concern about pending developments and proliferation of private wells and septic systems in the area impacting the springs. Mr. Higgins replied that there are policies in the Salmon Habitat Plan that are intended to guide decisions made about ongoing development in the watershed, including in the areas of cold water sources to the river.

--BREAK--

At the break, Chair Pelozza made a statement recognizing the upcoming Veterans Day holiday and the large event, including parade, held in Auburn. He then handed over chairing duties for the remainder of tonight’s meeting to Dennis Robertson.

VII) WRIA 9 Science Foundation Update (Action Item)

Action: Approve Fish Habitat Use and Productivity, Climate Change, and Temperature white papers as addendums to Science Foundation informing the Salmon Habitat Plan Update.

Matt Goehring, WRIA 9 Planning and Technical Coordinator, presented an update to the WRIA 9 Strategic Assessment Report’s Scientific Foundation for Salmonid Habitat Conservation. The presentation included habitat findings and their implications for the plan update, organized by sub-watershed. He also reviewed plan implications resulting from climate change. The findings predominately affirm and validate conservation hypotheses and necessary future conditions outlined in the Salmon Recovery Plan. The full presentation is located [here](#).

Extensive discussion followed the presentation. Jay Covington asked if the action statement should be amended to reflect the need to reevaluate Policy MS1, which directs funding allocation between spawning and rearing habitats. Mr. Goehring replied that more specific plan actions that are informed by the technical information and teed up for consideration by the WEF would go through the Implementation Technical Committee (ITC) before returning to the full WEF for consideration. Kathy Minsch asked what a potential timeline would be to address actions that could be included as updates to the Salmon Habitat Plan, emphasizing the timeline and approach is self-determined and we should take the time to do it right. Doug Osterman replied all four of the WEF’s regular 2018 meetings would be dedicated to this purpose. He said the ITC will also have a series of meetings to identify plan areas for refinement, including possibly incorporating city and county planners on the ITC to advise on land use policy and actions, and then bring recommendations to WEF for discussion and decision. Dennis Robertson observed, noting the recent flooding due to the Houston hurricane that more people should be paying attention to providing places for rivers to flood, particularly in the face of climate change.

WRIA 9 WEF Meeting Summary

November 9, 2017

Noel Gilbrough said the crux of this issue in WRIA 9 is getting downstream passage at Howard Hanson Dam. Greg Volkhardt explained that the need for fish passage at the dam is not as highly publicized as other projects and, therefore, the Corps does not feel the pressure to address it. Letters have been sent to the head of NOAA fisheries and the then-Secretary of the Army by Washington's congressional delegation. He added that a collaborative effort is needed to keep the pressure on the Corps on this issue.

Kathryn Campbell stated the WEF should liaise with fishermen's groups, as they present a more attractive face for salmon recovery than the fish. Al Barrie opined that fish passage at the dam is a small issue in comparison to climate change causing an entire ecosystem to potentially collapse. Mr. Robertson countered that while climate change is important, it is not the focus of the WEF and we must continue to focus on salmon recovery and incorporate climate change into actions. He stressed the importance in continuing to protect all parts of the river system, as losing any one part of it can result in a drastic loss of fish. Brandy Reed suggested the WEF strategically ally itself with other priorities beneficial to salmon recovery, such as land/tree cover and stormwater management. Mr. Volkhardt stated there needs to be a focus on larger projects with greater impacts on fish population, and to focus more on the "wins" of what has been accomplished so far.

Jay Covington made a motion to approve the white papers as addendums to the Science Foundation informing the Salmon Habitat Plan update. Stewart Reinbold seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

VIII) Habitat Project Accomplishments in 2017 (Presentations)

- A. **Porter Levee Setback:** Josh Latterell, a Senior Ecologist at KC DNRP, presented on the Porter Reach Restoration Project, a levee setback project on the Green River near Auburn, which was constructed in Summer 2017. The presentation can be viewed in PDF format [here](#) and Dr. Latterell can be contacted [here](#).
- B. **Newaukum Creek Restoration Project – 10 Years of Monitoring:** Dan Eastman, a Senior Ecologist at KC DNRP, presented on the history of the Lower Newaukum Creek Restoration project, which was completed in 2008, and the ten years of monitoring since the project's completion. The presentation can be viewed in PDF format [here](#) and Mr. Eastman can be contacted [here](#).
- C. **Chinook Wind Regional Mitigation Site:** Michael Murphy, Transfer of Development Rights/In Lieu Fee Mitigation Program Supervisor for KC DNRP, presented on the Chinook Wind mitigation project on the Duwamish, between North Winds and Duwamish Gardens. The project involves demolition of a former hotel site and plans to convert it to four acres of intertidal salmon habitat. The presentation, including Mr. Murphy's contact information, can be viewed in PDF format [here](#).

IX) Wrap Up/Next Steps

Mr. Osterman referenced the 2018 meeting schedule noting that, due to elevator work at Renton City Hall, the WEF meetings for 2018 will not be at Renton City Hall. Two of the meetings are scheduled for the Tukwila Community Center and two, as tentative placeholders, at the King Street Center in Seattle. He is looking for other venues for the two tentatively scheduled in Seattle. Brandy Reed suggested the Renton wastewater treatment facility as a possible space.

The November 9, 2017 meeting of the WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum adjourned at 6:36 pm.

An Evaluation of Potential Impacts of Chemical Contaminants to Chinook Salmon in the Green-Duwamish Watershed

Prepared for:

Water Resource Inventory Area 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum

Submitted by:

Jenée Colton
King County Water and Land Resources Division
Department of Natural Resources and Parks



King County

Department of
Natural Resources and Parks

Water and Land Resources Division

Executive Summary

The 2005 Green-Duwamish Salmon Habitat Plan identified protection and improvement of sediment quality as a Tier 3 conservation hypothesis for salmon recovery. Although sediment clean-up was hypothesized to benefit Chinook salmon, limited scientific data were available on the potential impacts of sediment contamination on Chinook salmon productivity. Other habitat quality and quantity issues were more well-defined and identified as higher priority needs in the watershed. WRIA 9 commissioned this paper in 2017 – along with several other white papers – to address priority data gaps identified during the scoping of the 10-year update to the Salmon Plan. This paper summarizes research completed since the 2005 Plan was adopted on the potential impacts of chemical contaminants on Chinook salmon productivity in the Green-Duwamish watershed. The information is intended to inform identification and prioritization of recovery needs as WRIA 9 watershed partners update the 2005 Salmon Plan.

Contaminants are carried from sources to surface waters as well as within surface waters, by transport pathways. Contaminants can be carried to the Green-Duwamish receiving waters by point discharges (permitted industrial, stormwater and combined sewer overflows [CSOs] discharges), overland flow (stormwater runoff), groundwater, and direct atmospheric deposition, as well as by spills/leaks and bank erosion. Fish are exposed to chemicals through multiple routes including water passing through their gills and/or its ingestion, direct sediment contact and/or its ingestion, and/or through consumption of contaminated food. The importance of an exposure pathway to a fish is dependent on several variables primarily related to the chemical properties of the contaminant (e.g., hydrophilic, hydrophobic) and the ecology of the species of interest (e.g., diet, benthic or pelagic habits). Generally, water exposure and food consumption are the greatest exposure pathways to Chinook. Because juvenile Chinook spend a longer amount of time in the Green-Duwamish watershed than adult Chinook, their exposure to chemicals and risk of health impact are greater. In addition, juvenile Chinook are feeding during this period and consuming prey that are potentially contaminated.

Metals such as aluminum and selenium, have low toxicity under typical environmental conditions. Several other metals, such as copper, chromium, and lead, share similar acute symptoms resulting from disturbance of homeostasis. However, chronic exposure symptoms range widely from neurological and reproductive to sensory system and immune system impacts. Common classes of organic contaminants include pesticides, pharmaceuticals, phthalates, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs). Three commonly detected organic chemical contaminants in the Puget Sound Region are PCBs, PAHs, and PBDEs. There is a wide variety of possible health effects in fish from organic chemical exposure.

The available ambient water, sediment, and Chinook salmon tissue chemistry and sediment bioassay data collected in the Green-Duwamish watershed and the ecological assessments that use these data are reviewed in this report. Key information found from this review includes:

Observations of potential impacts of contaminants

- Chinook salmon return rates are substantially lower in contaminated estuaries, like the Duwamish, compared to uncontaminated estuaries.

Tissue chemistry/biomarkers

- Lower Duwamish Waterway (LDW) and East Waterway (EW) risk assessments did not identify risk of impaired growth or survival for juvenile Chinook salmon. However, the LDW risk assessment noted reduced immunocompetence may occur in juvenile Chinook migrating through the LDW.
- Subsequent studies, using more conservative assumptions, concluded PCBs may be causing health impacts in Chinook salmon.
- The risks of impacts to Chinook salmon from Chemicals of Emerging Concern (CECs) are unknown although these chemicals are likely present in wastewater discharges, and to a lesser degree stormwater discharges to the Green/Duwamish watershed.
- Relatively little juvenile Chinook tissue data have been collected or evaluated in the Duwamish Estuary in the last 10 years, and less data are available for the Green River. Tissue chemistry data indicate juvenile Chinook salmon are bioaccumulating contaminants while in the Duwamish Estuary. Tissue assessments suggest that PCB exposure may be causing sublethal adverse effects to juvenile Chinook salmon.

Sediment

- In the most contaminated areas of the LDW and EW, contaminated sediments are potentially impacting benthic invertebrates which could reduce the quantity or quality of food for juvenile salmon.
- Juvenile Chinook salmon in the Duwamish Estuary are exposed to sediments contaminated with PCBs, PAHs, some metals and phthalates.
- In the Duwamish Estuary, PCBs are the most widespread sediment contaminant. Sediment contaminants in the Green River need more characterization. Based on existing data, sediment contamination is highest in Mill (in Kent) and Springbrook creeks and may be a concern to benthic invertebrates. Mill Creek (in Auburn) is less contaminated, and Jenkins, Newaukum, Covington or Big Soos creeks are of little concern. Arsenic and BEHP concentrations most frequently exceeded the no-effects benthic sediment cleanup level (SCO) in Green River tributaries.
- Superfund cleanup of contaminated sediments will be an important step in reducing the exposure of aquatic life including Chinook salmon to contaminants, particularly PCBs. Sediment recontamination will remain a risk from dredging activities during cleanup of the LDW and EW.

Water chemistry

- Several water quality assessments have not identified any chemicals that are presenting notable risk to aquatic life. Of the chemicals investigated, mercury in water may be a chronic exposure risk for juvenile Chinook salmon in the Green River.

While tracking the LDW cleanup schedule, it is recommended that further direct work on Duwamish Estuary Chinook salmon be supported by the WRIA 9 group. Work completed

before cleanup begins on the LDW and EW will provide a foundation for comparison with future data to measure how juvenile Chinook health and contaminant impacts change over time. This work will be most efficiently directed at Chinook diet and tissue chemistry, biomarkers and sublethal effect measurement and improvement of Chinook-specific effect thresholds.

In addition to ongoing support for cleaning up contaminants in sediments and limiting future contaminant transport to surface waters, specific recommendations for future work include:

- Conduct studies that measure contaminants in juvenile Chinook tissues and stomach contents at different life stages or residence times. e.g., in rearing habitat for Chinook, in restored habitat project areas, and where tributaries enter the Green River. This work will strengthen the small dataset available for risk evaluation.
- Focus new studies on contaminants known to be elevated in the Duwamish Estuary and for which substantial effects data are published for some salmonids (PCBs, PAHs) and opportunistically explore CECs, such as pharmaceuticals, in water and Chinook salmon to build a chemistry database. CEC analysis is costly, effects analysis tools are lacking, and substantial new data are necessary to begin risk evaluation for Chinook. Therefore, prioritizing known contaminants first will optimize resources.
- Establish one or more new tissue effect thresholds for PCBs that are Chinook-specific. Effects thresholds are a tool that allow chemistry results to be placed into the context of toxicity. PCBs are the most widespread contaminant in the Duwamish Estuary. Outside of Superfund risk assessments, there is only one published PCB effect threshold that has been developed to assess Chinook in this region. Given the highly variable assumptions made in defining an effects threshold, developing one (or more) new PCB thresholds would provide a more stable foundation for evaluating how PCBs are affecting Chinook survival.
- Support studies that examine other effects evidence (e.g., juvenile Chinook bioassays with Duwamish sediments, biomarkers) by providing in-kind or financial assistance. In addition to the types of evidence recently collected for Chinook salmon (tissue and stomach content chemistry concentrations), work on other lines of evidence that can demonstrate occurrence of contaminant effects. For example, encourage National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration or Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to conduct laboratory exposure of salmon for PCB, PBDE, PAH effect endpoints using Duwamish sediments.
- Tease out cause(s) of lower smolt-to-adult return (SAR) by collecting juvenile salmon when they leave the Duwamish Estuary and measure body mass, nutrition and stomach contents and compare to mass of Chinook salmon at release from hatcheries. This would test if food quality (e.g., benthic invertebrates) between hatcheries and Duwamish Estuary mouth may be reducing juvenile health and decreasing SAR.

Necessary Future Conditions & Implementation Targets *PSP common indicator				White Cell – Needs WEF Approval	
				Grey Cell- Previously WEF Approved	
Habitat Indicator	Necessary Future Cond. (2005 Plan)	10-year Target (2005 Plan)	Current Condition	Recommended 10-year Target (by 2028)	Sources
Shoreline Armor*	65% of shoreline in natural condition	Restore 13,500 ft. of shoreline	64%/59 mi. of shoreline armored ¹ . 1500 ft. restored, but net gain of 70 ft. ²	Remove 3,000 ft. (<1% improvement) of hard armor and achieve an overall net reduction in hard armor	1) Salmon Plan 2) 2014 WRIA 9 Marine Shoreline Monitoring and Compliance
Marine Riparian Vegetation*	65% of marine shoreline characterized by riparian tree cover ¹ .	No target developed.	40%/36 mi. of shoreline has riparian tree cover [24%/21.8 mi. of shoreline is dense trees; 16%/14.8 mi. is patchy trees]	60 ac. and/or 3.25 mi. (~3.5% gain) of shoreline revegetated ³	1) Salmon Plan 2) WRIA 9 Status and Trends Monitoring Report: 2005-2010 3) Re-Green the Green 2016
Shoreline Conservation	Not Applicable	Protect 5 mi. of shoreline ² . As of 2014, 4 mi. were protected ³	9.5 mi. of adjacent upland protected as natural lands ¹	Acquire 2 mi. of shoreline for permanent protection, prioritizing beaches and feeder bluffs	1) 2017 GIS analysis 2) Implementation Guidance (2006) 3) WRIA 9 Status and Trends Report: 2005-2010
Duwamish					
Shallow Water Habitat	173 ac. of shallow water habitat in the transition zone (RM 1-10) (30% of historic) ¹	Restore 26.5 ac. of shallow water habitat	5.8 ac. as of 2014 has been restored	40 ac. of shallow water habitat created between RM 1-10 ²	1) Salmon Plan 2 Duwamish Blueprint 2014
Riparian Forest*	65% of each bank of the river has > 165 ft. of riparian tree coverage (586 ac. total)	No Target was developed	69 ac./12% of 165 ft. buffer contains trees. 34 ac./ 20% of 50 ft. buffer contains trees. ³	170 ac. (~29% of 165 ft. buffer) /9.8 mi. of bank revegetated ²	1) Salmon Plan 2) Re-Green the Green 2016 3) Hand-digitized for Lower Green SWIF, 2013

Necessary Future Conditions & Implementation Targets				White Cell – Needs WEF Approval	
*PSP common indicator				Grey Cell- Previously WEF Approved	
Habitat Indicator	Necessary Future Cond. (2005 Plan)	10-year Target (2005 Plan)	Current Condition	Recommended 10-year Target (by 2028)	Sources
Lower Green					
Off Channel Habitat	45% of historical off-channel habitat (2.8 mi. side channels; 450 ac. wetlands; 5039 ac. floodplains)	16.5 ac. of reconnected off-channel habitat (including riparian area). ¹ Create 1.4 mi. of side channel by 2034 ²	20.7 ac. as of 2014 (included riparian habitat) ³	Currently Under Development	1) Implementation Guidance (2006) 2) Approved by WEF as Tech. Recom. May 2014 3) Implementation Progress Report 2005-2014
Riparian Forest*	75% of each bank of the river to >165 ft. wide ¹ (828 ac. total)	No target was developed	222 ac./27% of 165 ft. buffer has trees. 84 ac./34% of 50 ft. buffer (248 ac.) has trees. ³	250 acres (~30% of 165 ft. buffer)/ 8.52 mi. of high priority, unforested shoreline planted with trees by 2025 ²	1) Approved by WEF as Tech. Recom. May 2014 2) Re-Green the Green: 2016 3) Hand-digitized for Lower Green SWIF, 2013
Large Woody Debris*	1705 pieces per mi. (21 key pieces) ¹	No target was developed, but there was a decrease over 10 years	2004: 54 pieces/mi. ³ 2014: 48.5 pieces/mi. ²	425 pieces/mi., which is half of 2014 20-year targets ¹	1) Approved by WEF as Tech. Recom. May 2014 2) LG/Duwamish River Habitat Assessment 2014 3) LG River Baseline Habitat Survey Report, 2004
Bank Armor	No new, decreasing amount ¹	No new, decreasing amount ¹	2014: 42 mi. of river bank, 17.7 mi. are KC levees and 9.8 mi. are KC maintained revetments. The other 14.5 mi. are a combination of semi-armored roads acting like levees and natural banks ²	Set back 1 mi. of levee (based on Lower Russell Rd)	1) Salmon Plan 2) 2017 King County unpublished GIS data

Necessary Future Conditions & Implementation Targets				White Cell – Needs WEF Approval	
*PSP common indicator				Grey Cell- Previously WEF Approved	
Habitat Indicator	Necessary Future Cond. (2005 Plan)	10-year Target (2005 Plan)	Current Condition	Recommended 10-year Target (by 2028)	Sources
Middle Green					
Floodplain Connectivity / Lateral Channel Migration	Floodplain subject to lateral channel migration represents 65% of historical conditions. ¹	Restoration of 50 acres of reconnected off-channel habitat, including riparian vegetation. ²	2017: 1751 ac. or 55% of historic floodplain connected; 45 ac. restored (including riparian) from 2005-2014 ³	Currently Under Development	1) Salmon Plan 2) Implementation Guidance (2006) 3) Implementation Progress Report 2005-2014
Riparian Forest*	> 65% of Channel Migration Zone (1424 of 2,190 ac.) and up to 165 ft. wide where possible ¹	No target was developed	2005: 50.3% 2009: 50.5% of the Channel Migration Zone forested ¹	175 acres (8% of CMZ) / 4.4 mi. revegetated ²	1) WRIA 9 Status and Trends Monitoring Report: 2005-2010, WRIA 9 ITC, 2012 2) Re-Green the Green: 2016
Large Wood Debris*	10 jams/mi. ¹	No target was developed	2006: 2.2 jams/ mi. ³ 2015: 3.8 jams/ mi. ²	5 jams/mi.	1) WRIA 9 Strategic Assessment 2005 2) Middle Green River LWD Monitoring, 2016 3) WRIA 9 Status and Trends Monitoring Report: 2005-10
Bank Armor	No new, decreasing amount ¹	No new, decreasing amount ¹ <i>Target met</i>	2004=25% 2009=24% ^{2, 3}	Set back 1 mi. of revetment/levee (Based on Porter, Lones and Hurley projects, which together are a little under a mile)	1) Salmon Plan 2) Analysis lumped part of the LG and MG, numbers are higher than should be. 3) WRIA 9 Status and Trends Monitoring Report: 2005-2010, WRIA 9 ITC, 2012

Necessary Future Conditions & Implementation Targets				White Cell – Needs WEF Approval	
*PSP common indicator				Grey Cell- Previously WEF Approved	
Habitat Indicator	Necessary Future Cond. (2005 Plan)	10-year Target (2005 Plan)	Current Condition	Recommended 10-year Target (by 2028)	Sources
Middle Green Tributaries					
Soos Creek Riparian Forest*	65% revegetated to 165 ft.	No target was developed	2015: 150ft. riparian buffer is 4200 ac., 1626 ac. is forested ¹	700 ac. (17% of riparian buffer) / 11.7 mi. revegetated ¹	1) Re-Green the Green, 2016
Newaukum Creek Riparian Forest*	65% revegetated to 165 ft.	No target was developed	2015: the 150 ft. riparian area is 4088 acres, 960 acres of which is forested ¹	900 ac. (22% of riparian buffer) / 14.0 mi. revegetated ¹	1) Re-Green the Green, 2016
Upper Green					
Fish Passage	Up and downstream fish passage provided at Howard Hanson Dam	Fish passage. Target not met	Upstream passage facility complete. Downstream passage not complete	Downstream passage at HHD	
Bank Armor	No new, decreasing amount ¹	No new, decreasing amount ¹ Target met	2004=15% armored 2009=15% armored ²	Set back 0.5 mi. of levee	1) Salmon Plan 2) WRIA 9 Status and Trends Monitoring Report: 2005-2010, WRIA 9 ITC, 2012

WATER RESOURCE INVENTORY AREA 9 (WRIA 9) WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM FORUM



- Algona
- Auburn
- Black Diamond
- Burien
- Covington
- Des Moines
- Enumclaw
- Federal Way
- Kent
- King County
- Maple Valley
- Normandy Park
- Renton
- SeaTac
- Seattle
- Tacoma
- Tukwila

- King Conservation District
- Vashon/Maury Island Community Council
- Covington Water District
- Port of Seattle
- Washington Department of Ecology
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Washington Department of Natural Resources
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- Green-Duwamish Urban Waters Partnership

- Washington Environmental Council
- Green/Duwamish Watershed Alliance
- Trout Unlimited/Mid-Sound Fisheries Enhancement Group
- Save Habitat and Diversity of Wetlands (SHADOW)
- American Rivers

- The Boeing Company
- Master Builders Association
- King County Agricultural Commission

January 18, 2018

Mr. Steve Leider, Fishery Biologist
 National Marine Fisheries Service, West Coast Region
 510 Desmond Drive SE, Suite 103
 Lacey, WA 98503



RE: Duwamish-Green Hatcheries Draft EIS

Dear Mr. Leider,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the *Draft Environmental Impact Statement for 10 Salmon and Steelhead Hatchery Programs in the Duwamish-Green River Basin*. Effective, scientifically-sound management of salmon and steelhead is of critical importance in ensuring effectiveness of habitat-based actions being implemented in the Duwamish-Green River Basin under direction of the WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum, a state-designated citizens’ committee and coalition of local governments and other stakeholders that has been planning and implementing actions to recover the ESA-listed Green River Chinook salmon population since 1998. Although Chinook-focused, the WRIA 9 mission includes conserving and restoring other salmon species and steelhead stocks and making the watershed healthier for people and fish.

In 2005, with broad consensus among stakeholders, the 17 local governments of the Green River watershed approved the *WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat Plan: Making Our Watershed Fit for a King* (hereafter referred to as the “the SHP”). It was federally approved in January 2007 as part of the broader Puget Sound wide Chinook Salmon Recovery Plan. While the Plan focuses on the habitat “H” of the four primary factors of decline (harvest, hatcheries, and hydropower/dams being the other three factors), successful recovery will require integrating all four “H’s”, as indicated by the federally-adopted Puget Sound Chinook Salmon Recovery Plan, of which the WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat Plan is a chapter.

We are providing comments on both the DEIS and each of the 10 HGMPs. Our concerns focus on adequacy of identifying, assessing, and avoiding or minimizing effects of the HGMPs on the Basin’s natural salmon and steelhead. We recognize and strongly support the need for providing meaningful Treaty and non-Treaty fisheries.¹ We remain concerned about consequences for the long-term health, conservation, diversity, and productivity of the natural stocks of fish and effectiveness of WRIA 9’s habitat actions and investments to improve habitat to levels necessary for the recovery of Chinook salmon. Much of our concern is with the potential for additional, incremental loss of genetic diversity in Green River salmon and steelhead that hatchery programs would likely cause. Just recently we note the reported finding of significant historic loss of genetic diversity in Columbia River Chinook salmon (Service 2018). In that regard and to help ensure coordinated efforts to revitalize our much-loved Duwamish-Green River Basin, we provide you with the attached comments, concerns, and recommendations. Please contact Doug Osterman, WRIA 9 Salmon Recovery Manager, at 206-477-4793 or Doug.Osterman@kingcounty.gov with questions.

Sincerely,
 WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum Co-Chairs:

Bill Peloza
 Councilmember, City of Auburn

Marlla Mhoon
 Councilmember, City of Covington

cc: WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum

Financial support provided by signers of Watershed Planning Interlocal Agreement for WRIA 9 including: Algona, Auburn, Black Diamond, Burien, Covington, Des Moines, Enumclaw, Federal Way, Kent, King County, Maple Valley, Normandy Park, Renton, SeaTac, Seattle, Tacoma, Tukwila

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 2 of 23

WRIA 9 – Executive Summary of Comments and Concerns with Draft Environmental Impact Statement for 10 Salmon and Steelhead Programs in the Duwamish-Green River Basin and the 10 HGMPs

- Alternatives, supporting information, and conclusions in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and the Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans (HGMPs) are not well-aligned with goals and actions of the WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat Plan (SHP). They do not accurately portray conditions in the Basin or the WRIA’s concerns about hatchery and natural fish interactions. In addition, they may not be sufficiently precautionary in favor of the listed species in considering effects of the alternatives. The fact that the SHP is a locally and federally approved plan with considerable scientific background and the large amount of local, state, and federal funding being spent on habitat actions, we recommend that WRIA 9 issues and information be considered before the DEIS is finalized.
- More specifically, we have concerns regarding:
 - Adequacy of disease control programs
 - Adequacy of statistical evaluation methods
 - Hatchery effects and influence
 - Release date timing viability
 - Unclear descriptions of release strategies
 - Outdated approaches to management
 - Incorrect assumptions about predation and competition
 - Lack of specificity on measuring outcomes and ensuring “random” selection
 - Downplay of reduced fitness concerns arising from mixing/interbreeding
 - Absence of citations to support statements and basis for criteria
 - Outdated citations
 - Oversimplification of the causes of decline of steelhead production
 - Differing predation potential ratios used in DEIS and HGMPs
 - Lack of empirical evidence to support integration benefit contentions
 - No assessment of climate change effects in HGMPs
 - Assignment of “negligible negative effect” ratings

WRIA 9 - General Comments and Concerns with Draft Environmental Impact Statement for 10 Salmon and Steelhead Programs in the Duwamish-Green River Basin and the 10 HGMPs

Supporting Salmon Recovery and the WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat Plan

In their final supplement to the Puget Sound Chinook Recovery Plan (National Marine Fisheries Service 2006), the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) highlights the importance of integrated watershed-level planning for species recovery. The WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat Plan (SHP), “Making Our Watershed Fit for a King” (WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum 2005) is the federally-recognized, locally-adopted Chinook recovery plan for the Duwamish-Green River Basin, yet the HGMPs only briefly mention the SHP. As noted in detail below, they do not substantively assess, integrate or include SHP recommendations for avoiding or minimizing effects of hatchery fish on natural fish in the Basin even though this was an explicit recommendation of the final supplement (page 30). Under “Factor E. Other natural or man-made factors affecting continued existence,” the final supplement specifically notes that

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 3 of 23

hatchery programs be operated in a manner consistent with individual watershed and region-wide approaches, use appropriate criteria for integration of hatchery and extant populations, and use appropriate ecological, genetic, and demographic risk containment measures. However, in the HGMPs we see little effort to establish consistency with the SHP, protect and utilize extant populations (i.e., wild populations of rainbow trout in upper watershed that are genetically similar to wild steelhead below the dams) or to utilize advanced measures to contain risk of adverse interactions with hatchery fish. In sum, while the DEIS dutifully describes past and current planning efforts, it does not appear cognizant of the limited degree to which watershed-scale integration of hatcheries and recovery efforts has actually occurred. (To some degree, this is reflected in statements on current and future habitat that we feel are outdated.)

A primary goal of the SHP is making salmonid populations viable by improving their abundance, distribution, productivity, and diversity, *aka* Viable Salmonid Population (VSP) parameters, sufficient to warrant de-listing and provide meaningful fisheries. The SHP was developed to help ensure all groups – habitat and fish managers and land use authorities – are working in the same direction and that investments in habitat restoration and protection and programmatic actions, such as comprehensive growth management and shoreline management plans, are likely to produce improvements in all VSP parameters and, therefore, lead to the conservation and recovery of listed Chinook salmon. The SHP identified three key non-habitat goals that are relevant to the long-term viability of the Basin’s salmonid populations.

One goal is to establish a spring-run of Chinook above the Howard Hanson Dam (HHD) to replace the run that was there prior to the construction (*ca* 1908) of the (further downstream) Tacoma Headworks Dam. Neither the DEIS nor Chinook HGMPs address this or the effect of implementing the HGMPs on attaining it despite being a goal of the federally-approved SHP and specifically called out in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) supplement that hatchery programs address extant populations. The preferred alternatives for establishing fish runs above HHD rely on hatcheries. They do not include or assess benefits of an option where adults are passed upstream of HHD to let them naturally spawn and establish populations with minimal or no hatchery intervention, assuming downstream passage is provided. Of particular concern to WRIA 9 is any lost or diminished opportunity to establish upper watershed stocks, such as a spring-run of Chinook or an upriver steelhead run, with relatively little hatchery influence. Establishing these runs would be good for diversity and long-term productivity. This would also benefit integration. Based on recent examples (Elwha and Big White Salmon Rivers to name a few), there is good reason to believe that salmon and steelhead will rapidly recolonize new or lost habitat once passage is provided.

A second goal is to increase all VSP parameters, especially productivity and diversity. We are concerned about the long-term effects of an integrated hatchery approach – and of hatchery practices in general – on the genetic diversity and productivity of the Basin’s naturally spawning Chinook and coho salmon and steelhead trout. It seems inevitable (and illogical to conclude otherwise) that the continual interbreeding of natural-origin (more fit) with hatchery-origin (less fit) fish over generations will degrade genetic diversity and productivity and result in less fit fish than could be produced through a greater emphasis on habitat and natural selection processes. A key to making an integrated approach work is ensuring that the proportion of hatchery-origin spawners on natural spawning grounds does not exceed 30%, below which it is presumed (but not proven) that adverse effects of interbreeding are minimized. Yet between 1970 and 2014, this threshold was only met 3 times and in most years was greater than

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 4 of 23

40% (Figure 8, WRIA 9 2015). In any event, integration is largely untested and there is little evidence available to judge effectiveness.

We note that in assessing consequences for population viability for the EIS alternatives (DEIS Table 37), conclusions are heavily driven by abundance and distribution benefits while downplaying long-term effects on genetic diversity and productivity. Short of a severe population crisis that might require something like a captive broodstock program, it is illogical to conclude that the long-term viability of a population of natural-origin fish is benefitted by breeding with high numbers of less-fit hatchery-origin fish. In their response to comments on the draft 2013 Soos Creek Chinook HGMP, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) indicated that hatchery fish are counted as being 80% that of natural-origin fish in their population modeling. This would indicate that for every successful spawning event between a hatchery-origin and natural-origin fish the net result is something less than the quality of the natural-origin fish. This logic, when applied to almost 45 years of data showing high numbers of hatchery-origin spawners spawning with wild fish, would suggest that hatchery programs have been and continue to be a drag on population productivity and viability in the long-term.

The third SHP goal is to avoid interactions among juvenile hatchery and wild Chinook, particularly in the Lower Green River and Duwamish River transition zone.ⁱⁱ Studies from 2001 to 2003 by King County found evidence of swamping/overcrowding and reduced growth rate of smaller wild juveniles in the presence of larger hatchery juveniles in the lower river/transition zone (King County 2013). The Soos Creek Chinook HGMP states June release dates reduce the likelihood of interaction with the majority of natural-origin juvenile Chinook and, therefore, predation/competition is assumed to be low. However, release dates started in early to mid-May and in only half (6 out of 12 years), release continued into June (the latest release date in twelve years was June 11 in 2010). Furthermore, holding juvenile Chinook in the hatchery longer may not be realistic due to concerns with warm water and disease (*Furunculosis*). As a result, reducing the current overlap in timing of out-migrating hatchery and wild juvenile Chinook may not be achievable and there will be continued effects of hatchery fish on natural fish in the lower river.

WRIA 9 concerns about hatchery effects were expressed in a 2005 Strategic Assessment Report (SAR) drafted to provide guidance to the WRIA in response to requests from the Shared Strategy and Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team (WRIA 9 Watershed Coordination Services and Technical Committees 2005; Shared Strategy 2001; PSTRT 2003). The SAR noted that although management of hatchery production and harvest resides with NOAA Fisheries, WDFW, and the Indian Tribes, there are considerable data indicating that hatchery production and harvest rate can significantly affect productivity (and diversity) of natural salmon populations. The SAR information raised the question of whether to emphasize conservation of naturally-spawning Chinook salmon, along with their higher productivity and greater potential to adapt to changes in habitat and climatic factors, or whether to maximize production of hatchery fish to enhance harvest opportunity.

The SAR identified several hatchery and harvest-related hypotheses (actions) with potential to enhance productivity of natural Chinook salmon. One action (Non-Habitat Hypothesis 1) identified the use of live-capture harvest techniques to significantly reduce hatchery fish straying to the spawning grounds, thereby enhancing productivity of natural spawners. This action would limit interbreeding of hatchery- and natural-origin fish and limit the production of progeny exhibiting reduced survival. Moreover, the large number of hatchery fish on the spawning grounds currently confounds evaluation of productivity

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 5 of 23

of the natural population. Removal of stray hatchery fish would enhance accuracy and precision of productivity estimates needed to evaluate effectiveness of habitat-based actions.

A second action (Non-Habitat Hypothesis 2) involved measures to minimize interactions between hatchery and natural Chinook salmon juveniles and adults. Studies in 2002 and 2003 suggest that the release of large numbers of juvenile hatchery Chinook salmon may result in reduced growth and displacement of natural Chinook salmon in mainstem and off-channel habitats in the Duwamish estuary (King County 2013). Productivity of natural Chinook salmon may be enhanced by reducing competition among juveniles for food and space and by enhancing the attractiveness of the hatchery to returning adults (i.e., reduce competition on spawning grounds).

Updating Current and Potential Future Conditions

When describing habitat conditions, the DEIS and HGMPs do not adequately consider the great deal of progress, work, financial investments, and land use and regulatory changes in WRIA 9 to implement the priority actions of the WRIA 9 SHP. Thus, it makes assumptions and uses out of date information about the overall habitat trajectory that do not appear to be grounded in an accurate assessment. Over nearly 20 years, under guidance of NOAA Fisheries and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, we have put considerable effort into researching and improving the understanding of the Duwamish-Green Basin ecosystem functions. As described in the Salmon Habitat Plan Implementation Progress Report, WRIA 9 has made over \$136 million in habitat investments and significant progress was achieved on 54 of 162 high priority salmon habitat projects between the Plan's adoption in 2005 and 2014 (WRIA 9 2015). Since 2014, there has been an additional \$14 to 15 million in habitat investments. The WRIA 9 forum members have learned and shared a lot and have acted together to implement habitat projects and programs to protect and restore habitat throughout the watershed based on scientific assessments and federally-approved priorities for recovering the Chinook salmon population of the Duwamish-Green Basin. Through our many mutually-supported and implemented efforts, habitat conditions have likely begun to stabilize and, in general, should be improving rather than degrading as assumed in the DEIS.

Several habitat reports and studies may be useful for the DEIS to consider:

- The WRIA 9 Status and Trends Monitoring Report assessed change in a variety of land use indicators over five years from 2005 to 2010 (WRIA 9 Implementation Technical Committee 2012). Nearly ten years ago results were indicating relatively stable or small change in benthic invertebrates, forest cover and impervious surface, with most adverse change attributed to development within designated urban growth areas.
- As noted above, the WRIA 9 Implementation Progress Report documented numerous habitat investments and activities between 2005 and 2014 (WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum 2015).
- The federally-approved Programmatic Habitat Assessment (PHA) conducted as part of the FEMA NFIP BiOp described and quantified the effects of likely development in the future as well as the effects of many of habitat actions in floodplains under King County jurisdiction (King County 2012). The PHA applied a somewhat conservative "overstate potential for bad and understate potential for good" approach to estimating area affected by development and restoration in order to minimize potential for Type II Error, i.e., concluding regulations were effective when in fact they might not be. The PHA concluded that the net effect of ongoing and future habitat protection and restoration activities in combination with strong development regulations

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 6 of 23

(critical areas, stormwater, erosion, and sediment control ordinances) was likely sufficient to protect and promote recovery of listed species in King County's rural-zoned floodplains. This finding is important because rural-zoned lands are where most of the remaining productive habitats and habitat protection and restoration opportunities remain.

- The Regulatory Effectiveness Monitoring for Developing Rural Areas project, a study funded under the 2008 Puget Sound Initiative, assessed environmental response to rural land use and land cover change and regulatory compliance using high resolution (6ft) photos in nine rural-zoned watersheds consisting of six "treatment" watersheds, where new development was subject to updated (2005) Critical Area Ordinance (CAO) regulations, and three forested, undeveloped "control" watersheds between 2007 and 2012 (Lucchetti et al 2014). To put contemporary land cover change in perspective, land cover scenarios representing historic (back to ~ 1900) and hypothetical future full-build-out conditions were constructed and a watershed Hydrologic Condition Index (HCI) was developed to compare potential change in stream flow high pulse counts (a key watershed hydrology metric) across time-based, rural land cover scenarios (Lucchetti and Burkey 2014). (As with the County's PHA floodplain assessment, the study minimized potential for Type II Error by somewhat overstating the footprint of future build-out.) The study concluded that future development in rural areas was not likely to cause much change in watershed hydrology, particularly in comparison with urban areas, and that the area and effect of non-compliance was likely very small. The study concluded that the effectiveness of habitat restoration in rural streams should not be undermined by future development, assuming zoning, regulations, and compliance rates do not change. As with the PHA, an important aspect of this study is that it characterized land use in rural areas, which is where much, if not most, of the existing habitat protection and restoration value exists in WRIA 9.

Similar studies in urban areas have not been done. We acknowledge that much more work needs to be done in urban areas to improve and increase habitat, however, significant strides have been made to strengthen regulations, remediate historic land use effects, and restore habitat functions in the context of many constraints. As a result, it is likely that most conditions are, or logically should be, stabilizing or slightly improving in urban areas of the Basin.

In summary, considering the amount of land protected in critical and sensitive areas, new stringent development regulations (critical area, stormwater, erosion and sediment control), and numerous habitat restoration projects and passage around the HHD, we feel that conditions are likely on a trajectory of improvement rather than degradation in WRIA 9. The 2017 State of the Sound report notes progress toward a variety of targets (vital signs) has been made but there is still much to do (Puget Sound Partnership 2017). The report also notes the need to better integrate Chinook recovery with local plans and to build resilience in systems. These are issues we echo in this comment letter.

Being Precautionary

Precaution is important when planning for endangered species, yet it is hard to discern whether – or the degree to which – the HGMPs and DEIS alternatives are being precautionary. Statistical methods are not presented in the HGMPs. Language in both documents seems to understate concern when evidence is limited (e.g., efficacy of integration), lacking (e.g., disease transmission to wild fish) or, at times, conflicting (e.g., studies reaching different conclusions on competition between hatchery and wild Chinook juveniles in the lower river). The HGMPs describe a number of monitoring and evaluation

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 7 of 23

procedures to track concerns. It is not clear, however, which elements, if any, of this monitoring is required (versus recommended) or if funding is sufficient to ensure it will happen to the degree needed to detect changes or effects. Lack of a clear study design, statistical methods or power analysis provides no ability to assess likelihood of monitoring efforts in detecting effects the HGMPs purport to avoid. A plan such as a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP, e.g., Lucchetti and Latterell 2008) is recommended to allow the reader to understand limitations of the monitoring programs being proposed. A QAPP typically includes detail on study design, statistics, and a power analysis to assess likelihood of detecting effects. An approach that minimizes Type II error (e.g., generally “overstate potential for bad and understate potential for good”) is recommended as a way to minimize the potential for concluding no effect when an effect happened (false negative).

Conclusions

In summary, alternatives, supporting information, and conclusions in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and the Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans (HGMPs) are not well-aligned with goals and actions of the WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat Plan (SHP). They do not accurately portray conditions in the Basin or the WRIA’s concerns about hatchery and natural fish interactions. In addition, they may not be sufficiently precautionary in favor of the listed species in considering effects of the alternatives. The fact that the SHP is a locally and federally approved plan with considerable scientific background and the large amount of local, state, and federal funding being spent on habitat actions, we recommend that WRIA 9 issues and information be considered before the DEIS is finalized.

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 8 of 23

WRIA 9 - Specific Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement for 10 Salmon and Steelhead Programs in the Duwamish-Green River Basins

Summary

General Comments

As noted in the DEIS, the purpose of the DEIS is to disclose, analyze, and consider a broad range of environmental issues and a full range of reasonable alternatives and not to suggest or reach conclusions relative to ESA analysis. In that regard, the WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum has concerns that the alternatives did not address or inadequately addressed several issues, including:

- Implications for establishing an upper watershed spring Chinook population as recommended in the WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat Plan. Although the Chinook Fish Restoration Facility (FRF) would not necessarily preclude that action in the future, hatchery programs are extremely difficult to stop or modify once they become established.
- Delaying release of relatively large juvenile hatchery Chinook to mid- or late-June to avoid interaction with out-migrating smaller wild juveniles. The possibility for this is hampered by warm water and disease in the hatchery. Studies from 2001 to 2003 by King County et al (2013) suggested a swamping and/or competition effect of large hatchery juvenile Chinook on the smaller wild juvenile Chinook in the lower river, especially in the transition zone.
- Benefits of modifying hatchery environments to a more naturalistic (e.g., NATURES) condition.
- Ensuring with confidence, minimal interaction of indigenous wild steelhead with introduced summer-run steelhead to prevent or minimize adverse genetic and fitness effects when interbreeding.
- Relying on spawners to choose their mates instead of random selection.
- Ensuring that disease transmission to natural fish is not presently occurring and will not occur in the future. The HGMPs rely on hatchery health guidelines, which appear to apply to a controlled hatchery environment. There was no discussion of lack of reliable local assessments, implications of reliance on a single, relatively general and older reference (Steward and Bjornn 1990), and known difficulty in detecting or remediating effects of disease outbreaks in wild fish.
- Using something other than “integration” (except for summer-run steelhead) to address hatchery effects. Lacking evidence to the contrary and given the persistently high (> 30%) numbers of hatchery-origin Chinook on spawning grounds, it is difficult to see that integration will result in anything but a somewhat slower than historic rate of degradation in diversity, productivity, and fitness of natural fish as they breed and interact with less fit hatchery fish over time. Other concerns with integration are that it may result in lower ability of local populations to adapt to future challenges, such as climate change, and mask the effectiveness of habitat protection and restoration actions.
- Being precautionary by minimizing Type II Error, i.e., concluding no effect when in fact an effect may have occurred. In the HGMPs, statistical procedures to detect effects the HGMPs hope to avoid or minimize, such as adverse shifts in spawn timing or reduced life history and genetic diversity, are not presented. As a result, it is unclear how effective the monitoring might be. Considering that integration is an experiment and that each hatchery is a part of that experiment, something like a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP), commonly required for many research and experimental projects, would help to understand study design and statistical

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 9 of 23

methods that might be used to collect data and guide decisions. The Chinook and steelhead HGMPs (section 11.2 in the Plans) provide no sense of what would be done if a problem is detected and note that “risk aversion measures will be developed in conjunction with monitoring and evaluation plans” (although some leave this blank or simply say “N/A”) which themselves are not sufficiently detailed to assess.

- Pg. S-5 Lines 1-3 – States “The hatchery programs would use hatchery capacity as described in HGMPs and would be adaptively managed over time to incorporate best management practices as new information is available.” Based on HGMPs (see specific comments) it is not at all clear that effects would or could be sufficiently detected – or what changes would or could be made in time to reverse or remediate effects before significant damage is done to VSP parameters, mainly diversity and productivity. The HGMPs use phrases like “statistically significant” but provide no study design, level of significance, power analysis, etc., to have any sense how likely effects would be detected or, if detected, what would change. Without this information, confidence is low that proper assessments will be accomplished. A formal QAPP (or similar document) is recommended as guidance to confirmation that monitoring is sufficient to detect change.

- Pg. S-8 Line 5 – Does undetectable mean no effect? The concern here is that being undetectable is not proof of lack of effect. Disease is a concern and there does not appear to be a program to track diseases outside of the hatchery. Without a directed program assessing disease in natural fish in natural habitats, it seems an actual problem would be “undetectable.” Similarly, competition for food, space, and predation are not easy to prove one way or the other, particularly without a rigorous program to do so, but yet would still have consequences for wild fish recovery.

Chapter 1

- Pg. 1-15 - Project Area – Some Vashon streams (Judd and Shinglemill Creeks) are – or used to be – stocked with coho from the Green River hatchery system.

- Pg. 1-29 – Re: The Population Recovery Approach (PRA) for Chinook. As a Tier 2 population, are the listed Green River required or expected to show any improvement or just be stable? Also, is there a PRA for steelhead?

Chapter 2

-Pg. 2-5 Alternative #3 - Effect of Termination – The NMFS states that termination of hatchery programs would not lead to substantial progress toward conservation and recovery. Presumably this is because NMFS’ past assessments indicate many of the conditions that led to listing are not being remedied. However, habitat conditions are, or logically should be, improving due to relatively new, extensive, and much stronger regulations and habitat protection and restoration projects. Many of these regulations did not exist, were insufficient or poorly implemented to be effective prior to ~ late 1980s/early 1990s when the Washington State Growth Management Act and programs such as King County’s Basin Planning Program started affecting zoning, regulations, and capital investments to protect habitat.

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 10 of 23

Chapter 3

-Pg. 3-13 Line 23 – Should mention harvest as a factor affecting VSP parameters.

-Pg. 3-15 2nd para – NMFS concludes that for the Green River there is a “...current and continuing degradation and loss of habitat...” See previous comments about need for the DEIS to better describe current habitat conditions and actions in WRIA 9.

-Pg. 3-15 Line 27 – Suggest deleting “have the potential to.” Hatcheries invariably affect natural-origin salmonids. The concern is whether the effects are significant.

-Pg. 3-17 Lines 5 & 6 – See previous comment on “risk-averse.” Since the PS Hatcheries DEIS, it appears that current hatchery release levels are only lower due to decreases in hatchery releases of steelhead and pink salmon. These do not appear to be “risk-averse.”

-Pg. 3-8 Line 27 – Suggest adding “and space” after “preferred food” to reflect that crowding caused by very high numbers of juvenile hatchery Chinook also occurs, creating added stress and possible disease transmission to wild juveniles.

-Pg. 3-19 - Table 10 –

- Genetics: suggest removing words “can” and “may” as they give the impression that there is uncertainty and effects may not occur. As suggested earlier, it seems illogical to suggest these change mechanisms don’t occur. The issue is whether effects are significant and, if so, can they be reduced to an acceptable level of effect?
- Population Viability Benefits: Statements on retention of genetic fitness and the maintenance or increase in productivity seem too strong. Empirical evidence is lacking to support contention that integration will provide these benefits and not undermine diversity and productivity, albeit at a slower rate than past practices.

-Pg. 3-20 Lines 8-10 – Re: PS Hatcheries DEIS. Has the DEIS been finalized and, if not, is it appropriate to use it to make conclusions such as this? Is there a record of whether and how the NMFS responded to comments? Does the NMFS consider the DEIS to be Best Available Science? The issue is whether it is appropriate to use conclusions contained in a DEIS, where it is uncertain if or how public comments were addressed?

-Pg. 3-22 Line 15 – Suggest inserting “may” between “programs” and “produce” to reflect uncertainty.

-Pg. 3-23 Lines 8-9 – Restoring spring Chinook above the HHD is a high priority goal for the WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat Plan but has not been included in any DEIS alternative. There is also no assessment of the effect DEIS alternatives may have on restoring a spring Chinook run. Given that the SHP is federally-approved it would make sense to include this action in the alternatives or, at a minimum, assess the effect of implementing the HGMPs in attaining it at some later time.

-Pg. 3-29 Line 17 – In reference to integration the PNI metric, the DEIS notes that the integration approach “...has not been empirically tested and is speculative.” Where appropriate, we suggest DEIS

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 11 of 23

wording better reflect the uncertainty of the integration approach.

-Pg. 3-38 Lines 12-14 and Pg. 3-29 Lines 11-13 – In a multi-year study of juvenile fish use in the lower Green River, King County swamping and reduced growth effects of juvenile hatchery Chinook on wild juvenile Chinook in the transition zone of the Lower Green River were identified (King County 2013).

-Pg. 3-47 Lines 15 & 16 – Re: Suggest increasing effect rating from moderate to high. King County has studied juvenile fish use in the lower river and detected reduced growth rate and displacement of wild juvenile Chinook when large numbers of juvenile hatchery Chinook were in the lower river transition zone.

-Pg. 3-63 Line 2 – A “negligible negative effect” rating for masking effect is low considering that one-fifth of the hatchery Chinook, the species of greatest concern, are not marked and the ratio of hatchery-origin fish on spawning grounds is high. Recent draft data collected in 2016 by WDFW for WRIA 9 indicates the proportion of unmarked hatchery fish may be as high as ~ 25%. In other words, 1 in 4 hatchery-origin fish on spawning grounds would not be identified and instead counted as natural-origin. Suggest a moderate to high negative effect rating for this effect.

-Pg. 3-68 Lines 4-7 – The rating for effect of fishing is “negligible negative,” but this is for the existing program. The stated goal of the hatcheries, however, is to promote and, presumably, increase fishing and harvest. Therefore, if the hatcheries are successful, wouldn’t incidental or even directed fishing mortality be likely to increase? If the rating is to assess likely future effects, then suggest changing rating of harvest effect to low to moderate negative effect.

-Pg. 3-70 Line 11 – While the goal of integration is to promote natural over hatchery based selection, there remain high levels of hatchery Chinook on spawning grounds. Furthermore, procedures such as random mate selection and highly artificial hatchery environments indicate hatchery selection and other effects will continue under the proposed programs.

-Pg. 3-75 Line 9 – As noted for random mate selection done by hatchery staff, the distribution of carcasses by humans is not natural selection. It is understood, however, that this is better than not putting them back in the environment, assuming no disease transmission.

Chapter 4

-Pg. 4-15 - Table 30 – Suggest that the genetic effects ratings for effect of hatchery fish on fall-run Chinook salmon should be High Negative for Existing Conditions and Alternative 1, High Positive for Alternative 3 and Moderate Negative for Alternative 4. A Moderate Negative rating for Alternative 2 seems tenuous in that it relies on being able to track and remediate negative effects through adaptive management. Arguably, the track record for adaptive management is not good. The Green River has an extensive history of hatcheries and a relatively large hatchery program. Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that significant decline in genetic diversity has already occurred.

-Pg. 4-79 – Suggest that the Moderate Positive population viability benefit rating of the Soos Creek fall-run Chinook salmon hatchery to natural-origin fall-run Chinook and the Moderate Negative rating for eliminating the program be reversed (positives become negative and *vice versa*). The ratings are heavily

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 12 of 23

driven by abundance and distribution benefits while downplaying long-term effects on genetic diversity and productivity. Short of a severe population crisis that might require something like a captive broodstock program, it is illogical to conclude that the long-term viability of a population of natural-origin fish is benefitted by breeding with high numbers of less-fit hatchery-origin fish. In their response to comments on the draft Soos Creek Chinook HGMP, the WDFW indicates that hatchery fish are counted as being 80% that of natural-origin fish in their population modeling (see response to PSHAAC Comment 5.b. Pg. 17). In sum, for every successful spawning event that involves a hatchery-origin and natural-origin fish the net result is something less than the quality of the natural fish. Therefore, while providing abundance and distribution benefits in the near-term, hatchery programs have been a drag on population productivity and viability in the long-term.

Chapter 5

-Pg. 5-7 Line 13 – Suggest adding “in concert with hatchery and harvest effects” between “...other factors)” and “have affected overall...”

-Pg. 5-7 Lines 16-17 – As noted above, suggest NMFS revisit and update statements about Green River habitat conditions using more recent information.

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 13 of 23

WRIA 9 - Comments on Green River Hatchery Genetic Management Plans (HGMPs)

*All HGMPs were reviewed but attention was primarily on Chinook and Steelhead programs as they affect listed species and, therefore, are the primary conservation concern. Issues raised in WRIA 9 comments on previous draft Soos Creek Fall Chinook HGMP were assessed and restated as necessary (January 22, 2013 letter to Brian Missildine from Doug Osterman).

General Comments – applicable to all or most HGMPs

Climate Change – Climate change effects were not assessed in any HGMP. Because the HGMPs remove a portion of fish from natural selection pressures, they are not likely to increase long-term genetic diversity of the affected naturally spawning salmon and steelhead populations or their resilience in the face of future climate or other environmental changes. For Chinook, there has already been (pre-1960) a three-week shift in peak spawner timing toward earlier timing and warmer water (Ruggerone and Weitkamp 2004). Climate-related effects of this historic shift may already be evident as it is our understanding that Chinook pre-spawn mortality was observed in 2015 below the Soos Creek hatchery. Can the HGMPs be modified to restore the historic spawn timing for Chinook? How has spawn timing for other species been affected by past harvest and hatchery practices and could those effects be reversed?

Fish Restoration Facilities – There is no assessment of the benefits of not using a hatchery and simply moving adults upstream of HHD to let them spawn and establish populations naturally, assuming downstream passage is provided. Of particular concern, is lost opportunity to establish upper watershed stocks with relatively little hatchery influence, which would be good for diversity and long-term productivity and in that way also benefit integration. Based on recent examples (Elwha and Big White Salmon Rivers to name a few), there is good reason to believe that salmon and steelhead will rapidly recolonize new or lost habitat once passage is provided

Random – Random selection of broodstock – and other randomized selections – is used throughout these programs to ensure human selection bias is minimized but no method is described how this will happen or be ensured. Also, while arguably better than human selection, random selection is not the same as natural selection and so genetic diversity and fitness will likely decline.

Statistical significance – Phrases such as “statistically significant” are invoked in several places. However, no details (e.g., study design, p-levels or power analyses) are provided to give the reader a sense for how statistical analysis will be conducted or the likelihood of detecting change when in fact a change has occurred. Generally, to be conservative in favor of the resource (in this case, listed species), it is recommended that study designs minimize Type II Error.

Disease – Deferral to hatchery fish health guidelines and a relatively old citation (Steward and Bjornn 1990) are used to suggest that disease transmission to wild fish is unlikely. No data are presented and no testing is proposed to corroborate lack of transmission and support the statement that transmission is unlikely. However, detecting diseases in the wild is highly unlikely unless a directed program is in place to do so.

Land Use – The HGMPs’ reliance on hatcheries appears to be driven by a strong perspective that basin habitat is heavily and irretrievably degraded. See comments elsewhere on a different, more

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 14 of 23

contemporary perspective.

Habitat Productivity – Salmon productivity is a primary measure of habitat effectiveness. If the fish using those habitats are less fit over time then the effectiveness and production benefits of WRIA 9's habitat actions will be reduced. Another concern is that assessments of habitat effectiveness based on productivity may be confounded by hatchery effects and may result in a false conclusion that habitat actions are not as effective as they otherwise would be if used by higher quality natural-origin fish.

Near- vs Long-term Trade-offs – As described, it seems that the HGMPs may reduce long term diversity and productivity in exchange for short term abundance, productivity, and distribution benefits.

Chinook HGMPs

1. Soos Creek Fall Chinook Hatchery Program (integrated)

-Date submitted: April 3, 2013

-Pg. 4 - Table 1.8.1 – Disease transmission – Says “hatchery practices and operations designed to stop” introduction or spread of diseases. It seems speculative and optimistic to say “stop” as it's not clear that, if transmitted, diseases would be readily detected in the wild. The sole citation on disease, Steward and Bjornn (1990), is old. Is it the most recent and best citation to make this statement?

-Pg. 4 - Table 1.8.1 – Competition and Predation – HGMP document notes that “fish are released at time, size and life history stage to foster rapid migration to marine waters” but this does not guarantee such behavior and, in any event, migration is not “instantaneous.” As a result, impacts to wild fish are inevitable when there is overlap in migration distribution and timing. As noted in WRIA 9's previous comments (January 22, 2013 letter to Brian Missildine from Doug Osterman), “Data collected as part of the Salmon Habitat Plan clearly indicate that the release timing of most of the Soos Creek Hatchery sub yearling Chinook coincides with the time when large numbers of wild juvenile Chinook are using the estuary in May” and “that hatchery sub yearlings move quickly into the transition zone, eat the same food and can overcrowd the natural fish... displacing [them] and reducing their growth. A strong correlation was observed between the two- to three-week residence of hatchery sub yearlings in the transition zone, and an abrupt decrease in the natural Chinook salmon growth index.” WRIA 9 suggested moving release date to mid- to late-June but the HGMP indicates “June” and is not specific to time within June. Furthermore, warming water and disease concerns may make it difficult to significantly move release timing of the hatchery juveniles to avoid overlap in the lower river/transition zone areas.

-Pg. 5 - 3.1.2 - Table 1.10.1.1 – “...program provides mitigation for lost fish due to development...” If the mitigation does not produce fish equivalent to wild fish then fitness, survival, and productivity of the population(s) in question will be reduced and the effectiveness of the mitigation lessened. While many improvements over historic practices have been made to minimize effects, hatcheries are still an imperfect replacement for habitat and natural selection. As a result, fish produced from hatcheries have potential to degrade the overall productivity of the total population. The concern is that potential productivity benefits provided by regulations and habitat protection and restoration may be reduced when used by less-fit fish.

-Pg. 5 - 3.3.2 - Table 1.10.1.1 – “...to allow for statistically significant evaluation...” What p-level? Has a

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 15 of 23

power analysis been done? If so, what is likelihood of detecting an adverse change if in fact one occurs?

-Pg. 6 - 3.4.1 - Table 1.10.1.1 – “collection of broodstock... randomly throughout entire return period.” How will randomness be achieved and ensured across the entire run? According to Weitkamp and Ruggerone (2004) the return has already been shifted 3 weeks early from historic timing largely due to past hatchery practices that spawned a greater proportion of early arriving fish. What consideration has there been to shift return timing back to something more like the historical timeframe, which would be better under a future warmer climate?

-Pg. 7 - 3.3.1 - Table 1.10.2.1 – “Hatchery program contributes to an increasing number of spawners returning to natural spawning areas.” Does this not tacitly indicate that there is increasing hatchery influence on natural spawners? This would create more hatchery interactions and effects and would not be consistent with natural processes that maintain or increase diversity of natural spawning populations.

-Pg. 7 - 3.3.2 - Table 1.10.2.1 – “...statically significant...” See previous comment on p-level and power analysis.

- Pg. 7 - 3.4.3 - Table 1.10.2.1 – Stability of life history patterns is identified as a goal. This raises several questions regarding statistical procedures, likelihood of detecting a change/effect, what would be done if an adverse effect is found, why is stability desired and would all changes necessarily be bad? A goal of the WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat Plan is to increase life history diversity in ways that would increase fitness, productivity, and resilience in the face of future change, such as warming climate. It seems that the large numbers of hatchery fish in the system would tend to thwart that goal and reduce or simplify rather than increase life history diversity in ways that might be important for long term survival of the species.

-Pg. 8 - 3.5.1 - Table 1.10.2.1 – If genetic variation is not monitored how would you know there is no effect?

-Pg. 8 - 3.7.1 - Table 1.10.2.1 – Re: Disease. See previous comments.

-Pg. 9 - 3.7.6 - Table 1.10.2.1 – How much shift in spatial and temporal distribution is considered significant and what is the ability to detect a shift if in fact one occurs (p-level, power analysis)? What timeframe for “historic distribution” is being used for baseline? What can or would be done if a shift is detected?

-Pg. 11 - 1.16 – The PSSMP is over 30 years old. Does – or should – it be revised in light of conservation needs? Is management being driven by an outdated approach to management? Also, note that Alternatives 1 and 2 would have reduced risk to natural-origin fish but were not pursued in favor of increased fishing potential.

-Pg. 13 2nd para – Document states “Several of the risk factors identified by Good et al (2005) are still present, including high fractions of hatchery fish in many populations and widespread loss and degradation of habitat.” The high fractions of hatchery fish do appear to persist on the Green River as seen in Table 2.2.2.9 pg. 16, where the most recent [2005 to 2009] estimates of hatchery-origin fish on spawning grounds are above the 30% goal of the WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat Plan. However, with respect to

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 16 of 23

habitat, the HGMP should be updated to account for the habitat restoration and protection actions noted previously.

-Pg. 16 - Table 2.2.2.9 – Are there more recent data than 2009? If so, what do they show and how has the percent of natural fish changed? The concern is proportion of hatchery-origin fish spawning with natural-origin fish which, after the 2005-2009 (5 yr.) time period when natural-origin spawners averaged 3,077fish/per year, abundance dropped dramatically in the subsequent three years (2010 to 2012) to only 498 fish/year (WRIA 9 January 22, 2013 letter to Brian Missildine from Doug Osterman).

-Pg. 18 1st Para – “Seiler et al (2002) reported none of the yearling Chinook sampled...” None out of how many were examined? What, if any, additional sampling has been done below the trap to corroborate this and how applicable are the trap data to understanding/predicting interactions in the lower river, estuarine, and nearshore marine waters? The concern, as previously expressed by WRIA 9 is potential for high predation where wild sub-yearlings concentrate and are susceptible to predation by larger yearling Chinook (WRIA 9 January 22, 2013 letter to Brian Missildine from Doug Osterman; Brennan et al 2004; King County 2013).

-Pg. 18 2nd para – Document states June release dates reduce likelihood of interaction with majority of natural-origin juvenile Chinook and, therefore, predation/competition is assumed to be low. This appears inconsistent with actual release dates shown in Table 10.4.1, where release dates started in early to mid-May and in only half (6 out of 12 years), release continued into June (the latest release date in twelve years was June 11 in 2010). On Pg. 36 it is also noted that warm water and low flows creates concern about *Furunculosis* (see comments elsewhere re: disease) making it difficult to hold fish into June. As a result, absent more definitive information, predation/competition should not be assumed to be low.

-Pg. 18 3rd para – See other comments re: disease transmission to wild populations.

-Pg. 18 5th para – “Preference to release fish integrated at the highest rate...” In real-time practice, how would this “highest rate” be measured?

-Pg. 18, Pg. 4 and Pg. 37 – Different release strategies are described depending on whether a three-year average of 900 or 1500 NORs is observed on the spawning grounds. What happens if the average is between these values? The description is not only confusing but the goal is also not clear.

-Pg. 21 – The WRIA 9 planning activities are mentioned, but only briefly. See previous comments re: contemporary habitat protection and restoration in WRIA 9.

-Pg. 29 - 7.3, Pg. 7 - Table 10.2.1 & Pg. 39 - 11.1.1 – Re: “100% mass marking.” What is actual measured mark rate and what are implications of less than 100% marks? As noted in comments to previous draft HGMP, King County field studies indicate that about 4% of clipped fish were not actually clipped. When applied to the number of fish released, this could be as many as 160,000 juveniles that would be mis-identified on a regular basis and suggests that the already low numbers of wild fish could be even lower. Draft 2016 otolith data from WDFW adult spawners indicates the number of unmarked Chinook could be much higher than previously thought.

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 17 of 23

-Pg. 29 - 6.3 – “Broodstock is selected randomly...” How is randomization actually done in the hatchery setting? Also, while random selection may be better than human selection bias it is not what the fish would choose to do under natural conditions.

-Pg. 29 - 7.2 – Re: broodstock collection. It is noted that broodstock are collected across entire run but nowhere in the HGMP is it mentioned that the run timing has shifted (pre-1960s) by three weeks from historic run timing (Ruggerone and Weitkamp 2004). The implications of this historic shift are not discussed but may be serious if climate change models prove correct. In essence, selection has moved return timing into periods of increasingly warmer water. How will this affect the ability to safely capture and transport broodstock and what are the implications for disease? Are there alternatives that may shift run timing back to historic conditions and/or cooler temperatures?

-Pg. 30 - 8.1 – “Chinook for broodstock are selected randomly...” See previous comment on “random” selection.

-Pg. 31 - 8.2 & 8.5 – Random selection... see previous comment.

-Pg. 38 —10.11 – Re: reducing risk of genetic and ecological effects resulting from fish releases. This section identifies several ways in which risk may be reduced but provides no assessment of how much reduction will actually be achieved or whether the risk reductions will be sufficient to reduce effects on listed species to a “no effect” or *de minimus* level.

- Pg. 39 – Re: local funding of WSPE trap. Is this guaranteed and, if not, how will it be ensured?

2. Fish Restoration Facility – Green River Fall Chinook

- Date submitted: July 29, 2014

- General Comment re: FRFs – If downstream passage is provided, why not move adults upstream and let them spawn naturally? This would eliminate hatchery effects. It appears that the primary motivation is to more quickly create a population above the HDD. However, this likely results in some hatchery effects.

- General Comment re: “Random” – As noted above, it is not clear how “random” selection will actually be achieved. Regardless, random selection is not the same as natural selection.

-Pg. 15 top of page – Re: Genetic effects discussion. The HGMP seems to downplay reduced fitness concerns arising from mixing/interbreeding of hatchery and wild fish in the wild because there is a lack of studies and Berijikian and Ford (2004) suggest that fish with shorter times in hatcheries may have reduced effect. However, lack of evidence is not demonstration of lack of effect and reduced effect is not necessarily an insignificant effect.

-Pg. 18 2nd para – “These factors have degraded or eliminated habitat areas and natural selection processes important for Chinook and other salmon, adversely affecting... abundance and productivity of the natural population...” It would be appropriate to also recognize reduction or loss of natural selection pressures resulting from hatchery practices on the fish themselves.

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 18 of 23

Green River Steelhead HGMPs

General Comments – Steelhead HGMPs

1. Green River Native Winter (late) Steelhead Hatchery Program

- Date submitted: October 13, 2014

-Pg. iii 3rd para – What is the implication of no funding to assess SARs and contribution to natural spawning population? If there's an effect of the hatchery program, how would it be detected?

-Pg. 3 4th Para – A reduction (from up to 55% *ca* 1984 to around 11% since 2005) in contribution of tributary spawning to overall wild escapement is attributed solely to habitat impact from development. Please provide a citation and/or data to support this statement. Is it possible that other factors (hatchery, harvest, climate and/or marine waters) may have contributed to this shift?

-Pg. 4 - Table 1.8.1 – Re: Broodstock collection. Hook and line selection of spawners not the same as natural selection.

-Pg. 4 - Table 1.10.1.1 – Re: Statistically significant evaluation. See comments on Chinook HGMPs.

-Pg. 6 - 3.4.2 – “Any lower natural production is offset by increased egg-to-fry survival and higher female/smolt ratio provided by hatchery rearing.” This would increase likelihood of hatchery effects.

-Pg. 6 - 3.4.3 – Performance standard is said to not change life history characteristics but at same time notes that current condition is unknown and monitoring plan is still being developed. See previous statements concerning adequacy of statistical methods and the goal of stability of life history patterns.

-Pg. 7 - 3.7.4 – Re: Disease. See previous comments in comments on Chinook HGMPs on adequacy of controlling/detecting disease transmission to wild fish.

-Pg. 9 - 1.16 – Criteria for termination of program are provided but the basis for them are not provided.

-Pg. 14 – Re: Residualism. If steelhead juveniles do not smolt and leave volitionally, will the remainders be moved to non-anadromous lakes, as is proposed for the summer steelhead program?

-Pg. 18 & 19 – Relationship to habitat protection and recovery strategies. This discussion cites Judge 2011 but see more contemporary and basin-specific habitat information described above.

-Pg. 29 – Mating selection 8.1 – Here again, random selection is described but specifies no process to ensure. Also, random is not the same as natural selection.

-Pg. 30 - 9.1 – Egg take: Says current egg take is 50,000 but elsewhere says 33,000. Unclear what number is being proposed. Does the proposed program intend to reduce egg take to 33,000?

-Pg. 37 - Table 10.7.2 – Here again, egg take is noted as 33K but elsewhere 50K eggs is mentioned.

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 19 of 23

2. Soos Creek (Green River) Hatchery Summer Steelhead Program (Segregated)

- Date submitted: October 29, 2015

-Pg. i – What is basis for reductions in releases in number (> 12%) and release locations (> 13%) of early summer steelhead? While understandable that reductions may be beneficial, why these levels and why not even more reduction?

-Pg. ii 2nd para – Statements are made implicating lack of adequate – and/or failed – habitat protection and restoration measures. See previous statements about contemporary WRIA 9 conditions and actions to protect steelhead as sole or primary cause for steelhead decline and loss of fisheries.

-Pg. ii – Total Viability Analysis (TVA) is mentioned but is not described in enough detail to assess.

-Pg. 3 1st para – States production of steelhead has been diminished by “extensive loss and degradation of habitat” but makes no mention of how hatchery, harvest or marine conditions may have also contributed. As mentioned earlier, this is almost certainly an oversimplification of the causes for decline.

-Pg. 3 2nd para – See previous comment requesting data and or citation for this statement attributing loss of tributary steelhead spawning solely on habitat.

-Pg. 3 - Table 1.8.1 – Re: Disease transmission to wild fish. See previous comments.

-Pg. 4 - Table 1.10.1.1 - 3.2.1 – What is incidental catch and mortality rate of non-targeted winter steelhead? And how much incidental mortality is too much?

-Pg. 6 & 7 - Table 1.10.2.1 3.4.3, 3.5.1, and 3.5.3 – Re: Changes in life history characteristics, patterns of genetic variation and introgression rates, respectively. What is confidence that changes can be detected? What is Type II Error risk and how is it minimized? What would be done if adverse effect detected?

-Pg. 6 & 7 - 3.7.1 & 3.7.4 – Re: Disease transmission to wild fish. See previous comments.

-Pg. 14 1st para, last sentence – The following statement is made: “The potential risks of this hatchery program, therefore, have to be considered in the context of failure to implement steelhead protection and restoration measures commensurate with those measures imposed on steelhead hatchery and harvest programs that result in diminished fishing opportunities.” Suggest this statement be removed or modified to better reflect the more complex nature of multiple effects (land and water development, harvest and hatchery effects, and climate changes) on salmon and steelhead.

-Pg. 14 2nd and 3rd para – Text on introgression, PEHC, etc., tacitly acknowledges hatchery effects and the need to better understand and measure risks and effects of hatcheries.

-Pg. 30 - Mating 8.1 – Re: Randomness. See previous comments.

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 20 of 23

3. Fish Restoration Facility – Green River Winter Steelhead

- Date submitted: July 18, 2014

General Comment re: FRFs – As noted previously, if downstream passage is provided, why not move adults upstream and let them spawn naturally? This would eliminate hatchery effects. Furthermore, Winans et al (2010) found rainbow trout populations above the HDD to be genetically similar to wild steelhead below the HDD. Therefore, rather than barren of fish, the habitat above the dam has a thriving population of rainbow trout that represents the extant winter-run steelhead population (a priority for ESA protection) that likely would spawn with and contribute to productivity of steelhead passed above the HDD. Elwha Dam removal and subsequent fish use above the dam suggests that steelhead will rapidly take advantage of previously blocked habitat.

Green River Coho HGMPs

General Comments – Coho HGMPs

1. Soos Creek Hatchery Program

- Date submitted – July 24, 2014

-Pg. 3 4th para – What evidence of success, other than anecdotal, is there from outplants of coho fry and smolts to surrounding areas, e.g., Des Moines, Miller and Walker Creeks?

-Pg. 3 5th Para – Program is identified as “integrated.” See previous concerns re: integration.

-Pg. 8 – Re: Disease transmission. See previous concerns and comments on adequacy of disease control programs.

-Pg. 9 - 3.3.2 – Re: Statistical significance. See previous comments on statistical concerns.

-Pg. 11 - 3.4.2 – “Collection of NOB does not reduce potential juvenile production...” How would this be detected? And if wrong, how would it be remedied?

-Pg. 19 – Predation and competition: States that predation by coho smolts on juvenile Chinook is unlikely to be significant largely due to inability of the average-size coho smolts and pre-smolts to prey on the average-size sub-yearling Chinook. The concern, however, would be with larger-than-average-size coho juveniles preying on the smaller-than-average-size yearling Chinook. Based on known size distributions and prey-to-predator size ratios of 1/3 to 1/2, could potential predation rates be estimated rather than simply assumed to be low based on average-sized fish?

-Pg. 32 – Mating... randomness. See previous comments.

-Pg. 35 - Table 9.2.1.1 – Survival rates of fry to sub-yearling and sub-yearling to smolt are in range of mid-90%, which are much (~ 10Xs greater) than natural survival rates. This is an example, one of many, of how a hatchery does not mimic the natural environment and results in lesser quality/less fit fish.

-Pg. 43 - 10.11 – Predation potential “1/3 size [of predator to prey] rule” is different from the “1/2 size

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 21 of 23

[of predator to prey] rule” used by NOAA in the DEIS. What is implication if the larger ratio is used?

2. Keta Creek Complex - Green River Coho Yearlings

- Date submitted: June 22 2017

-Pg. 8 – Statement is made that “reliance on natural production to attain program goals is infeasible due to habitat loss and degradation over a large proportion of the historic coho salmon distribution in the watershed.” It is true that habitat has been lost and degraded but it seems likely that the quality and fitness of the fish has as well. In other words, effects to both habitat and fish are likely affecting productivity of the remaining runs.

-Pg. 16 – Re: Predation and relative body size. As noted above, the HGMP uses one predator-to-prey size (1/3) while the NOAA DEIS uses a different (1/2) size.

-Pg. 38 – Re: Predation concern of coho smolts preying on juvenile Chinook. Argument is made that predation will be minimized but extent to which it is minimized is not clear, especially of the body size rule, which is greater than the one HGMP uses.

3. Marine Technology Center Coho Hatchery Program

- Date submitted: September 17 2014

No specific comments. General comments related to disease and other hatchery effects apply.

4. Fish Restoration Facility – Green River Coho

- Date updated: July 21, 2014

- General Comment re: FRFs – If downstream passage is provided, why not move adults upstream and let them spawn naturally? This would eliminate hatchery effects. It appears that the primary motivation is efficiency, i.e., to more quickly create a population above the HHD. However, this comes with hatchery effects.

- General Comment – Disease and predation concerns mentioned above apply to this HGMP.

5. Green River Fall Chum Salmon

6. Keta Creek Complex Fall Chum Salmon

-Date updated: July 18, 2014

No specific comments. Stock and hatchery issues are not controversial at this time.

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 22 of 23

Literature Cited

- Berijkian and Ford. 2004. Review of relative fitness of hatchery and natural salmon. NOAA Tech. Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-61.
- Brennan, J.S., K.F. Higgins, J.R. Cordell, and V. Stamatiou. 2004. Juvenile salmon composition, timing, distribution, and diet in marine nearshore waters of Puget Sound in 2001-2002. King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks, Seattle Washington, 164pp.
- King County. 2013. *Draft*. Juvenile Chinook Migration, Growth and Habitat Use in the Lower Green and Duwamish Rivers and Elliot Bay Nearshore. King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks, Water and Land Resources Division, Seattle WA.
- King County. 2012. King County Programmatic Habitat Assessment.
- Online Report: <https://your.kingcounty.gov/dnrp/library/water-and-land/flooding/programmatic-habitat-assessment/king-county-nfip-bi-op-compliance-program-assess-chpt-1-8.pdf>.
 - PowerPoint: http://www.floods.org/Files/Conf2014_ppts/F3_Lucchetti.pdf.
- Lucchetti, G. and J. Latterell. 2008. Quality Assurance Project Plan for Regulatory Effectiveness Monitoring for Developing Rural Areas: A Targeted Watershed Grant under the 2008 Puget Sound Initiative. Online report: <http://your.kingcounty.gov/dnrp/library/water-and-land/data-and-trends/monitoring/critical-areas/081119-epa-cao-qapp.pdf>.
- Lucchetti, G., J. Burkey, C. Gregersen, L. Fore, C. Knutson, J. Latterell, P. McCombs, R. Timm, J. Vanderhoof, and J. Wilhelm. 2014. Assessing land use effects and regulatory effectiveness on streams in rural watersheds of King County.
- Online Report: <http://www.kingcounty.gov/depts/dnrp/wlr/sections-programs/science-section/critical-areas.aspx>.
 - PowerPoint: https://your.kingcounty.gov/dnrp/library/water-and-land/critical-areas/EPA-CAO_Project-PP_website.pdf.
- Lucchetti G.L. and J. Burkey. 2014. Development and utility of a hydrologic condition index. Presentation to 2014 Salish Sea Conference, Seattle, WA. PowerPoint: <https://your.kingcounty.gov/dnrp/library/water-and-land/critical-areas/CAO-HCI-SalishSea-5-1-2014.pdf>.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. 2006. Recovery Plan for the Puget Sound Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Region. Seattle, WA.
- Ostergaard, E., D. Clark, K. Minsch, S. Whiting, J. Stern, R. Hoff, B. Anderson, L. Johnston, L. Arber, and G. Blomberg. 2014. Duwamish Blueprint: Salmon Habitat in the Duwamish Transition Zone. Prepared by the Duwamish Blueprint Working Group for the WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum. Seattle, WA.
- Osterman, Doug. 2013. Letter to Brian Missildine.

Steve Leider
January 18, 2018
Page 23 of 23

Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team (PSTRT). 2003. Co-manager review draft: Preliminary conclusions regarding the updated status of listed ESUs of West Coast salmon and steelhead; A. Chinook salmon.

Puget Sound Partnership. 2017. 2017 State of the Sound. Olympia, Washington. November 2017. 84 pp. www.psp.wa.gov/sos.

Ruggerone, G and D. Weitkamp. 2004. WRIA 9 Chinook Salmon Research Framework: Identifying Key Research Questions about Chinook Salmon Life Histories and Habitat Use in the Middle and Lower Green River, Duwamish Waterway, and Marine Nearshore Areas.

Service, Robert F. 2018. Pacific Northwest salmon are in big genetic trouble. Science Magazine. <http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2018/01/pacific-northwest-salmon-are-big-genetic-trouble>.

Shared Strategy for Puget Sound. 2001. A Shared Strategy for Recovery of Salmon in Puget Sound.

Winans, G.A., M/C. Baird and J. Baker. 2010. A Genetic and Phenetic Baseline before the Recolonization of Steelhead above Howard Hanson Dam, Green River, Washington, North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 30:3.

WRIA 9 Implementation Technical Committee. 2012. WRIA 9 Status and Trends Monitoring Report: 2005 – 2010. Report prepared for WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum. 144 pp. <http://www.govlink.org/watersheds/9/pdf/W9-Status&TrendsReport2-6-12.pdf>.

WRIA 9 Watershed Coordination Services and Technical Committees. 2005. Strategic assessment report-scientific foundation for salmonid habitat conservation <http://your.kingcounty.gov/dnrp/library/2005/KCR1901.pdf>.

WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum. 2005. Salmon Habitat Plan: “Making Our Watershed Fit for a King.” <http://www.govlink.org/watersheds/9/plan-implementation/HabitatPlan.aspx>.

WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum. 2015. Implementation Progress Report for WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat Plan: Making Our Watershed Fit for a King. http://www.govlink.org/watersheds/9/plan-implementation/ProgressReport2015/1503_4553L_W9progReport_Main.pdf.

ⁱ <https://openjurist.org/694/f2d/1374/united-states-v-state-of-washington> United States v. Washington, 506 F.Supp. 187, 189 (W.D.Wash.1980). The district court held that hatchery fish are included in the fish to be apportioned by the economic value of the fish harvest, the income of tribes and their members, and the projected availability of fish for harvest in future years.

ⁱⁱ The transition zone is defined as extending from river mile 10 (upstream of the Interstate 5 crossing of the Duwamish) to river mile 1 (between Kellogg Island and the West Seattle Bridge). This definition is based on information available to date and the conclusions of the majority of scientists who have provided input. Additional information and/or further analysis may lead to adjustments in the transition zone definition (Ostergaard et al 2014).

From: Osterman, Doug

Sent: Friday, December 1, 2017 11:06 AM

To: GreenHatcheriesEIS.wcr@noaa.gov

Cc: Robertson Dennis <Dennis.Robertson@Tukwilawa.gov>; Mhoon Marlla (marllam@aol.com) <marllam@aol.com>; Bill Peloza <bpeloza@auburnwa.gov>; Kintner, Leah (PSP) <leah.kintner@psp.wa.gov>; amber.moore@PSP.wa.gov; Elizabeth Babcock (elizabeth.babcock@noaa.gov) <elizabeth.babcock@noaa.gov>

Subject: Green Hatcheries EIS

Importance: High

December 1, 2017

Steve Leider, Fishery Biologist
National Marine Fisheries Service
West Coast Region
510 Desmond Drive SE, Suite 103
Lacey, WA 98503

RE: [Draft Environmental Impact Statement for 10 Salmon and Steelhead Hatchery Programs in the Duwamish-Green River Basin](#)

Dear Mr. Leider:

The Lead Entity for Chinook Salmon Recovery, Water Resource Inventory Area 9, Green-Duwamish and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9), requests an extension of the public comment period for the Draft Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) *Draft Environmental Impact Statement for 10 Salmon and Steelhead Hatchery Programs in the Duwamish-Green River Basin (DEIS)*.

WRIA 9 was not directly notified of the availability to review the DEIS, announced on October 24, 2017. Instead, we became aware of the DEIS and the public comment period third hand via Tacoma Public Utilities and King County on November 16, 2017, nearly a month after the October 24 announcement. The lost time to review the voluminous amount of information and the late December deadline near the Holiday Season make it extremely difficult for WRIA 9 to adequately coordinate and prepare comments on the DEIS. The 10 hatchery and genetic management plans (HGMPs) by the co-managers have significant implications on implementation and adaptive management of the Puget Sound Chinook Salmon Recovery Plan (the Endangered Species Act "4-H's" recovery plan for Puget Sound salmon populations) and the WRIA 9 Salmon Habitat Plan, "Making Our Watershed Fit for a King" (the watershed-specific recovery plan addressing habitat in WRIA 9). It is imperative that WRIA 9 be given more time to review and coordinate comments on the DEIS and HGMPs among its many stakeholders, including the members of the Watershed Ecosystem Forum (WEF). WEF includes 17 local governments working together on the recovery of the Threatened Green River Chinook salmon population.

Please contact me with questions. Thank you for your consideration of our request to extend the public comment period for the Green Hatcheries DEIS.

Sincerely,

Doug Osterman, AICP

Salmon Recovery Manager

Green/Duwamish & Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9)

201 South Jackson Street, Suite 600

Seattle, WA 98104-3855

Doug.Osterman@kingcounty.gov

206-477-4793

Making Our Watershed Fit for a King



Public Comment Period is Extended Through January 19, 2018

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Duwamish-Green River Salmon and Steelhead Hatchery Programs

A draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) analyzing salmon and steelhead hatchery programs in the Duwamish-Green River basin in Puget Sound under a range of alternatives is available for public comment. Ten hatchery and genetic management plans describing the hatchery programs have been submitted jointly to NOAA Fisheries by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, and Suquamish Tribe.

The DEIS provides information for NOAA Fisheries, hatchery operators, and the public about the potential effects, positive and negative, of the salmon and steelhead hatchery programs on Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed and non-listed fish and wildlife species, their habitats, water, socioeconomics, and environmental justice resources.

Concurrent with this review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), NOAA Fisheries is reviewing hatchery programs under the ESA. Analyses under NEPA do not indicate whether hatchery programs meet ESA requirements. Rather, this NEPA analysis provides information about the current and anticipated environmental effects of operating the 10 salmon and steelhead hatchery programs under a range of alternatives.

To access the DEIS and more information

You can access the DEIS and information on the project at the NOAA Fisheries West Coast Region website at http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/hatcheries/salmon_and_steelhead_hatcheries.html

To comment

NOAA Fisheries will accept public comments on the DEIS through January 19, 2018. An additional 30 days have been added to the 45 day public comment period which started upon publication of a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register on November 3, 2017.

By email to: GreenHatcheriesEIS.wcr@noaa.gov

By regular mail or FAX to:
Steve Leider, Comment Coordinator
NMFS, West Coast Region
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
510 Desmond Drive SE, Suite 103
Lacey, WA 98503
Fax (360) 753-9517

If you have questions please email Steve.Leider@noaa.gov, or phone (360) 753-4650.

WATER RESOURCE INVENTORY AREA 9 (WRIA 9) WATERSHED ECOSYSTEM FORUM



Algona
Auburn
Black Diamond
Burien
Covington
Des Moines
Enumclaw
Federal Way
Kent
King County
Maple Valley
Normandy Park
Renton
SeaTac
Seattle
Tacoma
Tukwila

King Conservation District
Vashon/Maury Island
Community Council
Covington Water District
Port of Seattle
Washington Department
of Ecology
Washington Department
of Fish and Wildlife
Washington Department
of Natural Resources
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Green-Duwamish
Urban Waters Partnership

Washington Environmental
Council
Green/Duwamish
Watershed Alliance
Trout Unlimited/Mid-Sound
Fisheries Enhancement
Group
Save Habitat and Diversity
of Wetlands (SHADOW)
American Rivers

The Boeing Company
Master Builders Association
King County Agricultural
Commission

January 18, 2018

Mr. Steve Leider, Fishery Biologist
National Marine Fisheries Service, West Coast Region
510 Desmond Drive SE, Suite 103
Lacey, WA 98503



RE: Duwamish-Green Hatcheries Draft EIS

Dear Mr. Leider,

Thank you for extending the comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for 10 Salmon and Steelhead Hatchery Programs in the Duwamish-Green River Basin (Hatcheries Draft EIS). Providing more time to prepare our comments enables us to better articulate the importance to us of scientifically-sound salmon and steelhead management and work within our forum to ensure whatever we submit is representative of our partners. We strive to implement effective habitat-based actions in the Duwamish-Green River Basin pursuant to the federally-approved Salmon Habitat Plan (SHP) for the Green/Duwamish and Central Puget Sound Watershed (Water Resource Inventory Area 9, WRIA 9). We are, however, choosing to not provide our comments on the Draft EIS at this time, and request reopening the comment period.

The WRIA 9 SHP includes NOAA-guided management strategies to conserve and restore salmon species and steelhead stocks, make the watershed healthier for people and fish—and, fundamentally, produce more fish. Moreover, the SHP is built on the premise of well-integrated habitat, harvest, hatchery, and hydropower (Howard Hanson Dam) management. The habitat management strategies of the SHP are based on mutually supportive coexistence of hatcheries and habitat. However, our review and analysis of the Hatcheries Draft EIS and the Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans (HGMPs) raise concerns that they are not well-aligned with the SHP.

Reopening the comment period will enable us more time to work with NOAA Fisheries, tribes, and other partners. Opening the comment period to late February or early March will accommodate discussion and ideally reach consensus among members of the WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum at its quarterly meeting on February 8th, and time afterwards to reflect this collaboration in final comments. We invite both arms of NOAA Fisheries, Anadromous Production and Inland Fisheries Branch and Oregon Washington Coastal Office, to the February 8th meeting and participate in the conversation. The meeting will take place from 4:00-6:30pm on February 8th at the Burien Community Center. Please contact Doug Osterman, WRIA 9 Salmon Recovery Manager, at 206-477-4793 or Doug.Osterman@kingcounty.gov with questions.

Sincerely,
WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum Co-Chairs:

Bill Pelozo
Councilmember, City of Auburn

Marlla Mhoon
Councilmember, City of Covington

cc: WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum

Financial support provided by signers of Watershed Planning Interlocal Agreement for WRIA 9 including: Algona, Auburn, Black Diamond, Burien, Covington, Des Moines, Enumclaw, Federal Way, Kent, King County, Maple Valley, Normandy Park, Renton, SeaTac, Seattle, Tacoma, Tukwila

From: Steve Leider - NOAA Federal [<mailto:steve.leider@noaa.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 3:54 PM
To: Bill Peloza <bpeloza@auburnwa.gov>; Marlla Mhoon <mmhoon@covingtonwa.gov>
Cc: Osterman, Doug <Doug.Osterman@kingcounty.gov>; Allyson Purcell <Allyson.Purcell@noaa.gov>; Elizabeth Babcock <elizabeth.babcock@noaa.gov>; Jennifer Quan - NOAA Federal <jennifer.quan@noaa.gov>
Subject: Duwamish-Green Hatcheries DEIS

Bill and Marlla,

Thank you for your letter of January 18th regarding the Duwamish-Green hatcheries Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). In your letter you asked that the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) reopen the public comment period until late February or early March.

Providing public access and opportunities to comment on documents is an obligation that NMFS takes very seriously. You acknowledged in your letter that NMFS had already extended the comment period. This was done in response to requests NMFS received from your organization. NMFS feels that the time provided for review and comment by the public is sufficient, as described below.

NMFS began public scoping for the DEIS on May 4, 2016, when a notice of intent to prepare an EIS was distributed, which started a 30 day public comment period. The resulting DEIS was made available for public review starting on October 30, 2017, and a notice of availability was published in the Federal Register on November 3, 2017, inviting public comment for 45 days. NMFS received your requests for extension of the review period on December 1, 2017, and in response notified the public on December 5, 2017 of its decision to extend the review period by an additional 30 days, to January 19, 2018. A notice in the Federal Register announcing this extension was published on December 15, 2017. Overall, the total amount of time for public comment on the DEIS was over 75 days.

There is a public interest in NMFS selecting a preferred alternative under NEPA and making a decision in a timely manner.

In summary, NMFS believes it has provided sufficient time to review the DEIS and has decided not to reopen the public review and comment period. We will notify you when the final EIS is available for public review.

We appreciate your interest reviewing and commenting on the DEIS. If you or your staff have questions, please feel free to contact me at the number below.

Regards,

Steve Leider

NEPA Project Manager

Sustainable Fisheries Division
Anadromous Production and Inland Fisheries Branch
Lacey, WA
[360.753.4650](tel:360.753.4650)



Join Us "In the Green"

Tickets are going fast, and will sell out again!

Building Diversity Through Connections

2018 Green-Duwamish Watershed Symposium

February 26, 2018 | 9 am to 6 pm | Green River College, Auburn

Join us for our 2nd biennial Green-Duwamish Watershed Symposium - inspiring those working on the watershed's ecological challenges and social issues through fostering collaboration, building partnerships, and sharing knowledge.



Why should you attend?

- Gain** New Perspectives
- Increase** Knowledge
- Learn** about Emerging Issues & Solutions
- Broaden** Your Network of Resources and Relationships
- Be Inspired!*

Keynote: Collectively, Creating a More Resilient Green-Duwamish Watershed
 Josh Baldi, Director of Land & Water Resources Div., King County DNRP

Registration

Early Bird	\$55 (thu Jan 31 st)
Regular:	\$65
Day Of:	\$90 (excludes lunch)
Student:	\$20
AmeriCorps	\$20

(Student & Americorps require ID)

Registration includes lunch and an exhibit social hour

We hope to see you there!

Seating is limited so register early. We have sold out early at previous events.

Sponsors



King County



Port of Seattle



TACOMA WATER
TACOMA PUBLIC UTILITIES

Hosted By




For more information: www.GreenDuwamishWatershed.org

Contact: info@GreenDuwamishWatershed.org

www.duwamishalive.org

www.greenrivercoalition.org



2018 MEETING SCHEDULE

WRIA 9 Watershed Ecosystem Forum, Management Committee & Implementation Technical Committee

2018 Management Committee member jurisdictions: King County and Cities of Auburn, Covington, Federal Way, Renton, Seattle, and Tukwila. Ex-officio/service provider member: King County Water & Land Resources Division, Department of Natural Resources and Parks.

Watershed Ecosystem Forum	Date and Time	Location
Watershed Ecosystem Forum	Thursday, February 8 4:00 - 6:30 p.m.	Burien Community Center 14700 6th Avenue SW Burien, WA
Watershed Ecosystem Forum	Thursday, May 10 4:00 - 6:30 p.m.	Tukwila Community Center 12424 42nd Avenue South Tukwila, WA
Watershed Ecosystem Forum	Thursday, August 9 4:00 - 6:30 p.m.	Burien City Hall 400 SW 152nd St Suite 300 Burien, WA
Watershed Ecosystem Forum	Thursday, November 8 4:00 - 6:30 p.m.	Tukwila Community Center 12424 42nd Avenue South Tukwila, WA

Management Committee	Date and Time	Location
Management Committee	Wednesday, January 31 2:00 - 4:00 p.m.	Tukwila City Hall Hazelnut Room
Management Committee	Wednesday, April 25 2:00 - 4:00 p.m.	Tukwila City Hall Hazelnut Room
Management Committee	Wednesday, July 25 2:00 - 4:00 p.m.	Tukwila City Hall Hazelnut Room
Management Committee	Wednesday, October 24 2:00 - 4:00 p.m.	Tukwila City Hall Hazelnut Room

Implementation Technical Committee	Date and Time	Location
Implementation Technical Committee	Wednesday, February 21 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	King Street Center Chinook Room - 6049 201 S Jackson St., Seattle
Implementation Technical Committee	Wednesday, March 21 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	Tukwila Community Center Meeting Room A 12424 42nd Avenue South Tukwila, WA
Implementation Technical Committee	Wednesday, April 18 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	King Street Center Chinook Room - 6049 201 S Jackson St., Seattle
Implementation Technical Committee	Wednesday, May 16 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	King Street Center Chinook Room - 6049 201 S Jackson St., Seattle
Implementation Technical Committee	Wednesday, June 20 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	King Street Center Chinook Room - 6049 201 S Jackson St., Seattle
Implementation Technical Committee	Wednesday, July 18 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	King Street Center Chinook Room - 6049 201 S Jackson St., Seattle
Implementation Technical Committee	Wednesday, August 15 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	King Street Center Chinook Room - 6049 201 S Jackson St., Seattle
Implementation Technical Committee	Wednesday, September 19 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	Tukwila Community Center Meeting Room A 12424 42nd Avenue South Tukwila, WA
Implementation Technical Committee	Wednesday, October 17 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	King Street Center Chinook Room - 6049 201 S Jackson St., Seattle
Implementation Technical Committee	Wednesday, November 21 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	Tukwila Community Center Meeting Room A 12424 42nd Avenue South Tukwila, WA
Implementation Technical Committee	Wednesday, December 19 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	King Street Center Chinook Room - 6049 201 S Jackson St., Seattle