J A N U A R Y 1 9 9 9

MID-COLUMBIA COHO REINTRODUCTION
FEASIBILITY PROJECT

DOE/BP-3136

PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

DOE/EA-1282

RECEIVED
JUN 10 1999
OSTI

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

MASTER

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

**MID-COLUMBIA COHO SALMON
REINTRODUCTION
FEASIBILITY PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

DOE/EA-1282

Bonneville Power Administration

In cooperation with:

January 1999

Yakama Indian Nation, Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION	1
1.1 Underlying Need for Action	1
1.2 Purposes.....	1
1.3 Project Participants	1
1.4 Decisions to be Made	2
1.4.1 Decisions Based on This Environmental Assessment.....	2
1.4.2 Future Decisions	4
1.5 Scoping Issues.....	4
CHAPTER 2 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES	6
2.1 No Action Alternative.....	6
2.2 Tribal Alternative (Proposed Action)	6
Natural Production	7
Ecological Interactions.....	8
Long-Term Fitness.....	8
Culturing/Genetics	8
2.3 Phased Study Alternative	13
2.4 Hatchery Releases Alternative.....	13
2.5 Comparison of Alternatives	15
CHAPTER 3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.....	18
3.1 Introduction.....	18
3.2 Background	23
3.2.1 History of Mid-Columbia Coho and Their Habitat	23
3.2.2 Coho Life Cycle and Habitat.....	24
3.2.3 Other Anadromous Fish Management Activities Proposed for the Mid-Columbia	24
3.3 Effects of Incubating, Rearing, and Releasing Coho, and Selecting Coho Broodstock	25
3.3.1 Proposed Action and Phased Study Alternatives	25
3.3.1.1 Genetic Effects	26
3.3.1.2 Ecological Interactions	28
3.3.2 Hatchery Releases Alternative	36
3.3.2.1 Genetic Effects	36
3.3.2.2 Ecological Interactions	37

3.3.3 No Action.....	37
3.3.3.1 Genetic Effects	37
3.3.3.2 Ecological Interactions.....	38
3.4 Effects of Hatchery Modifications, Acclimation Site Development and Facilities Operations	38
3.4.1 Proposed Action and Phased Study.....	38
3.4.1.1 Hatchery Modifications.....	39
3.4.1.2 Hatchery Operations.....	40
3.4.1.3 Development and Use of Acclimation Sites.....	41
3.4.2 Hatchery Releases Alternative	51
3.4.3 No Action.....	51
3.5 Effects of Monitoring Activities.....	51
3.5.1 Proposed Action and Phased Study Alternatives	51
Tracking Methods	51
Collection Methods	52
Analytical Methods	53
Survey Techniques.....	54
3.5.2 Hatchery Releases	54
3.5.3 No Action.....	54
3.6 Cumulative Fishery Resource Impacts	55
3.6.1 Releases of Coho in Combination with Releases of Other Species	55
3.6.2 Migration Corridor Impacts	56
3.6.3 Genetic Fitness.....	56
3.6.4 Harvest.....	56
3.6.5 Increasing Knowledge Surrounding Reintroduction of Extirpated Stocks.....	57
CHAPTER 4 CONSULTATION, REVIEW AND PERMIT REQUIREMENTS.....	57
4.1 NEPA	57
4.2 Threatened and Endangered Species and Critical Habitat.....	57
4.3 Fish and Wildlife Conservation	58
4.4 State, Areawide, and Local Plan and Program Consistency.....	58
4.4.1 State Permits for Work in Stream Beds	58
4.4.2 Coastal Zone Management Program	58
4.5 Wetlands and Floodplains Protection	59
4.6 Heritage Conservation.....	59
4.7 Permits for Discharges into Waters of the United States	59
4.8 Permits for Rights-of-Way on Public Lands	59
4.9 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)	59
4.10 Recreation Resources	60

4.11 Requirements Not Applicable to This Project.....	60
Safe Drinking Water Act.....	60
Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA).....	60
Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA)	60
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Permits for Structures or Work in Navigable Waters.....	60
Farmland Protection Policy Act.....	60
The Executive Order on Environmental Justice.....	60
Noise Control Act.....	60
Clean Air Act.....	60
Global Warming.....	61
Energy Conservation at Federal Facilities	61

REFERENCES	62
-------------------------	-----------

GLOSSARY	67
-----------------------	-----------

Chapter 1 Purpose of and Need for Action

1.1 Underlying Need for Action

Before the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) decides whether to fund a program to reintroduce coho salmon to mid-Columbia River basin tributaries, research is needed to determine the ecological risks and biological feasibility of such an effort.

Since the early 1900s, the native stock of coho has been decimated in the tributaries of the middle reach of the Columbia River (the Wenatchee and Methow rivers) (Mullan 1983). The four Columbia River Treaty Tribes (Nez Perce, Umatilla, Warm Springs, and Yakama) identified coho reintroduction in the mid-Columbia as a priority in the *Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi-Wa-Kish-Wit* document, commonly referred to as the Tribal Restoration Plan (TRP) (CRITFC 1995). It is a comprehensive plan put forward by the Tribes to restore the Columbia River fisheries. In 1996, the Northwest Power Planning Council (NPPC) recommended the tribal mid-Columbia reintroduction project for funding by BPA. It was identified as one of fifteen high-priority supplementation projects for the Columbia River basin, and was incorporated into the NPPC's Fish and Wildlife Program (program measures 7.1H, 7.4A, 7.4F, and 7.4O). The release of coho from lower Columbia hatcheries into mid-Columbia tributaries is also recognized in the Columbia River Fish Management Plan, a court-mandated plan under the jurisdiction of *U.S. v. Oregon*, involving Federal, state and tribal fish managers in the Columbia basin (CTWSR et al. 1988).

1.2 Purposes

In meeting the underlying need, the project participants (see section 1.3) want to achieve the purposes, or goals, listed below.

- Increase knowledge about coho and their interactions with the environment to sufficient detail to make an informed decision regarding the feasibility of reintroducing coho to the mid-Columbia tributaries.
- Protect species of fish listed or proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in the mid-Columbia tributaries.
- Achieve cost and administrative efficiency in BPA fish mitigation efforts.
- Comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and Executive Orders.

1.3 Project Participants

- Yakama Indian Nation (YIN) (co-manager)
- Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) (co-manager)
- United States Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- United States Forest Service (USFS)

- National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
- Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation
- Bonneville Power Administration

1.4 Decisions to be Made

Background: Since 1996, coho research has been ongoing in the mid-Columbia region, including the Yakima basin¹ (Figure 1). Results of coho research in the Yakima basin will contribute to decisions about the mid-Columbia program in the Wenatchee and Methow basins.

The coho program for the Yakima basin is part of the overall Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Project. Impacts of some of the earlier research activities for coho were assessed in the Yakima Fisheries Project Final EIS (USDOE-BPA 1996). Additional activities under that program will be addressed in a supplemental analysis tiered to the EIS.

The coho program for the mid-Columbia tributaries (Wenatchee, Methow, Entiat) was initiated with a combination of Mitchell Act, BPA, and YIN funds. The work funded by BPA to date was categorically excluded under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

1.4.1 Decisions Based on This Environmental Assessment

BPA Decision: BPA must decide whether to fund the tribal Mid-Columbia Coho Reintroduction Feasibility Project. It is Phase 1 of a two-phase project that will attempt to reintroduce coho salmon to the Wenatchee and Methow river basins. The first phase is experimental in nature and is designed to begin resolution of several critical uncertainties related to the reintroduction of coho into tributaries of the mid-Columbia. Phase 2 would move to a full-scale reintroduction project if the results of Phase 1 demonstrate that it is feasible and that any environmental risks are acceptable.

The subject of this Environmental Assessment (EA) is the Phase 1 work. As required under NEPA procedures, BPA must examine the environmental effects of the project and determine whether they are significant. If they are determined not to be significant, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) will be issued and Phase 1 work may proceed. If they are determined to be significant, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared before making a decision to proceed.

Because the Phase 2 work will not be ripe for decision for a period of time while we gather information on the feasibility of proceeding, we will address Phase 2 in a separate NEPA document at the appropriate time (see section 1.4.2).

NMFS Decision: NMFS will use the EA, the Mid-Columbia Coho Salmon Study Plan (YIN 1998), and coho research results (Dunnigan and Hubble 1998) to provide a Biological Opinion on effects to endangered species, as required under the Endangered Species Act.

¹ A 1992 study was implemented prior to initiation of the BPA contracts and was funded for only one year by another source.

FIGURE 1 MID-COLUMBIA COHO SALMON STUDY – LOCATION MAP

USFS Decision: The USFS will use the EA along with its own management, planning and NEPA documents to inform decisions regarding use permits for activities proposed on USFS land.

1.4.2 Future Decisions

At some point in the future, decisions will need to be made whether to pursue further studies, to abandon efforts to reintroduce coho to mid-Columbia basins, or to begin full-scale implementation of reintroduction efforts. These decisions, if they involve participation by Federal agencies, probably would be subject to further environmental review and would include a range of alternative approaches. The results of the Phase 1 studies discussed in this EA would contribute to those decisions, but the importance placed on the results of any particular aspect cannot be predicted at this time. That would depend on the study program selected and on the study results themselves.

In addition, the NPPC has established a three-step review process for production programs in the Fish and Wildlife Program, of which the Mid-Columbia Coho Reintroduction Project is a part. Each project is reviewed at key stages of development—conceptual planning, preliminary design, and final design. Projects that propose new production, including those that begin planting fish in waters they have not been planted in before and/or that increase significantly the number of fish being introduced, are subject to this review. Phase 1 of the Mid-Columbia Coho Reintroduction Project was initiated before this process was established and is considered experimental, so no review as part of the three-step process is required at this stage. Before initiation of Phase 2 of the coho project within a specific mid-Columbia basin, a three-step review would be conducted. It will include the information collected and evaluated in Phase 1 and a review by an independent peer review panel. Currently, it is anticipated that the three-step review would be initiated in September, 2000.

1.5 Scoping Issues

During scoping for this EA (December 1-30, 1998), BPA received comments from 13 citizens and representatives of tribes and government agencies. This section describes the issues raised and where in the EA they are addressed.

- An alternative was suggested that broodstock development and research be continued in the Yakima basin to determine if it is viable there before moving into the Wenatchee and Methow. **Response:** Some reintroduction issues are basin-specific and cannot be addressed effectively in a different basin. However, an alternative of doing research in the Wenatchee basin only was included. See section 2.3.
- An alternative of hatchery releases only (instead of releases from acclimation sites closer to spawning areas in the tributaries) was proposed to first determine if coho survival can be achieved. **Response:** This alternative was included. See section 2.4.
- What are project costs? **Response:** See descriptions for each alternative in chapter 2.
- Concerns were expressed about whether costs of the project in dollars and to farmers and ranchers justify the benefits, especially if fish are taken downstream or if expected survival

rates are low. **Response:** The costs of alternatives are shown under the description of each alternative in chapter 2. Alternatives, including No Action, are compared in section 2.5. Coho harvest currently is limited (section 3.2.1). There would be few, if any, impacts to farmers and ranchers (see sections 3.3, 3.4 and chapter 4). One purpose of the research proposed is to determine what survival rates are (chapter 2). It is one of the pieces of information researchers would need before moving to full-scale reintroduction in Phase 2.

- What were the reasons for salmon extinction in these areas in the early 1900s? **Response:** See section 3.2.1.
- Concerns were raised about the wisdom of undertaking the project in light of impacts to juvenile chinook and steelhead including predation on other species, competition among species for scarce resources, transfer of disease to wild fish, the introduction of alien fish to a natural system, and the ability of the stocks of coho currently being used to travel the long distances from the ocean back to the mid-Columbia. **Response:** These impacts are discussed in section 3.3.
- A concern was raised that proposed monitoring facilities and activities would be expensive and degrade the habitat similar to facilities and activities implemented for spring chinook supplementation in the Methow basin. **Response:** In general, while some activities listed are similar (trapping, analyzing fish, radio tracking), facilities and activities proposed for this project appear to be more limited than those described by the commenter for spring chinook (no concrete facilities, no weirs). See sections 2.2, 3.4, 3.5.
- The EA needs to include the effects of development of acclimation ponds, including effects in wetlands and the need for Section 404 permits under the Clean Water Act. **Response:** See section 3.4.1.3.
- The EA needs to include effects on endangered species and their current status. **Response:** See various sections in chapters 3 and 4.
- The EA needs to include effects on cultural and historical resources. **Response:** See various sections in chapters 3 and 4.
- Questions were raised about the statistical power of recent coho studies. **Response:** These studies are described in detail in Appendix A of the *Mid-Columbia Coho Salmon Study Plan* (YIN 1998. See References section). Study results and researchers' confidence in the analyses are summarized in section 3.3.1.2.
- One commenter was concerned about impacts on water rights for hard-pressed farmers and ranchers. **Response:** Water rights and use of water for irrigators are not expected to be compromised (section 3.4).
- One commenter supported coho reintroduction unless it placed unwanted restrictions on use of property by riverfront property owners. **Response:** The research proposed for this project would not restrict riverfront property owners in any way.

- How would the coho be protected from downstream harvesters and bird and mammal predation? **Response:** Coho harvest currently is limited (see section 3.2.1); bird and mammal predation is part of the natural environment.
- A concern was raised that if the coho were restored to the point of being listed as endangered, then the ability of the Okanogan County Department of Public Works to do road, bridge and culvert maintenance would be adversely affected. **Response:** This is unlikely to happen because the stock being reintroduced was never an original stock, so it would not be considered under the Endangered Species Act. In addition, any current constraints the department currently is under due to other listed stocks would adequately protect coho.

Chapter 2 Proposed Action and Alternatives

2.1 No Action Alternative

If BPA does not fund studies as described in sections 2.2 – 2.4, the current situation could be expected to continue. Coho salmon currently are released in the mid-Columbia as specified in the Management Agreement for 1997 Brood Upper Columbia River Coho (The State of Washington, et al.), a stipulated order in *United States v. Oregon*. Releases would continue as described in that plan. Up to one million coho would be raised at lower Columbia River hatcheries, trucked to mid-Columbia basins, and released. Specific numbers and release basins are negotiated annually. These releases would be subject to consultation with NMFS and USFWS on their effects on listed fish species. Recently coho have been released in the Methow, Yakima, and Klickitat basins. Fish would not be acclimated in the natural environment. No research would be conducted in connection with these releases, although fish would be marked for purposes of estimating adult returns.

2.2 Tribal Alternative (Proposed Action)

The Tribal Alternative proposes research beginning in 1999, and lasting at least 2-3 years, that will allow decision-makers to determine if a locally adapted stock of coho salmon can be developed that will be able to repopulate the Wenatchee and Methow basins. The YIN's approach to coho salmon reintroduction is based upon the Tribal Restoration Plan (TRP) (CRITFC 1995). The YIN supports a "gravel-to-gravel" management approach to salmon mitigation throughout the Columbia River basin. This means managing the biological needs of the fish from egg deposition to spawning adult. Ideally the YIN desires to establish viable salmonid populations supported entirely by the natural environment.

To determine whether restoration of natural spawning is feasible, the YIN proposes to evaluate all stages of mid-Columbia coho life history.

- **Monitoring of reproductive success or egg viability** helps to determine if a highly "domesticated" hatchery stock—the only stock reasonably available now that local stocks are extinct—can be "naturalized" to produce viable offspring in the natural environment.

- **Juvenile freshwater monitoring** helps to determine 1) if healthy condition factors² from rearing in the natural environment are possible from a hatchery origin stock, and 2) if interactions with other species of concern (competition/predation) are within allowable limits.
- **Calculating smolt-to-smolt survival rates** helps to assess habitat problems during migration from freshwater rearing habitat to the ocean.
- **Smolt-to-adult survival rates** are the basic measure of program success and feasibility. Can adults return to the mid-Columbia basins in sufficient numbers to reestablish a naturally spawning, locally adapted coho stock?
- **Spawning surveys** determine whether the coho successfully spawn, at the optimal time, in preferred habitat areas.

Research proposed in the Wenatchee and Methow river basins builds on previous and continuing work in the Yakima basin (section 1.4) and is divided into categories that address four types of issues: Natural Production, Ecological Interactions, Long-Term Fitness, and Culturing/Genetics.

The studies listed below are proposed to be conducted in both the Wenatchee and Methow basins, with two exceptions. Direct predation studies will be conducted only in the Wenatchee basin, and the culturing/genetics program is not basin-specific. Study designs are explained in detail in the *Mid-Columbia Coho Salmon Study Plan* (YIN 1998).

Natural Production

- Smolt-to-smolt and smolt-to-adult survival studies

What are the **smolt-to-smolt** and **smolt-to-adult** survival rates for hatchery coho released in the Wenatchee and Methow basins? To answer this question, a portion of each release group (approximately 7,000 fish annually in the Wenatchee, 8,000 in the Methow) would be PIT-tagged (section 3.5.1, Tracking Methods) to evaluate smolt-to-smolt survival to McNary Dam and other lower Columbia River mainstem projects. Smolt-to-adult survival would be monitored based on Rock Island minus Rocky Reach and/or Tumwater Dam adult fish passage counts for the Wenatchee basin, and based on Wells Dam counts for the Methow basin.

- Redd surveys

These studies would help determine where and how many adults return to spawn with respect to the juvenile release sites. A key feasibility issue is whether or not coho are in fact spawning in proportion to the number of adults counted past an in-basin monitoring site, and if coho adults are spawning in areas considered suitable for coho.

² Standardized length-weight conversion tables for several species of fish including coho were developed several years ago as a general measure of fish health. These tables are based on what is termed in fish culture as "condition factor," which is expressed as the ratio of fish weight (in grams) to length (in millimeters) cubed. A well-fed fish will have a higher ratio than a poorly fed fish of the same length and should therefore be in better condition.

Returning adults would be radio-tagged at various dams to determine where they go within each basin (section 3.5.1, Tracking Methods). Foot/boat redd surveys would be conducted in the Wenatchee basin when sufficient numbers of spawners (i.e., 100 fish) return over Rock Island or Tumwater dams for the Wenatchee basin, and over Wells Dam for the Methow basin. Surveys would be conducted initially in stream reaches close to the smolt release sites, and would branch out from these release sites if the appropriate numbers of redds are not located. Physical data would be recorded from a random sample of redds in each sub-basin. If researchers encounter difficulty locating coho redds near release locations in 2000, up to 100 adults could be radio-tagged in 2001 to determine spawning distribution.

Ecological Interactions

- Direct predation studies

A rotary trap would be placed near three acclimation sites in the Wenatchee basin to monitor the level of predation on spring chinook and sockeye fry by coho smolts. The stomach contents of up to 3,000 coho would be examined for each of the two studies (6,000 fish total). Predation studies would not be done in the Methow basin primarily because the opportunities don't exist to study predation on the species of concern, spring chinook, sockeye, and steelhead. All returning spring chinook adults in the Methow are collected and taken to the hatchery to be bred under a captive broodstock and supplementation program (see section 3.2.3). Steelhead spawn farther upstream and emerge after coho have migrated (section 3.3.1.2).

- Residualism surveys

Snorkeling surveys would be done to determine whether and how many coho do not migrate downstream after release.

Long-Term Fitness

- Coho productivity studies

This study would be an analytical exercise. Stock productivity would be expressed as the number of returning hatchery adults (F_2) resulting from the initial number of adults (including jacks) spawned for a specific broodyear (F_1). The number of returning hatchery adults would be estimated based on the mainstem Columbia River counts between Rock Island and Rocky Reach dams, and Tumwater Dam and/or the Chiwawa adult weir for the Wenatchee basin; and on Wells Dam counts for the Methow.

Culturing/Genetics

- Egg banking/broodstock program

Researchers hypothesize that reintroducing coho to the mid-Columbia depends on whether a viable coho broodstock program can be established to provide eggs/smolt for off-hatchery acclimation/releases in the Methow and Wenatchee basins. To address this question, adult broodstock would be collected at Priest Rapids, Rocky Reach and/or Wells dams on the Columbia River, potentially at tributary sites such as Tumwater and Dryden dams and Chiwawa weir in the Wenatchee, and from adults returning to any of the mid-Columbia

hatcheries as strays. All egg-to-pre-smolt rearing would occur at an existing hatchery in the mid-Columbia region. Smolts would be **acclimated** under natural conditions at off-hatchery acclimation ponds in the Wenatchee and Methow basins.

- Genetics monitoring

The genetics monitoring program would study:

- the naturalization of a domesticated fish stock (Lower Columbia River stock);
- allelic frequencies to determine the amount and rate of divergence of the mid-Columbia broodstock from the lower river stock;
- physical traits and demographic information for introduced coho juveniles and adults and the contribution of those traits and other characteristics to survival; and
- changes in rates of straying and colonization.

The proposed actions would take place on the following schedule:

Spring 1999: Release coho smolts from two acclimation sites, Butcher Creek (150,000) and Leavenworth Hatchery pond (550,000) in the Wenatchee. No fish would be released in the Methow in 1999.

Conduct predation studies on lower Nason Creek above the confluence with the Wenatchee River.

Summer 1999: Possibly obtain permits for and develop Two Rivers and/or Chiwaukum Creek acclimation sites in the Wenatchee basin (a maximum of three acclimation sites would be needed for 2000 out of the six sites evaluated in this EA).

Continue interaction studies.

Spring 2000: Release coho smolts in all proposed acclimation sites; conduct predation studies at three sites in the Wenatchee basin. This might also be done in spring 2001.

Fall 2000: Collect broodstock.

Actions proposed for 2000 and 2001 are not yet firm; this EA evaluates the widest potential scope of the research. The technical team will evaluate the results obtained from the 1999 studies before deciding on the scope of the 2000 and 2001 work. All project participants must agree to actions in both 1999 and beyond before they are implemented.

Table 1 shows the kinds of actions required to undertake the proposed research program. Figures 2 and 3 show general locations in the Wenatchee and Methow basins. Program costs would be approximately \$2.1 million over the 2-year period of 1999-2000.

Table 1 Activities Required for Tribal Alternative

Activity	Wenatchee	Methow	Purpose
Volitional smolt releases	Up to 1,000,000 (Apr 25–May 30)	Up to 400,000 (Apr 25–May 30)	All categories (section 2.2)
Acclimation sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nason Creek (at Swamp and Butcher creeks) - Little Wenatchee and White Rivers (White River Side Channels and Two Rivers) - Icicle Creek (Hatchery Side Channel or Pond) - Wenatchee River (Chiwaukum Creek) Use a maximum of 3 of the 6 sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chewuch River (Eightmile Creek Ponds) – existing - Upper Methow River (Rockview Ditch) - existing - Wolf Creek (Biddle Ponds) – existing - Winthrop NFH - existing 	All categories (section 2.2)
PIT tagging	7,000 smolts each year	8,000 smolts each year	Natural Production – survival
PIT tag detection	At existing facilities at Rocky Reach, McNary, John Day, and Bonneville dams	At existing facilities at Rocky Reach, McNary, John Day, and Bonneville dams	Natural Production – survival
Screw trapping	Near acclimation sites on Nason Creek, Chiwawa and Little Wenatchee rivers, and L. Wenatchee outflow (Apr 1–Jul 31).	None—no predation studies in this basin	Ecological Interactions – direct predation
Electro-fishing, beach seining	Apr 25 – Jul 15 (alternatives if screw trapping is unsuccessful)	None—no predation studies in this basin	Ecological Interactions – direct predation
Fish measurements	At screw traps, traps sampled and all species collected and measured at least hourly, 24 hrs a day.	None—no traps in this basin.	Ecological Interactions – direct predation
Redd counts	Basin-wide, but concentrated near release areas, using rafts or walking in streams, bi-weekly.	Basin-wide, but concentrated near release areas, using rafts or walking in streams, bi-weekly.	Natural Production – spawning distribution
Radio-telemetry	Up to 100 returning adults at Priest Rapids, Tumwater or Dryden dams.	Up to 100 returning adults at Wells Dam.	Natural Production – spawning distribution
Stomach analysis	Up to 6,000 coho captured in screw traps.	None.	Ecological Interactions—predation
Snorkeling	Spot checks near release areas spring through fall	Spot checks near release areas spring through fall	Natural Production - migration timing, residualism
Hatchery brood-stock development/egg banking	Use existing facilities – possibilities include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hatcheries - Entiat, Winthrop, Leavenworth, Turtle Rock, or other appropriate Federal, State, PUD or Tribal facility - Adult trapping – Tumwater, Dryden, Priest Rapids, Rocky Reach, or Wells dams; at hatchery where adults return; or at Chiwawa weir. Collect adults from several sites to ensure maximum genetic variability. - Adult holding – Same locations as “Hatcheries” above 		
DNA analysis/-genetic monitoring	Experimental design to be determined – up to 240 coho would be fin-clipped or sacrificed for analysis and monitoring purposes.		

Figure 2 Wenatchee River Subbasin

Figure 3 Methow River Subbasin

2.3 Phased Study Alternative

The underlying reason for this alternative would be to minimize risks to other species of concern by studying one basin at a time. Only studies proposed for the Wenatchee basin, as described in the Proposed Action, would be done. No work would take place in the Methow. Future work in the Methow would be contingent upon results from the Wenatchee studies and from Yakima basin studies being done as part of a separate project (see section 1.4). Program costs would be \$850,000 over a two-year period.

2.4 Hatchery Releases Alternative

This alternative is designed to answer one key question: can adult coho return to the mid-Columbia in sufficient numbers to replace themselves? Smolts would be released only from hatcheries in the Wenatchee basin, on the theory that, if coho cannot return to the Wenatchee basin in sufficient numbers, they are unlikely to be able to return to the Methow with two more dams to pass and the longer migration distance. Acclimation in natural habitats would not take place. Coho would not be released in known spring chinook habitat and predation studies would not be done. Studies of the coho's ability to naturally reproduce also would not be conducted.

Smolt release numbers would be based on the number needed to produce enough adults to maintain a genetically viable population (i.e., 100 adult males and 100 adult females). Current survival rates average only 0.03%; for a population to replace itself, a 0.1% survival rate is required. This alternative would test whether that rate is achievable. Returning adults would be counted and collected at the hatchery release sites.

Program costs would be \$600,000 over a two-year period.

Table 2 Activities Required for Hatchery Releases Alternative

Activity	Wenatchee	Purpose
Smolt releases	250,000 (Apr 25–May 30)	Survival, long-term fitness
Release sites	Icicle Creek Side Channel or pond at Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery.	Survival, long-term fitness
PIT tagging	7,000 smolts each year	Survival
PIT tag detection	At existing facilities at Rocky Reach, McNary, John Day, and Bonneville dams.	Survival
Redd surveys	These would be done only if large differences were found between numbers of returning adults counted at the dams and the number collected at the hatchery.	Survival
Snorkeling	Intensive monitoring near release areas spring through fall.	Migration timing, residualism, risk management
Hatchery brood-stock development/egg banking	Use existing facilities – possibilities include: - Hatcheries - Entiat, Winthrop, Leavenworth, Turtle Rock, or other appropriate Federal, State, PUD or Tribal facility - Adult trapping – At hatchery where adults return - Adult holding – Same locations as “Hatcheries” above	
DNA analysis/-genetic monitoring	Experimental design to be determined – up to 240 coho would be fin-clipped or sacrificed for analysis and monitoring purposes.	

2.5 Comparison of Alternatives

Table 3 indicates whether the Proposed Action and Alternatives accomplish the purposes BPA and project participants hope to achieve. The conclusions are discussed after the table.

Table 3 Predicted Performance Summary

Purposes	Proposed Action	Phased Study Alternative	Hatchery Releases Alternative	No Action
Increases knowledge about coho and their interactions with the environment to sufficient decision-making detail.	Greatest potential to answer a full range of questions.	Good potential to answer a full range of questions, but additional studies most likely would be needed.	Addresses only the question of coho survival.	Would provide very little information.
Protects species of fish listed or proposed for listing under ESA in the mid-Columbia tributaries.	Some question of risk to spring chinook and sockeye but highest level of monitoring and risk management.	Similar to Proposed Action.	Less risk than Proposed Action but predation would not be monitored.	Risk could be similar to Hatchery Releases Alternative, depending on location of releases, but no monitoring would be done.
Achieves cost and administrative efficiency.	Highest cost to BPA in short term but most efficient.	Costs less than Proposed Action in the short term but increases administrative complexity.	Costs less than Proposed Action or Phased Study, but increases administrative complexity.	No cost to BPA and requires no administration.
Complies with all applicable laws, regulations, and Executive Orders.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Depends on how it is implemented; responsibility is not with BPA.

Increases knowledge about coho and their interactions with the environment to sufficient decision-making detail.

- The Tribal Alternative has the greatest potential of all the alternatives to answer a wide range of questions surrounding coho reintroduction, including whether they can survive, return to the mid-Columbia, and naturally reproduce; and whether their presence adversely affects other species of concern.
- The Phased Study Alternative has good potential to begin to address the full range of questions; however, additional studies most likely would be needed to identify differences in feasibility potential between the Wenatchee and Methow basins, lengthening by years the time required to answer questions compared to the Tribal Alternative.
- The Hatchery Releases Alternative would answer only one question surrounding coho reintroduction: whether coho can survive and return to a mid-Columbia basin. It does not test the theory that acclimation in natural ponds increases survival rates, nor does it address predation questions.
- The No Action Alternative does not increase knowledge about coho reintroduction because no monitoring of releases would be done.

Protects species of fish listed or proposed for listing under ESA in the mid-Columbia tributaries.

- The Proposed Action raises the strongest question about potential risk to listed species or species proposed for listing because it includes a proposal to study coho predation on spring chinook, a species proposed for Federal listing as endangered. **In addition, two proposed acclimation sites may create the potential for predation on sockeye salmon, listed by the State of Washington as Vulnerable/Species of Importance.** However, this alternative also has the highest level of monitoring of predation and competition effects on sensitive species.
- For the Phased Study alternative, the risk of effects to sensitive species would be similar to the Proposed Action, even though studies would not be undertaken in the Methow. In the Methow, there is little opportunity for predation of coho on sensitive species (see section 3.3.1.2), and consequently, less monitoring was proposed in that basin.
- The Hatchery Releases Alternative would have the lowest potential for risk to sensitive species because trapping and predation studies would not be undertaken, but the effect of predation would not be monitored.
- For the No Action Alternative, the risk to sensitive species could be similar to the Hatchery Releases Alternative, depending on the location of releases. Similarly, no monitoring would be done.

Achieves cost and administrative efficiency.

- The Proposed Action is the highest cost to BPA in the short term but compared to the other alternatives, is less administratively complex because only one other decision-making process likely would be required: Whether or not to implement full-scale coho reintroduction.

- The Phased Study Alternative would be less expensive than the Proposed Action in the short term because no studies would be done in the Methow basin in the next two years. However, additional studies could be needed, thus adding to the longer-term cost and requiring an additional decision-making process compared to the Proposed Action.
- The Hatchery Releases Alternative probably would cost slightly less than the Phased Study Alternative in the short term, but because predation and other ecological interaction studies undoubtedly would be needed before full-scale reintroduction of coho could be proposed, additional decision-making processes would be required.
- Because coho releases would be undertaken under the auspices of other entities, the No Action Alternative would cost nothing to BPA and would require no administration.

Complies with all applicable laws, regulations, and Executive Orders.

- Under the Proposed Action, Phased Study, and Hatchery Releases alternatives, BPA and project proponents would conduct all necessary consultations, obtain all required permits, and adhere to all conditions specified.
- Because the No Action alternative would be implemented by other entities, the responsibility for compliance does not rest with BPA.

Chapter 3 Affected Environment and Environmental Effects

3.1 Introduction

The research proposed for the four alternatives would occur in at least one of two tributary basins of the mid-Columbia River basin, the Wenatchee and Methow river basins (Figure 1). For each alternative, this chapter discusses the effects of three categories of research activity:

- Effects of incubating, rearing, and releasing coho, and collecting coho broodstock to provide the research fish (section 3.3).
- Effects of hatchery modifications, acclimation pond preparation and facilities operations required to conduct the research (section 3.4).
- Effects of monitoring activities (section 3.5).

The discussion focuses on the effects that are likely to occur during the two- to three-year time frame of the proposal. Some parts of the proposal could have long-term effects if the results of this research show that coho reintroduction in these basins is feasible and Phase 2 of the project is implemented. While this EA acknowledges the nature of those effects where appropriate, their in-depth analysis will be deferred until the time is ripe for decision-making for Phase 2.

The effects of the Proposed Action and the Phased Study alternative are described together because they would be the same, except that, under the Phased Study alternative, effects would not occur in the Methow Valley during the time period covered by the EA. The discussion in each category for the Hatchery Releases and No Action alternatives focuses on their differences from the first two.

Table 4 summarizes the impacts that are discussed in detail in the remainder of this chapter.

Table 4 Summary of Environmental Impacts of Proposal and Alternatives

Impact	Proposed Action	Phased Study	Hatchery Releases	No Action
Effects of Coho Incubation, Rearing, and Releases, and Selecting Broodstock				
Artificial selection	Long-term trend towards naturalization and local adaptation; little effect for the period of this EA.	Same as Proposed Action.	Less long-term potential for naturalization than Proposed Action because no acclimation in natural surroundings, but similar to Proposed Action for the EA period.	No potential for naturalization because smolts would be trucked from lower Columbia hatcheries and released with no acclimation.
Loss of within-population genetic variability	Low risk because no wild population exists.	Same as Proposed Action.	Same as Proposed Action.	Same as Proposed Action.
Coho straying to other basins	Low risk because coho would be acclimated.	Same as Proposed Action.	Same as Proposed Action.	Higher risk than other alternatives because coho would not be acclimated.
Coho predation on species of concern—spring chinook (proposed Endangered) and sockeye (Vulnerable)	Some risk to spring chinook from releases in Wenatchee and Methow and from Wenatchee predation study; some risk to sockeye from releases above Lake Wenatchee. Risk managed through monitoring and other measures.	Same risks as Proposed Action for Wenatchee. No risk in Methow, because no studies done there. Risks managed the same as for Proposed Action.	Slight risk from releases in Wenatchee; however, risk would not be managed through monitoring.	Some risk from releases because locations unknown. Risk would not be monitored.
Competition for use of habitat between coho and other species of concern	Low risk to other fish species due either to lack of overlap in micro-habitats and/or rapid outmigration of coho. Low risk mitigated through release practices.	Same risk as for Proposed Action, except no risk in Methow basin because no studies would be done there.	Somewhat lower than Proposed Action because coho would be released from hatchery site lower in the basin.	Similar to Proposed Action because release locations unknown.
Transfer of disease to other species	Low risk due to use of IHOT standard disease control practices.	Same as Proposed Action.	Slightly higher risk than Proposed Action because more fish could become diseased due to higher densities during rearing.	Similar to Hatchery Releases Alternative.

Table 4 (continued)

Impact	Proposed Action	Phased Study	Hatchery Releases	No Action
Effects of Hatchery Modifications and Operations				
Construction effects at Winthrop NFH to increase water supply	Little or no ground disturbance or increased sedimentation because existing pipeline would be tapped or temporary pipe installed above ground.	Same as Proposed Action.	Same as Proposed Action.	No impacts would occur because existing lower Columbia facilities would continue to be used as they are now.
Increased water use, waste and water discharges, and fish and chemical wastes	Existing permits expected to be sufficient, but if not, will be modified before production begins.	Same as Proposed Action, except amount of increase may be lower without releases in Methow.	Similar to Proposed Action: fewer fish reared but kept at hatchery longer.	No impacts because existing lower Columbia facilities would be used as they are now.
Effects of Development and Use of Acclimation Sites				
Water rights	Temporary, non-consumptive water rights might be needed for two new sites in Wenatchee; temporary rights for existing sites in Methow would be renewed.	Same as Proposed Action for Wenatchee; Methow sites would not be used.	None needed because new acclimation sites would not be developed.	None needed because new acclimation sites would not be developed.
Impacts to recreational areas/visual quality	Possible minor visual change near hiking trail at Chiwaukum Cr. site; winter sports users could be concerned if USFS road to White River site is plowed. No effect on candidate Wild & Scenic Rivers or recreational boaters.	Same as Proposed Action.	No impact—no new sites developed.	No impact—no new sites developed.
Destruction of sensitive plants	Potential impacts to two sensitive plant species and wetland-/riparian vegetation at Two Rivers and Chiwaukum sites.	Same as Proposed Action.	No impact—no new sites developed.	No impact—no new sites developed.

Table 4 (continued)

Impact	Proposed Action	Phased Study	Hatchery Releases	No Action
Effects of Development and Use of Acclimation Sites (continued)				
Construction effects in floodplains under the Phased Study alternative	All but Hatchery Side Channel/pond, Chiwaukum sites are in 100-yr. floodplain; potential for impact at Two Rivers site only due to work required.	Same as Proposed Action.	No impact—no new sites developed.	No impact—no new sites developed.
Construction effects in wetlands	Most sites likely to be in wetlands; only Two Rivers channel and Chiwaukum site have potential for impact due to modifications required. Site designs and mitigation would ensure no net loss of wetlands.	Same as Proposed Action.	No impact—no new sites developed.	No impact—no new sites developed.
Disturbance of wildlife	Several listed species are found in the region. Minor, temporary disturbance possible at Chiwaukum site. Surveys would be conducted before it is developed. Beaver could be temporarily disturbed at Butcher Cr. and White River.	Same as Proposed Action.	No impact—no new sites developed.	No impact—no new sites developed.
Disturbance of cultural resources	Existence of resources unknown; surveys required at Chiwaukum site and for channel at Two Rivers site.	Same as Proposed Action.	No impact—no new sites developed.	No impact—no new sites developed.
Construction noise at new pond sites.	Minor potential at Chiwaukum site due to proximity to trail access, but could be mitigated by timing.	Same as Proposed Action.	No impact—no new sites developed.	No impact—no new sites developed.

Table 4 (continued)

Impact	Proposed Action	Phased Study	Hatchery Releases	No Action
Effects of Monitoring Activities				
Stress, mortality from PIT tagging of juvenile coho	Up to 20% mortality to research coho from handling.	Same as Proposed Action.	Same as Proposed Action.	Same as Proposed Action.
Adult coho mortality from handling stress.	Up to 10-15% mortality.	Same as Proposed Action.	No impact because these studies would not be done.	No impact because these studies would not be done.
Potential for injury, increased predation among juveniles in screw traps; inconvenience to recreational boaters (Wenatchee only)	Risk minimized by frequent monitoring. ESA Section 10 permit required for spring chinook, steelhead, bull trout due to potential for harm. Boaters could not pass traps in water; traps would be flagged, sited away from high-use areas.	Same as Proposed Action.	No impact because predation studies would not be done.	No impact because predation studies would not be done.
Potential mortality from electro-fishing	Used only if screw trapping unsuccessful. Risk minimized by using experienced personnel and following NMFS guidelines.	Same as Proposed Action.	No impact because predation studies would not be done.	No impact because predation studies would not be done.
Stress from handling during beach seining	Used only if screw trapping unsuccessful. Low risk of harm.	Same as Proposed Action.	No impact because predation studies would not be done.	No impact because predation studies would not be done.
Risk of stress, injury and mortality during handling for measurements	Standard research techniques used. Risk minimized by using experienced, qualified personnel.	Same as Proposed Action.	No impact because these studies would not be done.	No impact because these studies would not be done.
Coho mortality for stomach analyses, genetic sampling	Up to 6,000 research coho smolts sacrificed (0.6% of releases); impact not considered adverse. Spawned adults used for genetic sampling would die anyway.	Same as Proposed Action.	No impact because predation studies would not be done.	No impact because predation studies would not be done.
Impacts of survey techniques	Minor disturbance to fish near release sites.	Same as Proposed Action.	Slightly greater than Proposed Action: surveys more intense.	No impact because these studies would not be done.

3.2 Background

3.2.1 History of Mid-Columbia Coho and Their Habitat

Historically, mid-Columbia coho salmon production occurred throughout many of the basin's tributaries. Major Columbia River tributaries in this area include the Wenatchee, Entiat, Methow, and Okanogan rivers. The primary tributaries for the two basins that are the subject of this EA include: Icicle, Peshastin, and Nason creeks and the Little Wenatchee, Chiwawa and White rivers (Wenatchee River [Figure 2]); and the Twisp and Chewuch rivers (Methow River [Figure 3]). All the major upper river basin tributaries supported coho.

Mullan (1983) estimated historical mid-Columbia River adult coho populations as follows:

- Wenatchee--6,000 - 7,000
- Methow--23,000 - 31,000

Mid-Columbia coho salmon populations were decimated in the early 1900s by impassable dams and unscreened irrigation diversions in the tributaries along with an extremely high harvest rate in the lower Columbia River. The loss of natural stream flow degraded habitat quality and further reduced coho productivity. Irrigation, livestock grazing and mining were major contributors to salmon habitat destruction before 1910. Later, timber harvest and fire management, in addition to irrigation, assumed more importance. Before 1920, 27 major dams were built in the Columbia River tributary basins (Wissmar et al. 1994). The construction of dams in the tributaries also degraded habitat and blocked fish access to large portions of the upper Columbia River basin.

Coho have also suffered the additional impacts of extremely heavy harvest exploitation in ocean and lower Columbia River fisheries. An intensive fishery conducted from The Dalles to the mouth of the river was considered the biggest harvest impact to the upriver stocks (McDonald 1895). With the construction of Mitchell Act hatcheries in the 1960s and 1970s, harvest rates on the lower Columbia were designed to maximize harvest of lower mainstem hatchery stocks that could sustain high exploitation rates. During this period, harvest rates on Columbia River coho stocks often exceeded 90 percent, effectively wiping out less abundant, natural upper Columbia River populations (NMFS 1991).

Indigenous natural coho salmon no longer occupy the mid-Columbia river basins. Since Priest Rapids Dam was completed in 1960, the peak escapement of adult coho upstream of the dam was probably never greater than 10,000 coho and has not exceeded 1,300 coho since 1974 (WDFW/ODFW 1998). Since 1988, adult counts at Priest Rapids Dam have averaged only 16 coho, probably a result of hatchery strays from Turtle Rock Hatchery releases of about 600,000 smolts (WDFW/ODFW 1995).

For several reasons, self sustaining coho populations were not established in mid-Columbia basins despite plantings of 46 million fry, fingerlings, and smolts from Leavenworth, Entiat, and Winthrop National Fish hatcheries between 1942 and 1975:

- The construction and operation of mainstem Columbia River hydropower projects were detrimental to mid-Columbia River salmonid populations because of the number of dams and

reservoirs through which they had to pass, leading to deaths from turbines, gas bubble trauma, and so forth.

- A substantial amount of critical physical fish habitat was lost or severely degraded (Tyus 1990; Petts 1980; Diamond and Pribble 1978).
- Existing coho programs were poorly administered, unsuccessful, or lower priority than programs for other salmonid species. For example, the most recent coho hatchery program in the mid-Columbia region was at Turtle Rock Hatchery, funded by Chelan P.U.D. The coho program was terminated because continual disease problems during the summer months required that the fish be constantly medicated. Unhealthy fish were released, which resulted in poor adult returns. Because fall chinook and steelhead were higher priority species, they were given priority use of the limited supply of high quality hatchery water. These species currently constitute the program at Turtle Rock. The last coho releases were in 1994.

Since that time, conditions and practices have changed. Most of the local habitat causes of coho depletion have been corrected. For example, irrigation diversions have been screened, tributary dams have been removed, mining has ended, and improvements in grazing practices have been made. Similar improvements have been made on the mainstem Columbia. The recent ESA listings of several salmonid species that migrate through the lower Columbia River have curtailed coho fisheries that once over-harvested the mid-Columbia stocks of coho. These fisheries restrictions are likely to be in effect for a number of years.

3.2.2 Coho Life Cycle and Habitat

Because the historical stocks of coho were decimated near the turn of the century, most life history information was obtained through affidavits from older residents. The historical information supports the fact that these fish were probably early-returning-type adults, ascending the mid-Columbia tributaries in August and September (Mullan 1983).

Lower Columbia River early-returning-type hatchery coho salmon spawn from October to mid-December. Columbia River coho salmon typically spend one year in freshwater before outmigrating as yearling smolts in the spring (April/May). After outmigrating, coho salmon spend approximately 18 months at sea before returning to spawn. Sexually precocious males (jacks) return to spawn after six months at sea.

3.2.3 Other Anadromous Fish Management Activities Proposed for the Mid-Columbia

Three mid-Columbia Public Utility Districts (PUD), Chelan County PUD, Douglas County PUD, and Grant County PUD, are preparing a Biological Assessment and Management Plan (Management Plan) for the Mid-Columbia River Hatchery Program. The Management Plan would address Endangered Species Act issues for fish hatcheries in the Wenatchee, Methow, and other mid-Columbia basins. The National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Confederated Tribes of the Yakima Indian Nation, Colville Indian Reservation, and Umatilla Indian Reservation are all participating in the consultation.

The Management Plan addresses a comprehensive program to help recover spring chinook, steelhead, summer/fall chinook, and sockeye populations in these basins. The actions proposed in the Wenatchee and Methow basins are described below for each species.

Spring chinook: The Management Plan proposes to supplement spring chinook populations at Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery and in the Chiwawa River, Nason Creek, and White River in the Wenatchee Basin. The Little Wenatchee population would not be artificially propagated, but left alone to serve as a reference population. In the Methow basin, a supplementation program is being implemented for the Methow and Chewuch populations using the returning adult population. A captive broodstock program may be initiated for the Twisp River population.

Steelhead: The preferred strategy for Wenatchee River steelhead is to collect broodstock on that river for propagation and release there only. The preferred strategy for the near-term for the Methow River is to continue broodstock collection at Wells Dam, and to investigate the means to collect local broodstock on the Methow River for the long term.

Summer/fall chinook: The strategy for summer/fall chinook is to continue to propagate yearlings to compensate for dam mortalities; to evaluate the genetic, ecological, and demographic characteristics of the natural populations throughout the hatchery program; and to recognize the risk that potential impacts may not be detected in sufficient time to correct them. Means to collect local broodstocks on the Methow River will be studied.

Sockeye: There are two populations of sockeye salmon in the mid-Columbia Region, from the Wenatchee and Okanogan rivers. Both currently have a low risk of extinction. The current production would be increased from 200,000 yearlings to 725,000 fish of various ages from Wenatchee River. The number of each population to be produced, and the means to propagate them will depend on several factors outside the scope of the Management Plan.

BPA and the YIN are coordinating the proposals under the Mid-Columbia Coho Reintroduction Project with the Management Plan through the Mid-Columbia Coordinating Committee and consultation with NMFS. We do not believe that the coho proposal would interfere with the Management Plan actions, and will continue to coordinate to ensure that they do not as both projects continue to be defined and evolve.

3.3 Effects of Incubating, Rearing, and Releasing Coho, and Selecting Coho Broodstock

3.3.1 Proposed Action and Phased Study Alternatives

Because coho salmon are extinct in the Wenatchee and Methow basins, the proposed research into the feasibility of reintroducing the species relies on development of a coho broodstock from lower Columbia River populations.³ No wild stock from the mid-Columbia exists to use, and wild stocks from other areas such as British Columbia are unavailable. The lower river stock has

³ The fish would come from Lewis River, Cascade, and/or Eagle Creek hatcheries. The original source of the Lower Columbia River stock was the Toutle River stock. The LCR stock also has had recent infusions of Sandy River stock.

been essentially a hatchery stock since the 1960s and is considered domesticated. Because a few coho are returning to the mid-Columbia from earlier releases, despite the program and habitat limitations of earlier years described in section 3.2.1, researchers believe the potential exists for broodstock development to succeed using this stock. Genetic effects of this activity would be limited primarily to the potential benefit of increasing the naturalization of a domesticated stock. These effects are discussed in detail in section 3.3.1.1.

The research also relies upon releases of large numbers of hatchery coho in order to test their survival, reproductive success, and interactions with other species, and to provide adequate returns for broodstock development. Currently, based on the 95% confidence interval calculated for Yakima River coho smolt-to-adult survival data, coho released in the mid-Columbia tributaries are expected to survive at rates between 0.043% and 0.11%. In the long term, the proposed project would attempt to improve on those rates.

In order to study ecological risks of a reintroduction program, the proposed research may increase the risk for those effects, such as predation by coho on other species, indirect predation effects such as "shielding" or "chumming," competition between coho and other species, and disease transmission. These effects are discussed in section 3.3.1.2.

3.3.1.1 Genetic Effects

Artificial Selection

The primary genetic effect of the coho broodstock development, rearing and release portions of this project's research is expected to be a long-term trend towards naturalization and local adaptation of the population.

When hatchery breeding and rearing is used to supplement the populations of existing natural stocks in a particular area, a risk exists that hatchery conditions and practices will encourage artificial selection of fish and fish behaviors that are suitable for the hatchery environment but reduce the fish's ability to survive in the wild. For example, if the fish selected for broodstock are not taken at random from the natural population, researchers may inadvertently increase artificial selection pressure for earlier spawning. Over several generations, if the fish are consistently spawned early, the hatchery population may mature weeks or even months earlier than the natural population.

Further, when large numbers of hatchery-bred fish breed with wild fish, there is concern that the genetic mixing may produce offspring with fewer of the traits that are important for survival in the natural environment.

This project, however, is unlikely to produce these adverse artificial selection effects for three reasons. First, the project is being undertaken in basins in which coho are extirpated, so there is no wild population to be adversely affected by a stock of hatchery origin, certainly not in the period of the proposed research that is the subject of the EA. If, however, the research shows that coho reintroduction could be feasible and a stock is developed that eventually naturalizes, then in the long term (during Phase 2 of the project, should it be implemented), measures would

need to be taken to adjust the relative numbers of hatchery-raised and naturally produced broodstock to avoid artificial selection effects.

Secondly, the stock proposed for use as the starting point for development of the broodstock—a lower Columbia River stock—has been a hatchery-only stock since the 1960s and is already divergent from the native stocks. Given the hatchery practices proposed for this project, the stock is unlikely to become any more divergent than it already is.

Third, the Tribal and Phased Study alternatives propose rearing practices that are designed to improve local adaptation of the existing stock. Research on coho in the Yakima basin (CTWSR et al. 1997) has shown that acclimation improves adult return numbers by two to three times when compared to direct releases into the river.

Genetic Variability

Loss of within-population variability is commonly associated with hatchery production. Loss can be due to genetic drift as a consequence of small population size or to non-random selection of hatchery broodstock. Since genetic variability is the raw material upon which selection acts, this loss in variability may manifest itself as a decreased responsiveness to natural selection, with a resulting drop in fitness.

In order to avoid problems associated with small **effective population** size such as **inbreeding** or **founder effects**, Integrated Hatchery Operations Team (IHOT) recommends that a minimum of 100 males and 100 females be used as broodstock (PRRG 1999). If, during this phase of the project, too few adults return to maintain an effective population size, their numbers would be supplemented either by adding lower river adults to the breeding pairs, by supplementing the next year's releases with lower river smolts, or a combination of both.

In addition, to maximize the potential for genetic variability and naturalization of the returning population (see "Artificial Selection" above), the project would initially use up to 90% of returning fish for broodstock, collected throughout the run. Hatchery fish that return to the mid-Columbia will have gone through a substantial selection process to survive the long migration and the variety of obstacles they encounter in the journey, which is expected to enhance the trend toward local adaptation. However, in the near term, a portion of all smolt releases likely would include lower river coho because returns may not be enough in the first two or three years to maintain effective population size. The primary effect of supplementing broodstock with lower river coho would be that adaptation to the mid-Columbia region would be slowed.

For the period covered by this EA, the broodstock selection process would be entirely random. While the genetics monitoring program would study returning coho for traits associated with survival and adaptability, any proposal to select for certain traits in developing broodstock would be evaluated in future decision-making processes (see section 1.4.2).

Straying

When individuals from one stock of anadromous fish return as adults to a river basin that is not in their natal area, genetic mixing with local stocks can introduce unwanted traits into the local population. It is unlikely that straying would be an issue for the Tribal and Phased Study alternatives because the proposal is to raise the fish in a mid-Columbia basin hatchery, acclimate

them naturally, and release them in the basin in which they are acclimated. Under such conditions the fish are unlikely to stray into a lower river basin. However, if they did, their numbers would be very small, as only 100-1,500 returning adults are expected from the numbers proposed for release. In addition, if a few of the coho reared in the mid-Columbia were to stray into lower river basins, or even into basins further up the Columbia, in most cases they would be mixing with basically the same stock of coho, so no adverse effects would be expected.

3.3.1.2 Ecological Interactions

For this research, ecological interaction risks include direct predation by coho on other species of concern, indirect predation effects, competition between coho and other species, and transfer of disease. Those ecological interactions that influence the survival, growth, or broad-scale distribution of the affected population would potentially be most serious in nature. Ecological risk may be greatest for endangered species or those of critically low abundance.

Fish species found in the two basins are listed in Table 5. Table 6 shows species of special concern and their status.

Table 5 Anadromous and Resident Fish Species in Wenatchee and Methow Basins

Anadromous	Resident
Spring chinook salmon	Rainbow trout
Summer/fall chinook salmon	Cutthroat trout
Coho salmon*	Eastern brook trout**
Summer steelhead trout	Bull trout
Sockeye salmon (W)	Brown trout**
	Smallmouth bass**
	Largemouth bass (W)**
	Yellow perch (W)**
	Mountain whitefish
	Largescale sucker
	Longnose dace
	Redside shiner
	Sculpin

*Note: There is no evidence that a self-sustaining population of coho remains in either basin.

**Note: These species are not native to these basins.

Table 6 Special Status Species in the Wenatchee and Methow Basins

Common Name	Endangered Species Act*	Washington Species Criteria**
Spring chinook salmon	Proposed Endangered	Vulnerable/Species of Importance
Summer/fall chinook salmon		Vulnerable/Species of Importance
Coho salmon		Vulnerable/Species of Importance
Sockeye salmon		Vulnerable/Species of Importance
Steelhead trout	Endangered	Species of Importance
Rainbow trout		Species of Importance
Bull trout	Threatened	Vulnerable/Species of Importance

*Definitions under the Endangered Species Act include:

Endangered Species: Any species in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

Threatened Species: Any species which is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

**WDFW species criteria (WDFW 1996) include:

Vulnerable: Species or groups of animals susceptible to significant population declines within a specific area by virtue of their inclination to aggregate, e.g., in fish spawning and rearing areas.

Species of Importance: Native and non-native fish species of recreational, commercial, or Tribal ceremonial and subsistence importance that are vulnerable to habitat loss or degradation.

In this section, examination of ecological interactions is limited to those that could occur within the Wenatchee and Methow river basins. Interactions with other species in the mainstem Columbia and downstream are discussed under the Cumulative Impacts section (3.6).

Predation

Predation effects can be direct or indirect and are related to the release of hatchery smolts into the natural environment. Hatchery smolts may prey on smaller fish, and birds and other fish may prey on hatchery fish. For this analysis, direct predation refers to coho consumption of another species. Indirect predation—either “chumming” or “shielding”—refers to either the increased or reduced levels of predation on other species as a result of the release of large numbers of coho smolts. “Chumming” refers to the response of predators attracted by the release of a group of hatchery smolts, which reduces the survival of co-mingling wild smolts. “Shielding” occurs when the predator base is overwhelmed by the presence of large numbers of hatchery smolts, thus increasing the survival rate of wild smolts.

Although the impact of predation on an individual prey animal is unambiguous, the impact on a population of prey is not. Depending on the abundance and productivity of the prey population, the impact of predation on the persistence and productivity of the prey population may range from negligible to serious. Effects are determined by the percentage of each species’ diet that is

made up of fish. Size of hatchery fish appears to be relevant to whether or not the supplemented species will prey significantly on other fish species (Hillman and Mullan 1989).

Coho salmon have been shown to prey on several species of salmonids including sockeye salmon (*O. nerka*) fry (Ricker 1941; Foerster and Ricker 1953; Ruggerone and Rogers 1992), pink (*O. gorbuscha*) and chum (*O. keta*) salmon fry (Hunter 1959), and fall chinook salmon (Thompson 1966).

In the Wenatchee and Methow basins, the species most at risk for direct predation is spring chinook; sockeye salmon could be at risk in certain parts of the Wenatchee basin. Spring chinook spawn in higher reaches of the watershed and so emerge from the gravel later than summer/fall chinook, due to the colder water; and they are smaller than coho when they begin migrating. Sockeye emerge at about the same time as coho and rear in habitat proposed for coho acclimation in the Wenatchee basin. Summer/fall chinook spawn lower in the watershed, and emerge sooner than coho. Although they are smaller than coho, they are too large to be prey. Most resident trout and steelhead are not considered to be at risk because these species generally emerge from the gravel after coho have migrated downstream, or spawn in upper reaches of tributaries (i.e., bull trout).

Coho Salmon Predation on Fall Chinook

Studies of coho predation on fall chinook were conducted in the Yakima basin at the Chandler Juvenile Monitoring Facility (CJMF) in 1997 and 1998. They indicate that coho predation on fall chinook was 0.1% of all fall chinook smolts produced above Prosser, or the equivalent of 3.7 fall chinook adults. However, researchers believe that the artificial conditions associated with CJMF create abnormal opportunities for predation (the fish are at unnaturally high densities in unnatural habitat with no cover against predators, and fish are potentially held several hours in the livebox before being examined) (Dunnigan and Hubble 1998).

Coho predation studies were also conducted in 1997 and 1998 in the open Yakima River (Dunnigan and Hubble 1998). There the observed rate of coho predation on fall chinook was zero: none of the coho sampled in either year contained remains of fall chinook. Calculations were then made, using two different methods, to estimate what total coho predation on fall chinook in the Yakima River might have been. Because the 1997 sample size was small, calculations made from it were not precise and the estimates ranged to absurd numbers. However, despite the small sample size, it seems likely that sampling reflected actual consumption rates in the river during the 1997 coho outmigration (Dunnigan and Hubble 1998). Conditions were not conducive for sight-feeding predators such as coho to be highly successful. Flows were extremely high and the water was turbid. Coho salmon migrated rapidly during this period (averaging 160 kilometers [100 miles] in 3 days) so the potential time for predation was limited. Predation rates on fall chinook by other sight-feeding predators such as smallmouth bass and northern pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus oregonensis*) were also relatively low during this period in 1997. It also seems highly unlikely that impacts in the river during 1997 would have been high given that coho predation at CJMF in 1997 was low and CJMF is perhaps the worst-case scenario for fall chinook predation (see above) (Dunnigan and Hubble 1998).

Sample sizes in 1998 allowed for more precise estimates of the total number of fall chinook consumed in the open river. They show that, 95 times out of 100, in identical conditions, the maximum number of fall chinook smolts consumed in the entire Yakima River would be no higher than 349 smolts (or approximately 3.5 adult fall chinook) (Dunnigan and Hubble 1998).

Coho Salmon Predation on Spring Chinook

In 1998, the YIN studied coho predation on spring chinook, analyzing the stomach contents of coho sampled at a rotary trap in the Easton reach of the upper Yakima River. Of an estimated 803,880 spring chinook fry in the study reach, researchers estimated coho consumed between 93 and 324 spring chinook fry, depending on which analysis model was used (Dunnigan and Hubble 1998). Using what appeared to be the more reliable model of gut evacuation rates presented by He and Wurtsbaugh (1993), researchers estimated that the total number of adult spring chinook equivalents consumed was no higher than approximately 7 adults (or 0.38% of the potential number of returning adults to the study reach) (Dunnigan and Hubble 1998). Researchers believe that this experiment represented the worst-case scenario to test for direct coho predation on spring chinook fry for the proposed release time because the Easton reach has the highest density of spring chinook redds in the upper Yakima basin; and during the period of the experiment, spring chinook fry were abundant and available as potential prey items for the coho smolts. The predation rate might have been higher if the coho had been released earlier, when the newly emergent spring chinook were smaller and probably more vulnerable to predation. However, the test accurately represented the time period during which future coho releases would be made (Dunnigan and Hubble 1998).

In 1997, YIN snorkeling surveys in the Methow basin generally found emergent spring chinook fry in association with shallow (less than 12 inches), low-velocity backwater and spring brook channels, or close to large woody debris along shallow stream margins (Dunnigan and Hubble 1998). Wild coho juveniles progress through a series of preferred habitat types beginning with back eddies, then moving to log jams, undercut banks, open bank areas, and finally to fast water habitat (Lister and Genoe 1970). Dunnigan and Hubble's observations generally agree with Lister and Genoe's (1970), in that coho prefer deeper and faster water conditions than do spring chinook fry, so there is minimal spatial overlap and therefore limited opportunity for direct predation or competition. In addition, in the Methow, all adult spring chinook are being collected for a captive broodstock program, and for the period of this EA, most coho adults in both basins also would be collected for broodstock. Consequently, the opportunities for predation by naturally spawning progeny of these released fish would be minimal.

Overall, based on data collected to date by the YIN, direct predation has not been shown to be a significant risk to spring or fall chinook. There is, however, some uncertainty because the results are limited (only one data set with statistically significant results), and because the results are being applied to potential effects in a different basin.

Because of this uncertainty, releases in the Wenatchee basin would be sized, based on the Yakima data, so that impacts to spring chinook would not be significant. In addition, the direct predation study proposed in the Wenatchee Basin as part of the Tribal and Phased Study alternatives is designed to monitor coho predation on spring chinook juveniles in that basin, to rule out any basin-specific differences. (See section 2.2 [direct predation study described in

Ecological Interactions] and Task 11 from the *Mid-Columbia Coho Salmon Study Plan* [YIN 1998].) This study would be undertaken only after consultation with NMFS to ensure that there would be no jeopardy to the spring chinook ESU (Evolutionarily Significant Unit)⁴, which is likely to be listed as endangered in spring, 1999.

Coho Salmon Predation on Sockeye Salmon

The risks of coho predation on sockeye salmon could be similar to spring chinook. Sockeye spawn upstream of most of the proposed release areas, but a significant number rear in Lake Wenatchee and would be there, at prey sizes, at times when coho would be released. Although not listed under ESA, sockeye in this area are considered a vulnerable species because they are one of only two populations remaining in the Columbia River system (the other is in Lake Osoyoos [Okanogan River]) (Ken MacDonald, USFS, personal communication, 1999). Coho released from the White River Side Channels and Two Rivers sites, if used, could pose a risk to sockeye. The risk would be managed by implementing a predation study similar to that proposed for spring chinook, using a WDFW screw trap at the Lake Wenatchee outfall.

Coho Salmon Predation on Bull Trout

Potential for coho predation on young-of-the-year bull trout would be limited due to the lack of geographic overlap between bull trout spawning and rearing areas in the Wenatchee and Methow rivers and proposed coho acclimation and release sites. All proposed acclimation sites are lacustrine-type habitats that generally are not utilized by juvenile bull trout.

Indirect Predation

An indirect predation study was initiated in 1998 in the Yakima basin, but the results were inconclusive; the study results and experimental design were compromised due to river conditions. The impacts of indirect predation on wild salmonid smolt survival are being investigated in the Yakima basin in 1999 because the known avian and fish predators are very abundant in the lower Yakima River (below Prosser Dam). Therefore, any impacts or benefits to wild smolts are most likely to be detected in an experiment conducted in the Yakima Basin. In other words, the Yakima probably presents a worst-case scenario for a potential negative impact on wild salmonid survival. Fewer such predators are expected in the Wenatchee and Methow rivers.

The annual production of all state and Federal anadromous salmonid hatchery programs in the mid-Columbia region is approximately 10.2 million fish. The largest number of coho released under any of the alternatives presented in this environmental assessment would represent an approximate 10% increase in the number of migrating salmonids in the region. This increase in production is unlikely to cause an increase in the functional or numeric response of either avian or fish predators in the area, and therefore impacts would be negligible.

Finally, because releases from several acclimation sites would be spread throughout the two basins, the fish would not be travelling in mass numbers as they would from large hatchery releases at a single site, so the potential predator responses are less likely to occur.

⁴ An Evolutionarily Significant Unit is a distinctive group of Pacific salmon (salmon, steelhead or sea-run cutthroat trout).

Competition

Direct competition for food and space between hatchery coho and other species can result in displacement of other fish into less preferred areas, which can potentially affect their growth and survival. For competition to have an adverse effect, the same limited resource must be used by more than one species. However, in some instances, competition for space and food may clearly alter patterns of microhabitat utilization while having no effect on productivity or viability (Spaulding et al. 1989). Indeed, the small-scale shifts in use of habitat niches may represent a significant benefit at the community level because environmental resources are used more efficiently (Nilsson 1966).

Juvenile coho salmon are known to be highly aggressive compared to other juvenile salmonids; thus they may compete with hatchery or naturally produced spring and summer/fall chinook, steelhead or rainbow trout, and resident fishes under certain conditions. For example, in a study conducted by Stein et al. (1972) in an artificial stream, coho socially dominated **fall chinook**, and fall chinook grew faster alone than with coho present. However, Lister and Genoe (1970) suggested that coho and fall chinook do not interact in the natural environment because of size-related differences in microhabitat selection. Coho salmon displaced **spring chinook** from preferred microhabitats in the Wenatchee River drainage but did not measurably affect their growth or survival (Spaulding et al. 1989). YIN snorkeling surveys, as discussed under "Predation" above, showed that spring chinook and coho use different microhabitats (Dunnigan and Hubble 1998). Groot and Margolis (1991) also suggest that there is little habitat overlap between chinook and other salmonids including coho and sockeye, and that this habitat segregation provides a possible mechanism for reducing ecological interactions between the species.

Coho salmon and **rainbow/steelhead trout** are reported to share habitat along the western coast of North America from California to British Columbia (Frasier 1969; Hartman 1965; Johnston 1967; Burns 1971), with both species residing in freshwater for extended periods (Groot and Margolis 1991). However, the reported impacts of the presence of coho salmon on rainbow/steelhead trout are conflicting. Coho were shown not to affect steelhead growth or habitat use in the Wenatchee River (steelhead occupied different microhabitats than salmon) (Spaulding et al. 1989), and coho affected steelhead habitat use only to a small extent in another Washington stream (Allee 1974, 1981). However, Hartman (1965) concluded that strong habitat selection occurred in the spring and summer as a result of aggressive behaviors which were differentially directed by coho against steelhead in pools and by steelhead against coho in riffle habitats.

Coho salmon have been shown to displace **cutthroat trout** from pool habitat into riffle habitat (Glova 1984; 1986; 1987; Bisson et al. 1988), even though both species preferred pool habitat in the absence of the other species. Tripp and McCart (1983) observed increasing negative impacts on cutthroat trout growth and survival as coho stocking densities increased.

In 1998, the YIN conducted field experiments to address the impacts of coho on the growth, abundance, and broad-scale geographical displacement of cutthroat and rainbow/steelhead trout. Researchers found no evidence that coho salmon influenced the abundance of cutthroat or rainbow trout when they compared the abundance of each species at sites where coho were

stocked as well as where coho were not stocked. Coho abundance was largely related to stocking location. In addition, they found no evidence that coho affected the growth of cutthroat or rainbow trout when they compared the condition factor of each species in areas with and without coho (Dunnigan and Hubble 1998).

Researchers were unable to locate any studies that investigated competitive interactions between **bull trout** and coho salmon. However, Underwood et al. (1992) investigated competitive interactions between hatchery steelhead and spring chinook juveniles and juvenile bull trout and concluded that competition between these species of hatchery fish and bull trout was not affecting abundance of bull trout or their use of microhabitats.

Little competitive interaction is expected between bull trout and coho smolts released in the mid-Columbia tributaries. Bull trout typically spawn in tributaries to the Wenatchee and Methow Rivers. Spawn timing in these tributaries is most likely similar to general patterns observed for the species, is related to water temperature and generally occurs from September to October (Pratt 1992). Spawning and rearing of bull trout is thought to be primarily restricted to relatively pristine and cold streams, often within the headwater reaches (Rieman and McIntyre 1993). The geographic overlap of the juvenile bull trout rearing habitat and the coho migratory path would be minimal for coho releases because the majority of juvenile bull trout rearing habitat is believed to occur upstream of proposed coho acclimation sites. Any opportunity for interaction with migrating smolts would be further limited due to the migratory behavior of coho smolts.

No published studies were found that demonstrated complete competitive exclusion (species extirpation) by coho of any species.

Rapid out-migration of hatchery fish is believed to decrease the risk of ecological interaction to wild fish (Steward and Bjornn 1990). Recent studies in the Yakima basin found that, on average, actively migrating PIT-tagged coho smolts migrated approximately 30.1 km (18.8 miles) per day. The later the fish were released and the higher the volume of water flowing in the river, the faster the fish moved. Migration rates for coho released in the mid-Columbia tributaries are expected to be similar.

Competition that results directly from the release of hatchery coho smolts would likely be negligible due to the fact that coho would be actively migrating downstream and therefore have limited time to interact with individual fish species. Implementing the following mitigation measures as appropriate would minimize the risk further:

- releasing coho smolts in low densities;
- avoiding or delaying releases in habitat for sensitive species (except when the point of the research is to test interactions with a specific species);
- releasing fish that more closely resemble sizes of wild coho⁵; and

⁵ Throughout the geographic range of coho salmon, length at smoltification is relatively consistent. Groot and Margolis (1991) reported that mean smolt size in yearling smolts ranged from 75 (Andersen and Narver 1975) to 122 mm fork length (McHenry 1981), and smolt size in Minter Creek, Washington ranged from 95-106 mm (Salo and Bayliff 1958).

- waiting until smolts are ready to actively migrate before releasing them.

If the project moves to Phase 2 and stocking or natural production significantly increases coho densities, the risk of adverse competition effects could increase. However, this is not expected to occur during the timeframe of this EA, particularly because most returning coho adults would be collected as broodstock, so little natural production is expected during this period.

Residualism is the tendency of hatchery smolts to delay or avoid what would otherwise be normal outmigration in the spring. The spatial and annual incidence of residualism is typically highly variable. When fish residualize, they become a part of the stream-reared fish community, competing with resident fish for resources such as food and space, and becoming potential predators (or prey). Residualism for coho has received little study. Recent experience with mid-Columbia coho releases, however, shows that when researchers remove the barriers at coho acclimation sites, the fish leave quickly. The incidence of coho residualism is expected to be minimized through acclimation and volitional releases and would be monitored in both the Wenatchee and Methow basins through the proposed snorkeling surveys. Coho residualism is being studied in more detail in the Yakima basin. Whether the expected low residualism would continue with subsequent generations is more open to question and is expected to be the subject of future studies.

In sum, because coho released during the period covered by this EA are expected to migrate quickly and therefore limit the risk of competition with other species, broad geographical displacement and reduced survival of other salmonid populations is not expected.

Transfer of Disease

In general, artificially propagated fish are more prone to suffer from infectious diseases and parasites than their wild counterparts because they live under unnaturally crowded conditions where transmission of infectious agents is more efficient. In addition, hatchery rearing conditions and artificial diets may result in stress or nutritional imbalances that affect the physical condition of hatchery fish and their resistance to disease organisms. Among the normal suite of viral, bacterial, fungal and protozoan diseases known to infect salmonids in the Columbia River basin, the most important for coho are bacterial kidney disease (BKD) and "cold water disease." Concerns were raised during scoping for this EA that such diseases could be transmitted from hatchery-reared coho to wild fish of other species, thus increasing the incidence of infection among wild stocks.

The presumed risk is from two sources: first from hatchery coho smolts released into these locations and later, from adult fish returning to spawn. Upriver salmonids have been documented holding in the lower reaches of lower Columbia River tributaries where they may become exposed to infectious agents in that sub-basin and later show overt disease when they arrive at their upriver "home." Using genetic "fingerprinting" methods, researchers have documented the movement of strains of infectious agents within the Columbia River basin that are believed to be due to the migration of adult salmonids (Jim Winton, USFS, personal communication, 1999).

Because anadromous fish are already in the subject watersheds and because coho salmon are more resistant than steelhead or chinook salmon to the viral and bacterial pathogens of concern,

the added risk from this source seems limited. Virtually all of the infectious diseases affecting hatchery coho salmon in the Columbia River basin are thought to occur in wild fish or in the natural environment. Most Columbia basins have or have had the major diseases of concern. For example, BKD is prevalent in essentially all hatchery and wild stocks of salmonids in the Columbia River basin (Jim Winton, USGS, personal communication, 1999).

A recent literature review by Miller et al. (1990) found that, in spite of the comparatively high incidence of disease among hatchery stocks, there is little evidence that diseases or parasites are routinely transmitted from hatchery to wild fish. This review found a number of studies indicating that bacterial kidney disease was *not* transmitted from infected hatchery outplants.

"Cold-water disease" is a significant risk to coho, particularly in the higher-elevation tributaries of the Wenatchee and Methow basins. When water temperature in the hatchery falls below about 40° F, potentially lethal bacterial outbreaks can develop. The disease is treated using antibiotics, but it is not always effective. Because coho smolts and adults are less susceptible to this disease and because the causative bacterium is already free-living in the watershed, other salmonids in the basin would not be placed at significantly greater risk from this disease.

Hatchery-reared fish are prone, through proximity, to contract a variety of fungal, protozoan, and helminth parasites that are relatively easy to diagnose, and chemical treatment of the holding water normally is effective. Any potential risk of transmitting most internal and external parasites of salmonid fish from hatchery to wild situations would be confined to the brief period during outmigration and would therefore be limited.

All phases of broodstock development, fish transfers, and smolt releases would follow the fish health policy documented in *Policies and Procedures for Columbia Basin Anadromous Salmonid Hatcheries* (IHOT 1995). Rigorous sanitation and use of disinfecting procedures combined with optimum husbandry, isolation and quarantine practices and a strong diagnostic and therapeutic program would minimize fish health concerns and reduce any potential for adverse effects from disease transmission by released coho to a low risk.

3.3.2 Hatchery Releases Alternative

3.3.2.1 Genetic Effects

Artificial Selection

The potential to reduce in the broodstock existing levels of divergence from natural populations resulting from artificial selection likely would be lower than the Tribal or Phased Study alternatives because fish would not be acclimated in natural surroundings. However, as this is a long-term benefit of the program, domestication effects during the period covered by this EA would likely be about the same as in the Tribal and Phased Study alternatives.

Genetic Variability

The same IHOT breeding procedures would be used as for the other alternatives. The potential for problems of maintaining genetic variability would also be the same.

Straying

The potential for adult straying would be similar to the Tribal and Phased Study alternatives.

3.3.2.2 Ecological Interactions

Predation

The potential for direct predation could be less than the Tribal and Phased Study alternatives because, with one release site located lower in the basin, the spatial overlap with other species of concern (spring chinook and steelhead young of the year) would be more limited. In addition, the total number of coho released would be lower than for the Tribal and Phased Study alternatives, further limiting the opportunities for interactions with other species. Because no direct predation study is proposed, the specific risk to spring chinook is lower as well. However, because no monitoring of these effects is proposed, there is little risk protection.

The potential for indirect predation may be greater than the Tribal and Phased Study alternatives. Large masses of fish moving downstream at once might attract predators, but could also shield other salmonids from predators.

Competition

Even with larger numbers of coho released in one place, competition would, like the Tribal and Phased Study alternatives, not be significant because the coho would move out of the area quickly, and therefore any effects would be limited.

Transfer of Disease

The types of diseases to which the coho would be susceptible would be the same as described in 3.3.1.1. While the same IHOT protocols would be followed to reduce the potential for hatchery-reared fish to acquire disease, the potential might be greater than the Tribal and Phased Study alternatives because densities in hatchery rearing ponds are higher than in the proposal's natural acclimation ponds. Higher fish densities during rearing create greater stress and susceptibility to some diseases and greater potential to encounter diseased fish. On the other hand, any potential that exists to transfer disease to other species could be less than the Tribal and Phased Study alternatives because fewer coho would be released and they would be released directly from the hatchery, which is located lower in the basin. Therefore the spatial overlap with non-migrating spring chinook and steelhead juveniles would be limited, and any potential to transfer disease to these fish would be reduced.

3.3.3 No Action

3.3.3.1 Genetic Effects

Artificial Selection

Under the No Action alternative, there would be no potential to reduce in the broodstock existing levels of divergence resulting from artificial selection. This is because Lower Columbia River stocks of fish would be bred and reared in lower Columbia River hatcheries, trucked to the mid-

Columbia basins, and released, without acclimation in the mid-Columbia. However, during the period covered by this EA, the differences between this and other alternatives would be negligible.

Genetic Variability

The same IHOT breeding procedures would be used as for the other alternatives. The potential for problems of maintaining genetic variability also would be the same.

Straying

The potential for straying is much higher than for the other alternatives because the fish, having been bred and reared in lower Columbia waters, could be imprinted on those waters enough to return there to spawn rather than continue several hundred more miles up the Columbia River. Studies from the Yakima basin show that the number of adult fish passing McNary Dam (on the Columbia River below the Yakima system) that also passed Prosser Dam (on the Yakima) was significantly higher for acclimated fish (48%) than for non-acclimated fish (13%) (CTWSR et al. 1997).

3.3.3.2 Ecological Interactions

Predation

There could be some potential for direct predation because release sites are unknown; depending on how far up in the basin they are released, spatial overlap with other species of concern (spring chinook and steelhead young-of-the-year) could occur. However, no direct predation study is proposed, so the potential for direct take would not exist. However, because no monitoring of effects is proposed, there is little risk protection.

The potential for indirect predation would be similar to the Hatchery Releases alternative because of the large masses of fish moving downstream at once that may both attract predators as well as shield other salmonids from predators.

Competition

The potential for competition would be similar to the other alternatives because the coho would move out of the area quickly, and therefore any substantial effects would be limited.

Transfer of Disease

The potential to transfer disease would be similar to the Hatchery Releases alternative.

3.4 Effects of Hatchery Modifications, Acclimation Site Development and Facilities Operations

3.4.1 Proposed Action and Phased Study

Impacts of the Proposed Action and Phased Study alternatives would be similar; however, any hatchery capacity increases required to accommodate Methow basin releases would not be required under the Phased Study alternative.

Spawning, incubating, rearing, and releasing coho and collecting broodstock could take place in the following places:

Wenatchee River Basin (Figure 2)

Adult Capture—Adult broodstock collection could occur at Priest Rapids, Rocky Reach and/or Wells dams on the Columbia River (Figure 1); at tributary sites such as Tumwater Dam, Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery, and the Chiwawa River weir (Eastbank facility); and from stray adults returning to any of the mid-Columbia hatcheries.

Adult Holding and Spawning—Tentatively this would occur at the Entiat National Fish Hatchery, but it could occur at another facility. Potentially adults could be held and spawned at the Leavenworth NFH.

Egg Incubation and Juvenile Rearing—This could be done at the Entiat NFH (Figure 1). Potentially, if incubation and/or rearing space is limited at Entiat, the activity could occur at Winthrop, Leavenworth, Turtle Rock, or other appropriate Federal, State, PUD or Tribal facility.

Acclimation and Release—Potential sites (Figure 2) are White River Side Channels (White River); Two Rivers (confluence of Little Wenatchee and White rivers); Butcher Creek and Swamp Creek (Nason Creek); Hatchery Side Channel or pond (Icicle Creek); and Chiwaukum Creek. A maximum of three potential sites would be developed.

Monitoring—Juvenile migration monitoring would most likely incorporate the use of rotary traps located in the river/creek channel or in an irrigation diversion (i.e., Dryden) upstream of the fish screens. Electro-fishing and/or beach seining might be used as alternatives to trapping. Juvenile distribution/abundance monitoring would be done primarily through snorkel surveys.

Adult monitoring could occur at Rock Island and Rocky Reach dams on the Columbia River, at Tumwater and Dryden dams on the Wenatchee, and at the adult broodstock weir on the Chiwawa River. The potential exists to install remote underwater video camera monitoring systems.

Methow River Basin (Figure 3)

Adult Capture—Primarily Wells Dam but secondarily at Priest Rapids and Tumwater dams.

Adult Holding and Spawning—Winthrop NFH.

Egg Incubation and Juvenile Rearing—Winthrop NFH and/or Entiat NFH, or other appropriate Federal, State, PUD or Tribal facility.

Acclimation and Release—Existing sites (Figure 3) at Eightmile Creek Ponds (Chewuch River), Upper Methow River (Rockview Ditch), Biddle Ponds (Wolf Creek), and Winthrop NFH.

Monitoring—Wells, Rocky Reach, and McNary dams.

3.4.1.1 Hatchery Modifications

In order to study whether a locally adapted broodstock can be developed in the mid-Columbia basins, researchers suggest that coho for this project be bred and reared at mid-Columbia hatcheries rather than in lower Columbia hatcheries as they are now. Space available at existing

mid-Columbia facilities would be used if at all possible. If all basin hatcheries are at capacity or otherwise unavailable, temporary facilities would be installed at an existing site.

If Winthrop National Fish Hatchery is used for coho broodstock development, the existing water supply would need to be increased in late spring/early summer 1999 to be able to rear 250,000 coho. Either the existing buried line from a ditch off the Methow River could be tapped, or a temporary pipe from the intake at the ditch could be used. In addition, if the hatchery is at capacity for rearing fish, portable, temporary raceways would be used for the coho research.

Potential effects of improvements at any hatcheries used for this study would be negligible because all work would be done within the confines of the existing hatchery properties. No new property would be acquired, so land uses would not change. The ground already has been disturbed at each site, so any excavation required is unlikely to uncover cultural resources. In the unlikely event that cultural materials are uncovered during construction, work in the immediate vicinity of the project would be halted, and the facility operators (e.g., USFWS in the case of Winthrop NFH) would consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer and a qualified archaeologist. BPA and the hatchery managers will ensure that any human remains encountered are treated in a respectful manner.

3.4.1.2 Hatchery Operations

For any of the hatchery facilities, downstream water users, including irrigators, probably would not be affected by increased withdrawals or discharges because water is passed through the system and discharged in the same amounts. The increased production is expected to fall within the operating limits of existing water rights. However, in the event operating limits could be exceeded, the additional water right would be obtained from WDOE before proceeding.

Depending on which facilities are used, discharge permits (NPDES) from the State of Washington may need to be modified for the increased production.

Adding coho production to existing facility operations would increase the amount of waste products, primarily fish feces and unconsumed fish food. Most of the fish wastes settle to the bottom of the rearing tanks and raceways, with a small percentage remaining suspended and discharged. Through routine cleaning practices, waste products accumulating in rearing structures are pumped to the facility settling basins. The basins detain raceway cleaning effluent and allow fish wastes to settle out of the water column. Wastes that accumulate in the settling basins degrade naturally, but might require more frequent periodic removal and disposal (normally every 5 to 10 years) with the additional production. Depending on current hatchery practices, this waste material might be offered to local farms for agricultural fertilizer, or applied to facility land. It could also be placed in a certified landfill.

Carcasses of any returned spawned adult fish must also be disposed of seasonally. Most hatcheries make specific disposal arrangements annually. Depending on a particular hatchery's practices, fish carcasses might also be incorporated into local composting programs or used as fertilizer, rather than disposed of by conventional means.

The addition of coho production to operations at any hatchery might require the increased use of several chemicals classified as medicines for fish disease prevention and control, including formalin (a saturated formaldehyde solution). In addition, MS-222, an anesthetic, is used primarily during transport of fish or when taking measurements (see section 4.5, Analytical Methods). MS-222 would be used in accordance with U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) requirements to calm fish and reduce stress.

These chemicals are already part of most normal hatchery operations. Only formalin is considered a potentially dangerous waste. The formalin would be considered a listed hazardous waste as formaldehyde. Project facilities must comply with the dangerous waste generator requirements of WAC 173-303-070(8) if it becomes necessary to dispose of more than 1 kilogram (2.2 pounds) of formaldehyde at one time. Because coho production is not expected to add significantly to formalin use and is normally used up by a hatchery during operations, the potential coho production facilities are not expected to be classified dangerous waste generators as a result of this project.

Several compounds routinely used at fish hatcheries, including formalin, are listed in 40 CFR 302 as requiring a report to be filed with the National Response Center within 24 hours if a spill above a certain amount (or reportable quantity) occurs. The addition of coho production to any of the existing hatcheries is not expected to increase the spill potential of any of these compounds, most of which are not stored at hatcheries in quantities that would be reportable if spilled.

Chemicals used for this project would be handled, applied, and disposed of in accordance with FDA, EPA, and the Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE) regulations. Consequently, adverse environmental effects from chemical use at project facilities are not anticipated.

3.4.1.3 Development and Use of Acclimation Sites

Figures 4 and 5 show a typical acclimation site. Existing ponds or canals would be used wherever possible. The purpose of acclimation ponds is to help hatchery-reared juvenile fish begin to adapt to the natural environment. Coho would be trucked from the hatchery to the ponds as pre-smolts and allowed to acclimate in the ponds. Temporary barrier nets would be placed at the inlets and outlets to the ponds. The nets are tied to trees on the banks, or are anchored with sandbags, concrete blocks, or heavy chains. They remain in place from about mid-March to mid-June. In other cases an outlet structure with a screen and water level controls such as **damboards** may be used. When it is clear to researchers that the fish are ready to begin their downstream migration (they have reached optimum smoltification), the barrier between the ponds and access to the main river or creek is removed, and the smolts exit when they are ready. Impacts of releases are discussed in section 3.3.

Figure 5: Top photo -- Swamp Creek site; Bottom photo -- White River Side Channel site

Methow Basin Sites

Acclimation ponds were developed in the Methow basin (Figure 3) for use in spring 1998. Their development was categorically excluded from NEPA evaluation because it occurred before fish species were listed as threatened and endangered in that basin. No new development would be required there. Temporary water rights that were granted for previous years' operations would need to be renewed. The minor impacts of operations, as described below for the Wenatchee basin sites, would be similar to those that have previously occurred in the Methow basin. One site, the Rockview Ditch, has not yet been used, but only temporary nets would need to be placed, so adverse impacts are not expected.

Wenatchee Basin Sites

Six sites are proposed for the Wenatchee basin which require varying levels of development. They are (Figure 2):

- Hatchery Side Channel or pond (Icicle Creek);
- Butcher Creek (Nason Creek);
- Swamp Creek (Nason Creek);
- White River Side Channels (White River);
- Two Rivers (near where the Little Wenatchee and White rivers enter Lake Wenatchee);
- Chiwaukum Creek.

Only two sites are proposed for use in 1999 -- Leavenworth Hatchery pond and Butcher Creek. One or more of the remaining four would be developed in 1999 for use beginning in 2000. Some resource impacts and permitting processes are similar for most or all of the proposed new acclimation sites; they are discussed below under "**General Impacts.**" Other impacts are site-specific, because the resources and amount of development at each site are different. These impacts are discussed under "**Site-Specific Impacts.**"

General Impacts

Land Use. Most of the proposed sites in the Wenatchee basin use existing ponds or waterways. Only two would convert land to ponds, and each site would use less than 0.8 hectare (2 acres) of land. All new ponds proposed for the project would be earthen-lined; no concrete would be used. New roads would not be needed, nor would existing roads need to be upgraded.

Water rights. Temporary water rights would need to be obtained from the WDOE for two of the sites—Two Rivers and Chiwaukum Creek. These water rights are for approximately two months annually (end of March to June 1) when flows are well above optimum levels. As long as the water intake and outfall are close to each other, the permits are rated non-consumptive because all water diverted through an acclimation pond is returned to the source. Irrigators are unlikely to be affected because flows normally are high enough during that period to supply their needs as well as those of the fish. All water rights would be obtained before the new ponds are developed.

Wastewater. Because the net biomass increase for each acclimation pond is less than 9,091 kg (20,000 lbs.), a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit generally is not required under Washington State environmental law as administered by WDOE.

At each site, a technician, residing in a trailer, would feed the fish in the acclimation pond and monitor their condition. The trailer would be self-contained, so no wastewater would be discharged at the site.

Ownership. The Hatchery Side Channel and pond are located on land owned by the USFWS. Butcher Creek and Two Rivers are on private property. The Chiwaukum and Swamp Creek sites are located on USFS land. Depending on final location and design, the White River Side Channel site could be on either USFS or private land. Permission to develop and use these sites must be obtained from those owners before work is done. A land use permit would be required from the USFS before sites on USFS land could be developed or used. Depending on the level of development, the USFS could require a site-specific design; could require surveys for all listed plant and wildlife species, for "Survey and Managed Species" defined in the Northwest Forest Plan (USDA FS/USDI BLM 1994), and for cultural resources; and would prepare its own NEPA document before a permit would be considered.

Recreation/Visual Resources. The Wenatchee basin is popular for a variety of recreational uses including boating (rafting, kayaking, canoeing), hiking, mountain biking, skiing, and snowmobiling, to name only a few. Because all proposed acclimation sites are on side channels or in backwater areas rather than on mainstem creeks or rivers, recreational boaters would not be affected. No sites would adversely affect proposed or candidate Wild, Scenic, or Recreational rivers. (See also discussion of Hatchery Side Channel and pond and White River Side Channel sites.) Recreational users of nearby areas, whether on land or water, are unlikely to notice the nets or other barriers, although they might notice new ponds at the Chiwaukum Creek site (see below). New ponds would be developed to look like and function as part of the natural environment, so adverse visual impacts are not expected. Roads to a few sites, including the USFS road to the White River Side Channels, may need to be plowed in the early spring to facilitate access by researchers, but none are designated snowmobile or ski trails. However, the USFS road is used by a few residents, snowmobilers and cross-country skiers, who might prefer the road unplowed. If so, alternative modes of access that would not require the road to be plowed might be used.

National Trails, Wilderness Areas, National Parks, or other specially designated areas would not be affected.

In sum, adverse impacts to recreational users near any of the proposed acclimation sites are not expected.

Sensitive Plants. Four sensitive plant species were identified in the project area: Wenatchee checker mallow, Wenatchee larkspur, Ute ladies tresses, and Showy stick-seed.

Of the four, two have potential to be affected by project activities. The Wenatchee (Oregon) checker-mallow (*Sidalcea oregana* var. *calva*), is classified as Proposed Endangered under ESA. It is found in the Leavenworth Ranger District in dry forest and moist meadows, and at stream margins generally within ponderosa pine forest. It is associated with Wenatchee larkspur

(*Delphinium viridescens*)--a USFS species of concern--and quaking aspen in moister sites. This habitat would be similar to that associated with the proposed acclimation sites.

The Showy stick-seed (soon to be proposed for listing) is found in Tumwater Canyon on steep, gravelly slopes (Ken MacDonald, USFS, personal communication, 1999). Although the Chiwaukum Creek site is near the canyon, the site would be on level terrain, so this plant species is unlikely to be affected.

The Ute ladies tresses is listed as Threatened. Although it has been found in the Okanogan in a similar climate zone, it has not been found on the Wenatchee National Forest (Ken MacDonald, USFS, personal communication, 1999), where all the proposed new acclimation sites are located. Therefore, the Ute ladies tresses is not expected to be affected.

At four acclimation sites, impacts to vegetation are not expected due to the limited and temporary nature of the development. At two sites (Two Rivers and Chiwaukum Creek), pond and/or channel construction could destroy some vegetation. These sites will be surveyed for the presence of sensitive species before ground-disturbing work begins. If sensitive species are found, the site would not be developed or would be moved to avoid impacts.

Floodplains. Under Executive Order 11988, Federal agencies must avoid or minimize adverse impacts associated with short-term or long-term modification and occupancy of floodplains. Modification and destabilization of the floodplain could have potentially adverse effects not only near the disturbance, but also in the stream channel and floodplain downstream. Adverse impacts could include increased potential for erosion of floodplain soil and sediment near the sites.

All but the Hatchery Side Channel/pond and Chiwaukum Creek sites are in 100-year floodplains. Effects on floodplains at each site are described under "Site-Specific Impacts" below.

Wetlands. Most if not all the proposed acclimation sites are likely to be in wetlands. However, only work at the Two Rivers and Chiwaukum Creek sites would create enough disturbance to potentially adversely affect wetlands and to require a Section 404 Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). Exact wetland locations would be delineated before final siting and construction. If these sites are found to be in wetlands, the following measures would be taken.

To avoid impacts on wetlands at acclimation sites, information from delineation surveys would be used during final design to develop mitigation measures, if necessary, to ensure that the project would result in no net loss of wetlands. Review and concurrence through the Corps' permit process would be completed as necessary before site development. Disturbance of wetlands would be avoided whenever possible. Buffers from construction activities would be provided. If disturbance could not be avoided, the area of disturbance would be minimized to the extent practicable. Upon completion of construction, disturbed land would be restored to its previous condition wherever possible.

Wildlife. The project area supports a variety of wildlife that inhabits forested and riparian areas. Species include several considered sensitive, including species listed as Threatened or Endangered under ESA: Bald eagle, peregrine falcon, northern spotted owl, grizzly bear, and gray wolf (in addition to the fish species discussed in section 3.3.1.2). Development work

proposed could temporarily disturb species occupying areas at and near acclimation sites, but because habitat would not be destroyed and the project would not increase long-term human use of the areas, no wildlife, including sensitive species, are expected to be adversely affected. See also discussions under Butcher Creek, White River Side Channels, and Two Rivers sites.

Development and use of the acclimation sites would not likely impact the growth, relative distribution or abundance of endangered, threatened, or sensitive species in the mid-Columbia region. Although development of two acclimation sites would require some ground disturbance, only minor amounts of in-stream sediment would be produced for a short time during construction.

Any sediments produced by development of acclimation sites would not adversely affect bull trout redds because most spawning areas for bull trout in the Wenatchee basin are upstream of proposed acclimation sites. Although some spawning areas for other sensitive species could be downstream of the two acclimation sites where digging would be required, work would be timed to avoid spawning, coffer dams would be used to minimize sedimentation, and no trees would be removed from riparian areas.

Site-specific impacts

Hatchery Side Channel or pond. The side channel at Leavenworth NFH is actually the original channel of Icicle Creek. In 1939-1940, as part of the Leavenworth Hatchery construction, a bypass channel was constructed and the original channel was dammed off at both the upper and lower ends. The original channel was used to hold adults prior to spawning, but also has been used for other studies. The USFWS has not used it for several years. The dams at either end of the channel are designed to allow control of the flow through the channel, and can be modified to allow fish passage both into and out of the channel. In the past, a few salmonids--spring chinook, bull trout, and a very few steelhead--have used the channel to reach spawning areas further upstream (G. Pratschner, USFWS, personal communication, 1999).

A temporary smolt screen would be added to the existing water control structure. Water would be supplied from an existing structure. Dredging of the channel is being undertaken by other entities for a different project and could result in a minor, temporary increase in sedimentation downstream of the work. However, development undertaken as part of the Mid-Columbia Coho Reintroduction Project would not disturb the natural environment.

An alternative would be to acclimate coho in an existing pond at the hatchery. No changes would be needed at the hatchery to use this pond for acclimation. This is proposed for 1999.

The Wenatchee National Forest recommends that Icicle Creek in this area be classified as a Recreational River under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the Forest manages the river to preserve the values that support that classification. Installation of a temporary smolt screen and use of the channel for fish acclimation would not adversely affect the recreational and other values of Icicle Creek.

A local interest group has proposed to USFWS that the dams and other structures in the channel be removed altogether, to restore the channel and allow full access to it by fish for spawning and

rearing habitat. That proposal is the subject of an environmental process currently being launched by the USFWS. They expect to issue a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement on the proposal in the near future.

The use of the side channel for acclimating coho as proposed under the Tribal and Phased Study alternatives would not interfere with either allowing fish passage through the channel, or with the proposal to remove the dams. In discussions with YIN and USFWS, it was agreed that the coho acclimation would be accomplished in a manner that would not block the channel to migrating fish. If the decision is made to remove the dams and other structures, either the coho acclimation would remain at the hatchery pond, or provisions would be made to allow acclimation under the new conditions. Nothing in this proposal would preclude or prejudice the outcome of the USFWS EIS on restoring the habitat of the Icicle Creek channel.

Butcher Creek. This site, just off Highway 2, is an existing beaver pond. Water would come from Butcher Creek. A smolt exit pipe approximately 5 centimeters (12 inches) in diameter would be installed through the beaver dam using hand tools, to provide smolt access to Nason Creek for their downstream migration. A temporary net would be placed upstream of the dam until smolts were ready to migrate.

The beaver is one of two species (the ruffed grouse is the other) selected by the Wenatchee National Forest as the management indicator species for riparian habitats⁶. The beaver could be disturbed while the pipe is being installed, but the primary effect would be that the water level behind the dam might be lowered slightly. If this happens, the beaver might try to build the dam higher to raise the water level, but the animal would not likely leave the area permanently, nor would its survival be threatened.

The site is in a 100-year floodplain, parts of which are classified as subject to shallow flooding (between 0.3 and 1 m [1 - 3 feet]), and is also a wetland. Floodplain and wetland characteristics would not be changed by use of this site as proposed.

Swamp Creek. This site is about 1.6 km (1 mi) north of Coles Corner on the road to Lake Wenatchee. It is an existing side channel of Nason Creek that was formed by the highway. Springs and seeps supply water. A culvert under the road connects the wetland and side channel to the main creek. The only work that is required at this site would be to place a temporary net upstream of the road culvert until the smolts are ready to migrate. Although the site is in a 100-year floodplain and is a wetland, development and use of the site as proposed would not change floodplain or wetland characteristics or values. A permit to use the culvert might be required from Washington Department of Transportation.

White River Side Channels. This site, on existing side channels of the White River, is approximately 2.4 km (1.5 mi) south of the Nepeequa Crossing Campground. Water is supplied to the site naturally by the White River. Similar to the Butcher Creek site, the only work required would be to place a temporary net upstream of the main river until the smolts are ready to migrate, and to place a smolt exit pipe through a beaver dam. Impacts of this activity would be similar to the Butcher Creek site.

⁶ Management indicator species are those whose population parameters appear to show the effects of land management practices on specific types of wildlife habitat (USDA FS 1990).

The Forest Service designated the White River in this area as eligible for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic Rivers system as a Recreational River. It is being managed to preserve the resource values that support that designation. The site is also in a 100-year floodplain and probably a wetland. However, because of the temporary nature of the modifications required at this site, the work would not adversely affect the recreational and other values of the White River or the floodplain/wetland characteristics and values.

Two Rivers. This site, near where the Little Wenatchee and White rivers enter Lake Wenatchee, is on the property of an operating sand and gravel mine (Two Rivers Sand and Gravel). Ponds would be constructed in an already mined area using a bulldozer and backhoe. Shallow depressions to groundwater level also would be dug, from which water would be pumped (using a temporary pump) to supply the ponds. Both the acclimation and water supply ponds may be lined with plastic if they won't hold water without it. A channel up to 150 meters (500 feet) long would be dug from the ponds to the Little Wenatchee River to provide an exit for the smolts.

The site of the proposed ponds has already been disturbed and cleared of vegetation. The exit channel, however, would disturb or destroy riparian and/or wetland vegetation for a distance of about 80 meters (260 feet). Plant surveys would be done before ponds and channels are designed and constructed to determine if any sensitive species occupy the area. If any sensitive species are found, the areas would be avoided.

The site is in a 100-year floodplain and the channel probably would be in a wetland. The sand and gravel company's operating permit does not allow disturbance within 76 m (250 ft) of the river. Permits to work in wetlands and shoreline areas could be required (see section 4.7). County authorities would be contacted to ensure that the construction would not alter floodplain or floodway characteristics or channel flow capacity. Certain design restrictions or limitations could apply. Ensuring that construction would not raise the expected level of the 100-year flood and would not include use of impervious surfaces would mitigate construction impacts within the 100-year floodplain. Sediment levels in the Little Wenatchee River would be unlikely to increase noticeably while the channel is being dug because no water would be flowing in the channel during the digging, and a temporary coffer dam using sandbags would be used at the outlet to the river to prevent sediment from entering the river.

Before designs are finalized, specific wetland locations would be delineated. The following measures would be taken, when practicable, to assure minimal impacts to wetlands.

- 1) In shoreline areas, disturbed land would be restored as closely as possible to pre-project contours and replanted with native and local species. However, site topography could require riverbank disruption. A restoration and monitoring plan would be prepared before shoreline areas were disturbed.
- 2) Erosion control measures would be implemented within the 60-m (200-ft.) State Shoreline area (see section 4.4.2).

Also see discussion "General Impacts - Wetlands" above.

Because the pond site has been disturbed already, cultural resources are unlikely to be affected. A cultural resources survey on the channel area would be done before ground-disturbing work

takes place. If cultural resources are found during the survey or during construction, procedures set forth in relevant regulations and guidelines would be followed (see section 3.4.1.1 and 4.6).

Noise from construction vehicles and operation of the pump would be temporary and unlikely to be more disturbing to wildlife or nearby visitors than that from the sand and gravel operation itself.

Chiwaukum Creek. Ponds, a buried water intake, and an outlet to Chiwaukum Creek would be constructed at a site just off Highway 2, about 1 km (0.6 mi) north of Tumwater Campground. Construction methods would be similar to those described for the Two Rivers site.

The site is not in a 100-year floodplain, but could be in a wetland. Construction activities could have erosion and vegetation impacts similar to the Two Rivers site and require similar permits. The site may have been a hatchery many years ago but apparently has not been disturbed for a long time, so more vegetation could be adversely affected than at the Two Rivers site. The site would be surveyed for the presence of sensitive plant species before ponds and channels are designed and constructed. Exact wetland locations would be delineated before designs are finalized. Mitigation measures similar to those described for the Two Rivers site would be applied.

A cultural resources survey of the site would be done before ground-disturbing work takes place. If cultural resources are found during the survey or during construction, procedures set forth in relevant regulations and guidelines would be followed (see sections 3.4.1.1 and 4.6).

The site is on the Wenatchee National Forest, on land classified in the Forest Plan as "Scenic Travel-Retention" and/or "General Forest." It is near an area classified as Late Successional Reserve, which may be habitat for the endangered spotted owl. A land use permit would be required from the USFS before this site could be developed or used. In addition to the plant and cultural resources surveys described above, the USFS would require a site-specific design; would require surveys for all listed wildlife species and for "Survey and Managed Species" defined in the Northwest Forest Plan (USDA FS/USDI BLM 1994); and would prepare its own NEPA document before a permit would be considered.

The lower portion of Chiwaukum Creek, near the proposed site, is known to contain spring chinook rearing habitat; and bull trout, of a size bordering between migratory and resident, have been seen there (Ken MacDonald, USFS, personal communication, 1999). Coho predation on spring chinook could be a concern at this site (see section 3.3.1.2). Depending on the timing and amounts, withdrawals from Chiwaukum Creek to supply the acclimation ponds could adversely affect habitat for bull trout and spring chinook.

The site also is near a recreational trailhead leading up Chiwaukum Creek towards the Alpine Lakes Wilderness. Access to the trail would not be affected. If this site were developed, construction would take place in late summer or fall 1999, but the USFS would be consulted to determine high-use times so they could be avoided. Once the ponds and intake/outfall structures are constructed, visitors familiar with the site could notice a change, including a security fence, but the view would be brief and would not be within the wilderness area where human modifications are restricted.

If the project does not continue after a few years, the site, without pumped water, would re-grow vegetation. The fence would be removed.

3.4.2 Hatchery Releases Alternative

Less rearing capacity is likely to be required at existing hatcheries compared to the Tribal or Phased Study alternatives. If additional capacity is needed at existing facilities, they would be temporary. As a result, impacts of hatchery modifications and operations would be the same or less than those described in sections 3.4.1.1 and 3.4.1.2.

Because off-site acclimation ponds would not be used under this alternative, no impacts would occur from their development or use in the Wenatchee and Methow basins.

3.4.3 No Action

Coho currently are being bred and reared in lower Columbia River hatcheries to meet requirements under *U.S. v. Oregon*. As a result, no modifications to hatcheries either in the mid- or lower Columbia would be required. Because off-site acclimation ponds would not be used under this alternative, no impacts would occur from their development or use in the Wenatchee and Methow basins.

3.5 Effects of Monitoring Activities

Monitoring activities include marking fish to track their migration and survival; trapping or otherwise collecting fish for measurement and for genetic and direct predation analyses; and surveying habitat. The primary impacts of concern are those to existing populations of other fish species and to other resources in each basin. While researchers would attempt to minimize impacts to coho because the point of the research is to see if coho can survive and reproduce in the mid-Columbia, the coho are research fish; some portion of the introduced population must be sacrificed in order to accomplish certain studies. Because no natural or hatchery-produced populations of coho exist in these basins, the research activities would not adversely affect an existing coho population.

3.5.1 Proposed Action and Phased Study Alternatives

Tracking Methods

Electronic methods are used to track fish to determine movement, distribution, and habitat use by life stages for individual fish, both juvenile and adult. These marking techniques are standard in fishery science.

PIT Tagging: A Passive Integrated Transponder (PIT tag) is a tiny microchip inserted into the abdominal cavity of a fish that allows identification of individual fish. Up to 7,000 fish

annually in the Wenatchee, and 8,000 annually in the Methow, would be PIT tagged. In 1999, the information would be used to estimate survival rates of smolts as they migrate through the system; in 2000, the marking would also help estimate how many return as adults. While these devices do not appear to negatively affect fish movement, some studies indicate that up to 20% of fish marked in this way die, primarily from the stress caused by handling (Prentice et al. 1994).

PIT tag detection will occur at existing dams and facilities. No new facilities would be needed.

Radio-telemetry: Radio transmitters are attached in the gullets of returning adult fish. Up to 100 adults in each basin would be marked at Priest Rapids, Tumwater, and/or Dryden dams (Wenatchee) and at Wells Dam (Methow). The transmitters have little effect on the feeding behavior of returning coho because the fish don't feed while in the spawning stream, and they die after spawning. However, several studies have indicated that adult salmonid mortality due primarily to handling stress may range from 10-15% (Hockersmith et al. 1995; Hockersmith et al. 1994). The marked fish will be followed either on foot, in vehicles, or from the air, or by using a fixed detector at a dam (e.g., Tumwater), to identify spawning locations.

Collection Methods

Methods used to collect fish for analysis purposes include screw traps, electro-fishing and beach seining. Their effects are described below.

Screw traps: A screw trap is a floating rotary trap used to trap juvenile fish moving downstream. Trapped fish would be measured for length and weight and examined for other characteristics. Up to 6,000 captured coho would be sacrificed to examine their stomach contents for evidence of predation on other fish. (See "Analytical Methods" below.)

Up to three screw traps would be placed in the Wenatchee basin (no direct predation studies are proposed in the Methow). Sites would be near acclimation ponds, most likely on Nason Creek, the Chiwawa River (an existing trap operated by WDFW), and the Wenatchee River.

The traps are anchored by a wire to some stable object, such as a tree, on either side of the river or stream. The traps will be in place from April 1 through July 31. Although some sampling would occur during the day, most activity would take place at night between approximately 11 p.m. and 3 a.m., when the fish are most actively moving.

Because one of the primary goals of the research is to study predation on spring chinook, a proposed endangered species under ESA, at least one trap would be sited in known spring chinook habitat. As a result, of the species listed or proposed for listing, spring chinook are most likely to be caught in the traps. A few steelhead and bull trout might also be caught. Summer/fall chinook are not expected to be affected because they tend to spawn and emerge downstream of coho release areas.

Potential impacts to fish include predation by one species on another if too many fish are kept in the livebox too long before being processed; and injury to fish from river debris that may lodge in the trap. Traps will be monitored hourly, if not constantly, to minimize

overcrowding in the livebox and its consequent predation, and to remove debris. Therefore, adverse effects on listed or proposed Threatened and Endangered species, including spring chinook, bull trout, and steelhead, are expected to be minimal.

Although the risk to listed species is expected to be low, the potential for harm requires that a Section 10 permit for a "taking" must be obtained from NMFS under ESA. Such a permit would be required for spring chinook, bull trout and steelhead, and would specify the number of fish of each species that may be "taken" by the project. BPA and project proponents currently are consulting with NMFS to define the allowable take.

Traps also are an obstacle to recreational boaters such as rafters, kayakers, and others, who must pull their craft out of the river to get around the traps. Sites for traps could be on Nason Creek at River Mile 1 and at an existing trap operated by WDFW about 0.9 km (0.5 mi) below Lake Wenatchee. Anchor wires on the traps would be flagged to warn boaters of their presence.

Electro-fishing: This technique would be used as an alternative collection method for direct predation studies in the Wenatchee basin if screw trapping fails to collect enough fish. Up to 6,000 coho would be collected. The sampling would be conducted weekly between April 1 and July 31.

Fish within the sampling area are stunned by an electric current and float to the surface, where they are collected with a net. This technique, like screw trapping, poses a risk to non-target fish, and if done by inexperienced personnel, could injure or kill fish. To reduce the potential for fish mortality, only personnel trained in electro-fishing techniques use this technique. They would follow guidelines for such procedures recently established by NMFS (NMFS 1998). The sites sampled would be near acclimation ponds.

Beach seining: This technique also would be an alternative collection method to screw trapping. Fish are encircled by and then drawn into a large net deployed from a beach. Potential mortality to fish from use of this technique is very low; stress from handling and de-scaling is the primary effect.

Analytical Methods

Fish measurements: All fish captured at screw traps (or using alternative methods), including species listed under the ESA, would be removed from the stream and measured to obtain life history data and to help determine survival rates. MS222 will be used to anesthetize coho. Using standard field techniques, coho removed for measurement are generally out of the stream no more than 15 minutes to half an hour. After the fish are anesthetized, measured and weighed, researchers ensure the fish are swimming well in a recovery pond before releasing them to a quiet area of the stream. Risk of injury or mortality to the fish during handling is minimized by using experienced, technically qualified people to measure the fish.

Coho stomach analysis: Up to 6,000 coho smolts would be captured in screw traps in the Wenatchee Basin and their stomach contents analyzed to determine what they are eating. Of particular concern is whether they prey on spring chinook, because it is the sensitive species

in the basin at greatest risk from coho reintroduction (see section 3.3.1). The coho must be killed in order to perform this research. The 6,000 smolts represent approximately 0.6% of the coho smolts that would be released into the Wenatchee basin. As these fish are considered research fish, this is not considered an adverse effect. Once analyses are complete, carcasses would be disposed as described in section 3.4.1.2.

Genetic sampling: Up to 240 fish would be either adipose fin-clipped or sacrificed for genetic studies. Clipping the adipose fin is done on juveniles. It is a standard research technique and results in minor stress to the fish from handling. Fish sacrificed for genetic studies would be returning adults and would die anyway after spawning. Once analyses are complete, carcasses would be disposed as described in section 3.4.1.2.

Survey Techniques

These techniques are used to count and describe spawning redds and to determine how quickly coho leave release areas. The only effect of these activities is a temporary, minor disturbance of fish in the area.

Redd counts: These surveys would be done basin-wide in the Wenatchee and Methow basins, but would be concentrated near release areas. Researchers would use rafts or walk in streams.

Snorkeling: These surveys would be spot checks near release areas in both basins. Sites would be selected randomly from 3 km (2 mi) above the release sites to the confluence with the Wenatchee River.

3.5.2 Hatchery Releases

Impacts would be the same as for the Proposed Action except there would be no effects of radio-telemetry, screw traps, or redd counts. Snorkeling surveys may be more intensive than for the Proposed Action and Phased Study alternatives but would not increase the minor level of impact.

3.5.3 No Action

Because no monitoring would take place under this alternative, the minor impacts of those activities would not occur.

3.6 Cumulative Fishery Resource Impacts

Regulations implementing NEPA require Federal agencies to consider the cumulative impacts of their proposed actions (40 CFR § 1508.25(c)(1991)). The regulations define cumulative impacts as follows:

"The impact on the environment which results from the incremental impacts of the action when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time." 40 CFR § 1508.7 (1991)

Only cumulative impacts to fishery resources are evaluated. Changes to the physical environment from proposed actions, even in combination with other activities, are too minor to have either significant adverse or beneficial effects.

3.6.1 Releases of Coho in Combination with Releases of Other Species

The *Impacts of Artificial Salmon and Steelhead Production Strategies in the Columbia River Basin Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement* (USFWS 1996) addresses cumulative impacts of all Columbia River basin hatcheries on naturally spawning stocks migrating in the Columbia River mainstem. While a final EIS has not yet been issued, nor a decision reached, the mid-Columbia coho project is not expected to have adverse cumulative effects or to influence the outcome of the Programmatic EIS. BPA believes that the mid-Columbia coho project can and should move forward ahead of the final Programmatic EIS because it meets the criteria in 40 CFR 1506.1 (c).

- The mid-Columbia coho project is independently justified because it is a modification of an existing hatchery program that would, through research, help to answer many of the concerns and issues surrounding the re-establishment of extirpated coho stocks. There are no naturally produced stocks of coho left in the mid-Columbia that would be impacted by these studies, and the results of the studies would aid in determining the impacts of a coho reintroduction program on other anadromous species at risk.
- The cumulative impacts of the project on Columbia River Basin fisheries are addressed in this environmental assessment.
- The project would not prejudice the ultimate decision on the Programmatic EIS because it is a phased, research-level study utilizing relatively low-cost, temporary facilities that are not meant to be permanent and that could easily be adapted to conform with the ultimate programmatic decision.

While this EA specifically addresses the impacts of the program, it includes the following cumulative impact analysis that considers the impacts of this program on the overall Columbia River Basin fishery. The cumulative impact issues that have been raised regarding artificial production of fish in the Columbia River Basin include the following:

- The impacts of large numbers of hatchery fish on naturally-spawned fish in the Columbia River migration corridor, the estuary, and the ocean;
- Genetic fitness impacts on existing natural fish populations; and
- Harvest impacts on natural fish populations.

3.6.2 Migration Corridor Impacts

Questions have been raised as to whether the addition of coho smolts to the Wenatchee and Methow River basins would impact other anadromous smolts as they migrate together to the ocean. The maximum number of coho smolts proposed to be released under this project is 1,400,000, which is only about 0.7% of the total number of hatchery anadromous fish smolts released in the Columbia River basin each year (approximately 197,000,000). The 1.4 million coho smolts are about 4.8% of the total number of hatchery coho to be released in the Columbia River basin in 1999 (29,400,000). Coho have been produced and released from lower river hatcheries for many years. This program would merely result in the movement of fish normally released from these lower river hatcheries to the mid-Columbia for release instead. Therefore, the project fish would not raise the total number of fish migrating through the lower Columbia River, and would not cause increased impacts in estuary or nearshore habitats. They could pose new impacts to fish migrating through the mid-Columbia between the Methow and Wenatchee basins and the lower river hatcheries. However, coho releases have occurred from these basins in the past, and are planned to continue under the *U.S. v. Oregon* agreements, with or without this project. Current plans under *U.S. v. Oregon* call for the release of 1,000,000 coho smolts into the mid-Columbia basins in 1999 (The State of Washington, et al.). The plans of the coho reintroduction project to increase the survival of outmigrating coho smolts may result in increased impacts in the long run because more of them would survive to interact with other fish in the migration corridor than have in the past. However, survival is unlikely to increase enough during the two- to three-year timeframe of this EA to result in a significant increase in coho interactions with other fish in the migration corridor.

3.6.3 Genetic Fitness

Genetic fitness is a concern where a naturally produced anadromous fish population is being supplemented with hatchery-produced fish. In the case of the mid-Columbia coho project, there are no nearby surviving naturally produced anadromous fish populations. All of the mid-Columbia and Snake River coho stocks have been extirpated. The only concern would be if returning mid-Columbia coho adults from this program strayed into naturally produced lower river coho populations. The chances of straying would be lower under the action alternatives than under the existing situation (no action alternative) because the fish would be acclimated. As discussed in 3.3.1.1, acclimation tends to reduce straying. Also, straying coho adults would more likely return to the lower river hatcheries where they were raised than to natural habitats in the lower river.

3.6.4 Harvest

In the long term, the cumulative impacts of Phase 2 of the Mid-Columbia Coho Reintroduction Project (if implemented), in combination with supplementation and other similar projects both

within and outside mid-Columbia basins, could be adverse for some unsupplemented wild stocks, if these projects are successful in increasing runs. Harvest pressure on unsupplemented wild stocks in mixed-stock fisheries might proportionally increase. On the other hand, such projects could also result in positive cumulative benefits for some weaker stocks due to a proportional dilution of weak stocks in the aggregate stock mixture. The Phase 1 activities covered by this EA, however, cannot increase the runs enough to create either increased harvest pressure or benefit.

3.6.5 Increasing Knowledge Surrounding Reintroduction of Extirpated Stocks

The Mid-Columbia Coho project aims to develop knowledge about how a largely domesticated stock might be reintroduced and naturalized in a basin where it has long been absent. This knowledge may be applicable throughout the Columbia basin. When combined with other current and future research on similar issues, the cumulative effect of the mid-Columbia project would be to increase the chances that other reintroduction projects would succeed, and that the concomitant resource risks would be reduced. These activities would serve to answer critical uncertainties associated with future reintroduction activities approved by the NPPC and funded by BPA.

Chapter 4 Consultation, Review and Permit Requirements

4.1 NEPA

The proposed project would be developed in a manner consistent with the National Environmental Policy Act and its implementing regulations, including Department of Energy implementing procedures (10 CFR 1021).

4.2 Threatened and Endangered Species and Critical Habitat

The Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 USC 1536), requires that Federal agencies ensure that their actions do not jeopardize threatened and endangered species and their critical habitats; it also gives review authority to USFWS and NMFS. Section 3.3.1.2 discusses impacts to threatened and endangered fish species in the Methow and Wenatchee basins, and section 3.4.1.3 discusses impacts to wildlife species. There is one federally listed plant species in the project area and one proposed for listing. Impacts are discussed in section 3.4.1.3.

BPA is in the process of consulting with both USFWS and NMFS on the impacts of the project to threatened and endangered species. A biological assessment, based on the discussions in this EA, is being prepared and will be submitted to them for review under Section 7 of the ESA. A Section 10 permit for direct take may also be required for the direct predation study (section 3.5.1). BPA and the Yakama Indian Nation will ensure that all necessary consultations and permits are obtained prior to undertaking the actions proposed in this EA, and that any permit conditions are followed.

4.3 Fish and Wildlife Conservation

Provisions of the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act (16 USC 839 et seq.) are intended to protect, mitigate, and improve conditions for fish and wildlife of the Columbia River and its tributaries. This project is proposed as a part of the NPPC's Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program to fulfill these obligations.

The Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act of 1980 (16 USC 2901 et seq.) encourages Federal agencies to conserve and to promote conservation of non-game fish and wildlife species and their habitats. Measures proposed to mitigate potential impacts on vegetation and on fish and wildlife that are non-target species for this project do this to the maximum extent possible within BPA's statutory responsibility.

The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 USC 661 et seq.) requires that Federal agencies consult with the USFWS whenever an agency plans to conduct, license, or permit an activity involving the impoundment, diversion, deepening, control, or modification of a stream or body of water. BPA is coordinating with the USFWS as a project participant to ensure species protection as required by this act.

4.4 State, Areawide, and Local Plan and Program Consistency

4.4.1 State Permits for Work in Stream Beds

Hydraulic project approval from the WDFW would be obtained to construct any form of hydraulic project or perform other work that would use, divert, obstruct, or change the natural flow of any river or stream that contains fish (RCW 75.20.100, WAC 220-110). This approval would be necessary for the water intake and outfall construction proposed at the Two Rivers and Chiwaukum Creek acclimation sites.

4.4.2 Coastal Zone Management Program

The Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 requires that Federal actions directly affecting the coastal zone be undertaken in a manner consistent, to the maximum extent possible, with the State's coastal zone management program. Washington's coastal zone management program is implemented through the provisions of the State Shorelines Management Act, including shoreline management programs developed/administered by the counties. The Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 also require that proposed Federal facilities fully comply with Federal consistency requirements as determined by and through consultation with a designated coastal zone management agency.

BPA and the WDOE have a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that provides a process for State and local review of BPA projects in and directly affecting shoreline areas in the State. BPA would fully meet its obligations under the MOA, but no permit would be required.

All proposed acclimation sites and/or channels would be subject to requirements under Chelan County's Shoreline Master Program (1979), which takes its guidance from the State of Washington Shorelines Management Act. Although the sites are in areas designated variously as "Natural," "Conservancy," or "Rural," designations which allow different levels of development, because the sites are proposed to enhance fishery resources, they probably would be exempt

from shoreline permits under Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 173-27-040 (Michael Kaputa, Chelan County, personal communication, 1999).

4.5 Wetlands and Floodplains Protection

Wetlands and floodplains could be affected. See section 3.4.1 and 4.7.

4.6 Heritage Conservation

Federal historic and cultural preservation acts include the National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC 470-470w-6), the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC 470aa-470ll), the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act (16 USC 469-469c), the American Antiquities Act (16 USC 431-433), and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC 1996). See sections 3.3.1.1 and 3.4.1.

4.7 Permits for Discharges into Waters of the United States

Minor amounts of dredged or fill material may be discharged to the White River, Chiwaukum Creek or associated wetlands during construction of the acclimation ponds. These activities would most likely be authorized by a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers nationwide permit (number 7 for intake and outlet structures) under the Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 (33 CFR 320-330). Certification that the discharge would not violate State water quality standards is required from the State of Washington. Other conditions may apply to the nationwide permits. Existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits for the hatcheries where operations could be expanded are expected to be adequate but will be modified before production is added if they are not (section 3.4.1.2).

4.8 Permits for Rights-of-Way on Public Lands

BPA would secure the necessary land use permits from the USFS for the Chiwaukum Creek acclimation site and for plowing of the USFS road that provides access to the White River Channels acclimation site. Use permits from Washington Department of Transportation may be required for the Swamp Creek and Butcher Creek sites if nets are put across the highway culverts.

4.9 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA)

This act is intended, among other goals, to ensure environmentally safe disposal of non-recoverable waste residues, particularly those that are toxic or hazardous. These topics are discussed in section 3.4.1.2. BPA does not anticipate that any hazardous wastes, as defined by RCRA (42 USC 6901 et seq.), would be generated by the project. If they were, however, they would be manifested, packaged and shipped offsite for disposal under the appropriate regulations (40 CFR 260-268, 40 CFR 270-272, WAC 173-303).

4.10 Recreation Resources

Two proposed acclimation sites are near rivers that the Wenatchee National Forest has proposed for classification as Recreational Rivers under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. The values for which these rivers currently are being managed would not be affected by the project (see section 3.4.1). No National Trails, Wilderness Areas, National Parks, or other specially designated recreational areas would be adversely affected.

4.11 Requirements Not Applicable to This Project

Safe Drinking Water Act

This project would not affect Sole Source Aquifers, or require an underground injection well.

Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA)

No pesticides or herbicides would be used for this project.

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA)

BPA does not propose to acquire property for this project, so surveys to determine site contamination requiring cleanup would not be done.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Permits for Structures or Work in Navigable Waters

This project does not affect waters classified as navigable waters according to the Corps definition in 33 CFR 329.

Farmland Protection Policy Act

The proposed project would not affect any prime, unique, or other important farmland as defined in the Farmland Protection Policy Act (7 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.).

The Executive Order on Environmental Justice

The project would not adversely affect minority or disadvantaged groups—no adverse effects on any human groups or individuals are expected.

Noise Control Act

WDOE regulates maximum environmental noise levels (WAC 173-60). Allowable levels depend on land use of the source and receiving property. Noise levels associated with the proposal and alternatives are discussed in section 3.4. Given the low level of noise expected to be generated and the lack of nearby sensitive receivers, State noise levels would not be exceeded.

Clean Air Act

No facilities would be constructed that would require air quality permits under the Clean Air Act (42 USC 7401 et seq.). Construction equipment exhausts would meet regulatory requirements.

Global Warming

The project would not cut trees or build facilities that would increase the potential for global warming.

Energy Conservation at Federal Facilities

This project does not propose construction of new buildings using energy, so BPA's policy to set an example for energy efficient construction does not apply.

References

- Allee, J.B. 1974. Spatial requirements and behavioral interactions of juvenile coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) and steelhead trout (*Salmo gairdneri*). Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Allee, B.A. 1981. The role of interspecific competition in the distribution of salmonids in streams. Pages 111-122 in E.L. Brannon and E.O. Salo, editors. Proceedings of the salmon and trout migratory behavior symposium. University of Washington Press, Seattle.
- Andersen, B.C., and D.W. Narver. 1975. Fish populations of Carnation Creek and other Barkley Sound streams – 1974: data record and progress report. Fisheries Resource Board of Canada. MS Rep. Series 1351:73p.
- Bisson, P.A., K. Sullivan, and J.L. Nielsen. 1988. Channel hydraulics, habitat use, and body form of juvenile coho salmon, steelhead and cutthroat trout in streams. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 117:262-273.
- Burns, J.W. 1971. The carrying capacity for juvenile salmonids in some northern California streams. California Fish and Game 57(1):44-57.
- CRITFC (Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission). 1995. *Wy-Kan-Ush-Mi Wa-Kish-Wit: Spirit of the Salmon*. The Columbia River Anadromous Fish Plan of the Nez Perce, Umatilla, Warm Springs, and Yakama Tribes.
- CTWSR (Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation), Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR), Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Nez Perce Tribe (NPT), Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), Shoshone-Bannock Tribe (SBT), Washington Department of Fish (WDF), Washington Department of Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Yakima Indian Nation (YIN). 1988. Columbia River Fish Management Plan. CTWSR et al. 74 pages.
- CTWSR, CTUIR, IDFG, NMFS, NPT, ODFW, SBT, WDF, WSFWS, YIN. 1997. *1996 All Species Review, Columbia River Fish Management Plan*. U.S. v. Oregon Technical Advisory Committee.
- Diamond, J. and H.J. Pribble. 1978. Review of factors affecting seaward migration and survival of juvenile salmon in the Columbia River and ocean. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Information Report Series, Fisheries. Number 78-7. Portland, Oregon.
- Dunnigan, J. and J. Hubble. August 1998. Results From YKFP and Mid-Columbia Coho Monitoring and Evaluation Studies. Prepared for the Mid-Columbia Technical Work Group.
- Foerster, R.E. and W.E. Ricker. 1953. The coho salmon of Cultus Lake and Sweltzer Creek. Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada 10:293-319.

- Frasier, F.J. 1969. Population density effects on survival and growth of juvenile coho salmon and steelhead trout in experimental stream channels. Pages 253-265 in T.G. Northcote, editor. Symposium on salmon and trout in streams. H.R. MacMillan Lectures in Fisheries, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Glova, G.J. 1984. Management implications of the distribution and diet of sympatric populations of juvenile coho salmon and coastal cutthroat trout in small streams in British Columbia, Canada. *Progressive Fish Culturist* 46:269-277.
- Glova, G.J. 1986. Interaction for food and space between experimental populations of juvenile coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) and coastal cutthroat trout (*Salmo clarki*) in a laboratory stream. *Hydrobiologia* 131:155-168.
- Glova, G.J. 1987. Comparison of allopatric cutthroat trout stocks with those sympatric with coho salmon and sculpins in small streams. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 20(4):275-284.
- Groot, C. and L. Margolis. 1991. Pacific salmon life histories. UBC Press, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Hartman, G.F. 1965. The role of behavior in the ecology and interaction of underyearling coho salmon and steelhead trout. *Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada* 22:1035-1081.
- He, E. and W.A. Wurtsbaugh. 1993. An empirical model of gastric evacuation rates for fish and an analysis of digestion in piscivorous brown trout. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 122:717-730.
- Hillman, T.W. and J.S. Mullan. 1989. Effect of hatchery releases on the abundance and behavior of wild juvenile salmonids. In: *Summer and Winter Ecology of Juvenile Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Trout in the Wenatchee River, Washington*. Report to Chelan County PUD by D.W. Chapman Consultants, Inc. Boise, ID.
- Hockersmith, E., J. Vella, L. Stuehrenber, R. Iwamota, and G. Swan. 1994. Yakima River radio-telemetry study: spring chinook salmon, 1991-1992. BPA Annual Report. Project number 89-089.
- Hockersmith, E., J. Vella, L. Stuehrenber, R. Iwamota, and G. Swan. 1995. Yakima River radio-telemetry study: steelhead, 1989-1993. BPA Annual Report. Project number 89-089.
- Hunter, J.G. 1959. Survival and production of pink and chum salmon in a coastal stream. *Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada* 16:835-886.
- IHOT (Integrated Hatchery Operations Team). Jan. 1995. Policies and Procedures for Columbia Basin Anadromous Salmonid Hatcheries: Annual Report for 1994. Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR.
- Johnston, J.M. 1967. Food and feeding habits of juvenile coho salmon and steelhead trout in Worthy Creek, Washington. Master of Science Thesis, University of Washington, Seattle.

- Lister, D.B., and H.S. Genoe. 1970. Stream habitat utilization by cohabiting underyearlings of chinook (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) and coho (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) salmon in the Big Qualicum River, British Columbia. *Journal of Fisheries Research Board of Canada* 27:1215-1224.
- McDonald, M. 1895. The salmon fisheries of the Columbia River basin. *Bulletin of the United States Fish Commission*. Vol. XIV: 153-168, Washington, DC.
- McHenry, E.T. 1981. Coho salmon studies in the Resurrection Bay area. Annual progress report. *Alaska Department of Fish & Game Aid Fish Restoration* 1980-81:1-52.
- Miller, W.H., T.C. Coley, H.L. Berge, and T.T. Kisanuki. 1990. *Analysis of Salmon and Steelhead Supplementation: Emphasis on Unpublished Reports and Present Programs*. Project 88-100, U.S. Department of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, OR.
- Mullan, J.W. 1983. Overview of Artificial and Natural Propagation of Coho Salmon (*Onchorhynchus kisutch*) on the Mid-Columbia River. Fisheries Assistance Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Leavenworth, Washington. December 1983.
- Nilsson, N.A. 1966. Interactive segregation between fishes. In: The biological basis of freshwater fish production. S.D. Gerking editor. Blackwell Scientific Publishing, Oxford, Great Britain.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 1991. Status review for lower Columbia River coho salmon. National Marine Fisheries Service. Seattle, WA. June 1991.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 1998. Backpack Electrofishing Guidelines. NMFS, Protected Species Branch, Portland, OR.
- NPPC (Northwest Power Planning Council). 1994. Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program. NPPC 94-55, Portland, OR.
- Petts, G.E. 1980. Long-term consequences of upstream impoundment. *Environmental conservation*. Volume 7. Pages 325-332.
- Piper, Robert. 1982. *Fish Hatchery Management*. U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington D.C.
- Pratt, K.L. 1992. A review of bull trout life history. Pages 5-9 in Howell, P.J. and D.V. Bauchanan, editors. *Proceedings of the Gearheart Mountain bull trout workshop*. Oregon Chapter of the American Fisheries Society.
- Prentice, E., D. Maynard, S. Downing, D. Frost, M. Kellet, K. Bruland, P. Sparks-McConkey, F. Waknitz, R. Iwamota, K. McIntyre, and N. Paasch. 1994. Comparative overwintering survival of tagged and untagged juvenile coho salmon. Pages 105-122 in a study to determine the biological feasibility of a new fish tagging system. BPA Annual Report for 1990-1993.
- PRRG (Production and Restoration Research Group). 1999. *Salmon Restoration Hatchery Strategies: A Review with Recommendations [Review Draft]*. Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission. Portland, OR.

- Ricker, W.E. 1941. The consumption of young sockeye salmon by predaceous fish. *Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada* 5:104-105.
- Rieman, Bruce E., and John D. McIntyre. 1993. Demographic and Habitat Requirements for Conservation of Bull Trout. In: U.S. Dept. of Agriculture —Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. General Technical Report INT-302.
- Ruggerone, G.T., and D.E. Rogers. 1992. Predation on sockeye salmon fry by juvenile coho salmon in the Chignik Lakes, Alaska: Implications for salmon management. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 12:87-102.
- Salo, E.O., and W.H. Bayliff. 1958. Artificial and natural production of silver salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) in Minter Creek, Washington. *Resource Bulletin Washington Department of Fisheries* 4:76p.
- Spaulding, J.S., T.W. Hillman, J.S. Griffith. 1989. Habitat use, growth, and movement of chinook salmon and steelhead in response to introduced coho salmon. Pages 156-208 in Don Chapman Consultants, Incorporated. Summer and winter ecology of juvenile chinook salmon and steelhead trout in the Wenatchee River, Washington. Chelan County Public Utility District, Washington.
- Stein, R.A., P.E. Reimers, and J.D. Hall. 1972. Social interaction between juvenile coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) and fall chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*) in Sixes River, Oregon. *J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can.* 29:1737-1748.
- Steward, C.R. and T.C. Bjornn. 1990. Supplementation of salmon and steelhead stocks with hatchery fish: A synthesis of published literature. In W.H. Miller (editor), Analysis of salmon and steelhead supplementation, Part 2. Report to Bonneville Power Administration (Proj. 88-100), Portland OR.
- The State of Washington, the State of Oregon, the United States, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, the Nez Perce Tribe, the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Indian Nation, and the State of Idaho. *Management Agreement for 1997 Brood Upper Columbia River Coho*. Various signing dates.
- Thompson, R.B. 1966. Effects of predator avoidance conditioning on the post-survival rate of artificially propagated salmon. Ph.D. dissertation submitted to University of Washington, Seattle.
- Tripp, D., and P. McCart. 1983. Effects of different coho stocking strategies on coho and cutthroat trout production in isolated headwater streams. *Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 1212:175 p.
- Tyus, H.M. 1990. Effects of altered stream flows on fishery resources. *Fisheries*. Volume 3. Pages 18-20.

- Underwood, K.D., S.W. Martin, M.L. Schuck and A.T. Scholz. 1992. Investigations of bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*), steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), and spring chinook (*O. tshawytscha*) interactions in southeast Washington streams. Bonneville Power Administration. Final report. Project number 90-053.
- USDA FS (United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service). 1990. Land and Resource Management Plan, Wenatchee National Forest. Wenatchee, Washington.
- USDA FS/USDI BLM (U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management). 1994. Record of Decision for Amendments to FS and BLM Planning Documents Within the Range of the Spotted Owl.
- USDOE BPA (United States Department of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration). 1996. Yakima Fisheries Project Final Environmental Impact Statement. DOE/EIS-0169. Portland, OR.
- USFWS (United States Fish and Wildlife Service). 1996. *The Impacts of Artificial Salmon and Steelhead Production Strategies in the Columbia River Basin Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement*. USFWS.
- WDFW (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife). 1996. Species of special concern list. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wildlife Management Program, Olympia, WA.
- WDFW/ODFW. 1995. Status Report, Columbia River Fish Runs & Fisheries, 1938-94. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife; Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. August 1995.
- WDFW/ODFW. 1998. Status Report, Columbia River Fish Runs and Fisheries, 1938-97. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife; Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. June, 1998.
- Wissmar, R.C., J.E. Smith, B.A. McIntosh, H.W. Li, G.H. Reeves and J.R. Sedell. 1994. A history of resource use and disturbance in riverine basins of eastern Oregon and Washington (early 1800s-1990s). Northwest Science, Special issue, 68:1-35.
- YIN (Yakama Indian Nation, Fisheries Resource Management Program). 1998. Mid-Columbia Coho Salmon Study Plan 11/25/98. Prepared for Bonneville Power Administration. Portland, OR.

Glossary

Acclimation	A stage in rearing, preceding release, intended to condition fish to the ambient environment.
Alleles	One member of a pair or series of genes that can occur at a particular site or locus on a chromosome. Genetic characteristics.
Damboards	Temporary structures that control water levels using vertical stakes into which varying numbers of 2x4s or 2x6s are slotted.
Effective population	The size of an ideal population that would experience genetic drift and inbreeding at the same rate as the real population under consideration.
Founder effects	When the breeding population is reduced to a few individuals, the genetic material is limited, which may result in establishment of undesirable traits in a population.
Genetic diversity/ variability	All the genetic variation in an individual, population or species.
Genetic drift	Random changes in allelic frequencies due to natural sampling errors that occur in each generation; the rate of genetic drift increases as effective population size decreases.
Inbreeding	Mating of biologically related individuals.
Lacustrine	Living or growing in or along the edges of lakes.
Loss of within-population variability	The reduction in quantity, variety and identity combinations of alleles in a population.
Naturally produced fish	Fish that spawn in the natural habitat as opposed to being spawned through a hatchery program. They may be offspring of fish spawned in either natural or hatchery environments.
Redd	A salmon nest.
Smolt	Juvenile salmonid undergoing metamorphosis into a saltwater fish, usually during the downstream migration period.
Smolt-to-adult survival	Ability of a fish to survive from the time it leaves the sub-basin as a smolt until the time it returns to the subbasin as an adult.
Smolt-to-smolt survival	Ability of a fish to survive from the time it becomes a smolt until the time it leaves the sub-basin.
Volitional release	A juvenile fish release strategy that allows an outmigrating fish to leave a rearing/acclimation pond without being pumped or forced.
Wild fish, wild population	Genetically unique populations of fish that have maintained reproduction successfully without supplementation from hatcheries.