Table of Contents

GLOSSARY xxviii

1.0 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION 1-1

1.1 Introduction 1-1

1.2 Summary of the Proposed Action 1-3

1.3 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action 1-3

1.4 Background to Purpose and Need 1-4

1.5 ESA 4(d) Rule and Limit 6 1-10

1.6 Fisheries Affecting Puget Sound Chinook Salmon 1-12

1.7 Regulatory Jurisdictions Affecting Washington Fisheries 1-25

1.8 Environmental Review Process 1-26

1.8.1 Public Scoping 1-26

1.8.2 Issues and Concerns Raised During Scoping 1-27

1.9 Decisions to be Made 1-27

1.10 Relationship to Other Plans 1-28

1.10.1 Pacific Salmon Treaty Annexes 1-28

1.10.2 Pacific Coast Framework Management Plan 1-28

1.10.3 Puget Sound Salmon Management Plan 1-29

1.10.4 Puget Sound Recovery Planning 1-29

1.10.5 Wild Salmonid Policy 1-29

1.10.6 Gravel to Gravel 1-30

1.11 Roles and Responsibilities of the Federal Government, State and Tribes in Fisheries Management ... 1-30

1.11.1 Federal Agencies 1-30

1.11.2 Tribes 1-31

1.11.3 State Agencies 1-31

1.12 Overview of the NEPA Environmental Impact Statement 1-32

2.0 ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION 2-1

2.1 Introduction 2-1

2.2 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Study 2-2

2.2.1 Tribal-Only Fisheries 2-2

2.2.2 No Hatchery Augmentation 2-3

2.2.3 Exploitation Rate Management 2-3

2.3 Alternatives Considered in Detail 2-3
2.3.1 Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo 2-6
2.3.2 Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management 2-13
2.3.3 Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only 2-15
2.3.4 Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take 2-19

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT 3-1
3.1 Introduction 3-1
3.2 Environmental Setting 3-2
3.2.1 Physical Description of the Action Area 3-5
3.2.2 Resident Population within the Action Area 3-8
3.2.3 Evolutionarily Significant Units within the Action Area 3-9
3.3 Fish 3-14
3.3.1 Threatened and Endangered Species 3-14
3.3.1.1 Puget Sound Chinook 3-16
3.3.1.2 Hood Canal and Strait of Juan de Fuca Chum Salmon (Oncorhynchus keta) 3-61
3.3.1.3 Listed Columbia River Chinook Salmon 3-67
3.3.1.4 Bull Trout (Salvelinus confluentus) 3-67
3.3.1.5 Listed Columbia River Chum Salmon 3-68
3.3.2 Unlisted Salmonids 3-68
3.3.2.1 Puget Sound and Olympic Peninsula Coho Salmon (O. kisutch) 3-68
3.3.2.2 Puget Sound Sockeye Salmon (O. nerka) 3-73
3.3.2.3 Washington Coastal Chinook and Unlisted Columbia River Chinook 3-75
3.3.2.4 Puget Sound Chum Salmon (Unlisted) 3-76
3.3.2.5 Puget Sound Steelhead (O. mykiss) 3-76
3.3.2.6 Puget Sound Pink Salmon (O. gorbuscha) 3-78
3.3.3 Non-Salmonid Fishes (Groundfish) 3-80
3.3.4 Forage Species (Pacific Herring, Sandlance, Smelt) 3-81
3.3.5 Fish Habitat Affected by Salmon Fishing 3-82
3.3.6 Marine-Derived Nutrients from Salmon Spawners 3-86
3.3.7 Selectivity on Biological Characteristics of Salmon 3-94
3.3.8 Hatchery-Related Fishery Effects on Salmon 3-115
3.3.8.1 Effects of Hatchery-Origin Chinook on Natural-Spawning Chinook Salmon 3-115
3.3.8.2 Overfishing 3-121

3.4 Tribal Treaty Rights and Trust Responsibilities 3-122
3.4.1 Introduction 3-122
3.4.2 Federal–Tribal Relations 3-122
3.4.3 The Trust Responsibility 3-123
3.4.4 Indian Treaty Rights in Puget Sound 3-123
3.4.5 Tribal Regulation and Usual and Accustomed Grounds and Stations 3-125
3.4.6 Limitations on the Exercise of Indian Treaty Rights 3-126
3.5 Treaty Indian Ceremonial and Subsistence Salmon Uses 3-128
3.5.1 Historic Fisheries 3-130
3.5.1.1 The Ethnographic Record 3-130
3.5.1.2 Tribal Areas, Reservation Locations, and the Importance of Salmon 3-132
3.5.1.3 Post Treaty Period Fishing 3-133
3.5.2 Contemporary Fisheries 3-135
3.5.2.1 Salmon Species, Availability, and Cultural Preferences 3-135
3.5.2.2 Fishing Areas 3-135
3.5.2.3 Gear 3-136
3.5.3 Salmon Uses and the Cultural Significance of Salmon 3-136
3.5.3.1 Use, Distribution and Sharing 3-136
3.5.3.2 Tribes and Relationship to Salmon: Responsibility and Stewardship 3-140
3.5.3.3 The Transmission of Fishing Culture 3-141
3.5.3.4 Other Activities That Underscore The Significance of Salmon in Contemporary Indian Culture 3-142
3.5.3.5 Summary 3-143
3.6 Economic Activity and Value 3-144
3.6.1 Commercial Salmon Harvesting and Processing 3-145
3.6.1.1 Salmon Harvesting 3-145
3.6.1.2 Processing of Commercial Salmon Catch 3-154
3.6.2 Sport Fishing Activity, Catch, and Value 3-155
3.6.3 Regional Economic Activity 3-161
3.6.3.1 Strait of Juan de Fuca/North Hood Canal Region 3-162
3.6.3.2 North Puget Sound 3-163
3.6.3.3 South Puget Sound/South Hood Canal 3-163
3.6.3.4 Three-Region Summary 3-171
3.7 Environmental Justice 3-173

3.7.1 Background 3-173
3.7.2 Methodology 3-173
3.7.2.1 Establish the Target Area 3-174
3.7.2.2 Identify the Population Areal Unit 3-174
3.7.2.3 Identify the Target Population 3-174
3.7.2.4 Identify the Reference Area 3-174
3.7.2.5 Define Disproportionate Effect 3-174
3.7.2.6 Identify Environmental Justice Area(s) of Concern 3-175
3.7.3 Public Outreach to Identify Significant Minority and/or Low-Income Groups 3-175
3.7.4 Low Income Populations 3-175
3.7.5 Racial Minorities 3-176
3.7.6 Indian Tribes 3-178
3.8 Wildlife 3-180
3.8.1 Marine Habitats 3-180
3.8.2 Marine Birds 3-186
3.8.2.1 Rhinoceros Auklet 3-186
3.8.2.2 Common Murre 3-187
3.8.2.3 Pigeon Guillemot 3-189
3.8.2.4 Gulls and Terns 3-190
3.8.2.5 Grebes, Loons, and Cormorants 3-191
3.8.2.6 Sea Ducks 3-193
3.8.3 Marine Mammals 3-194
3.8.3.1 Harbor Seal 3-195
3.8.3.2 California Sea Lion 3-195
3.8.3.3 Gray Whale 3-197
3.8.3.4 Killer Whale 3-198
3.8.3.5 Harbor Porpoise and Dall's Porpoise 3-199
3.8.3.6 Sea Otter 3-200
3.8.4 Benthic Invertebrates 3-201
3.8.5 Threatened and Endangered Species 3-202
3.8.5.1 Marbled Murrelet 3-202
3.8.5.2 California Brown Pelican 3-203
3.8.5.3 Bald Eagle 3-204
3.8.5.4 Steller Sea Lion 3-205

3.8.5.5 Humpback Whale/Fin Whale 3-205
3.8.5.6 Pacific Leatherback Turtle 3-206
3.9 Ownership and Land Use – Parks and Recreation 3-207
3.10 Water Quality 3-209
3.10.1 Turbidity and Sedimentation 3-210
3.10.2 Non-Point Source Pollution 3-210
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 4-1
4.1 Introduction 4-1
4.2 Basis for Comparison of Alternatives and Approach to Alternatives Analysis 4-3
4.2.1 No Action Alternative 4-3
4.2.2 Technical Approach to Impact Assessment 4-4
4.2.3 Scenarios for Alternatives 4-5
4.2.3.1 Abundance 4-5
4.2.3.2 Canadian and Alaskan Fisheries 4-6
4.3 Fish 4-9
4.3.1 Threatened and Endangered Fish Species 4-9
4.3.1.1 Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo 4-16
4.3.1.2 Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level 4-21
4.3.1.3 Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level 4-24
4.3.1.4 Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take 4-27
4.3.1.5 Summary Discussion of Alternatives 4-30
4.3.2 Unlisted Salmonid Species 4-54
4.3.2.1 Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo 4-55
4.3.2.2 Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level 4-57
4.3.2.3 Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level With Terminal Fisheries Only 4-60
4.3.2.4 Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take 4-64
4.3.3 Non-Salmonid Fish Species 4-67
4.3.4 Fish Habitat 4-68
4.3.5 Marine-Derived Nutrients from Spawning Salmon 4-70
4.3.5.1 Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo 4-71
4.3.5.2 Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level 4-74
4.3.5.3 Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only 4-76

4.3.5.4 Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take 4-77
4.3.6 Selectivity on Biological Characteristics of Salmon 4-79
4.3.6.1 Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo 4-80
4.3.6.2 Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level 4-84
4.3.6.3 Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only 4-85
4.3.6.4 Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take 4-86
4.3.7 Hatchery-Related Fishery Effects On Salmon: Straying and Overfishing 4-87
4.3.7.1 Straying of Hatchery Chinook 4-88
4.3.7.2 Straying of Coho and Chum Salmon 4-102
4.3.8 Indirect and Cumulative Effects 4-104
4.3.8.1 Indirect Effects 4-104
4.3.8.2 Cumulative Effects of the Proposed Action or Alternatives on Fish Species 4-109
4.4 Tribal Treaty Rights and Trust Responsibility 4-120
4.4.1 Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo 4-120
4.4.2 Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level 4-121
4.4.3 Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only 4-122
4.4.4 Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take 4-123
4.4.5 Indirect and Cumulative Effects 4-124
4.5 Treaty Indian Ceremonial and Subsistence Salmon Uses 4-125
4.5.1 Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo 4-127
4.5.2 Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level 4-128
4.5.3 Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only. 4-129
4.5.4 Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take 4-130
4.5.5 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts 4-131
4.5.5.1 Indirect Effects 4-131
4.5.5.2 Cumulative Impacts 4-133
4.6 Economic Activity and Value 4-135
4.6.1 Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo 4-137
4.6.1.1 Summary of Scenario Differences 4-137
4.6.2 Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level 4-137
4.6.2.1 Summary of Scenario Differences 4-137

4.6.2.2 Comparison of the Management Unit-Based Escapement Alternative (Alternative 2) to the Proposed Action 4-138
4.6.3 Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only 4-139
4.6.3.1 Summary of Scenario Differences 4-139
4.6.3.2 Comparison of the Population Unit-Based Escapement Alternative (Alternative 3) to the Proposed Action 4-140
4.6.4 Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take 4-141
4.6.4.1 Summary of Scenario Differences 4-141
4.6.4.2 Comparison of the No Action/No Authorized Take Alternative (Alternative 4) to the Proposed Action 4-141
4.6.5 Summary 4-143
4.6.6 Cumulative Effects 4-165
4.7 Environmental Justice 4-169
4.7.1. Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo 4-175
4.7.2 Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level 4-177
4.7.3 Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level 4-180
4.7.4 Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take, Scenario B. 4-182
4.7.5 Comparison of the Effects of Management Alternatives on the Tribes 4-183
4.7.6 Indirect and Cumulative Effects 4-185
4.7.6.1. Indirect Effects 4-185
4.7.6.2 Cumulative Effects 4-185
4.8 Wildlife 4-189
4.8.1 Marine Birds 4-189
4.8.1.1 Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo 4-193
4.8.1.2 Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level 4-194
4.8.1.3 Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only 4-194
4.8.1.4 Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take 4-194
4.8.2 Marine Mammals 4-195
4.8.2.1 Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo 4-197
4.8.2.2 Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level 4-197
4.8.2.3 Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only 4-198
4.8.2.4 Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take 4-199
4.8.3 Marine Invertebrates 4-199

4.8.3.1 Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo 4-200
4.8.3.2 Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level 4-200
4.8.3.3 Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only 4-200
4.8.3.4 Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take 4-200
4.8.4 Threatened and Endangered Wildlife Species 4-200
4.8.4.1 Alternative 1 – Proposed Action/Status Quo 4-202
4.8.4.2 Alternative 2 – Escapement Goal Management at the Management Unit Level 4-202
4.8.4.3 Alternative 3 – Escapement Goal Management at the Population Level with Terminal Fisheries Only 4-203
4.8.4.4 Alternative 4 – No Action/No Authorized Take 4-203
4.8.5 Wildlife Indirect Effects 4-203
4.8.6 Cumulative Effects on Wildlife 4-206
4.9 Ownership and Land Use – Parks and Recreation 4-216
4.10 Water Quality 4-217
4.10.1 Sedimentation and Turbidity 4-217
4.10.2 Non-Point Source Pollution 4-217

5.0 IDENTIFICATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERABLE AND AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVES 5-1
5.1 Impacts Summary 5-1
5.2 Identification of the Environmentally Preferable and Agency Preferred Alternatives 5-9
5.2.1 The Environmentally Preferable Alternative 5-9
5.2.2 The Agency Preferred Alternative 5-10

6.0 LIST OF PREPARERS AND CONTRIBUTORS 6-1
6.1 NEPA Evaluation Team 6-1
6.2 Contributors 6-4

7.0 LIST OF AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED 7-1

8.0 REFERENCES 8-1
1.0 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action 8-1
2.0 Alternatives Including the Proposed Action 8-2
3.0 Affected Environment 8-3
3.2 Environmental Setting 8-3
3.3 Fish 8-4
3.3.6 Marine-Derived Nutrients 8-12

3.3.7 Selectivity on Biological Characteristics of Salmon 8-17
3.3.8 Hatchery-Related Fishery Effects on Salmon 8-19
3.4 Tribal Treaty Rights and Trust Responsibilities 8-22
3.5 Treaty Indian Ceremonial and Subsistence Salmon Uses 8-23
3.6 Economic Activity and Value 8-25
3.7 Environmental Justice 8-26
3.8 Wildlife 8-27
3.9 Ownership and Land Use 8-39
3.10 Water Quality 8-39
4.0 Environmental Consequences 8-39
4.2 Basis for Comparison of Alternatives and Approach to Alternatives Analysis 8-39
4.3 Fish 8-40
4.3.5 Marine-Derived Nutrients from Spawning Salmon 8-41
4.3.6 Selectivity on Biological Characteristics of Salmon 8-42
4.3.7 Hatchery-Related Effects on Salmon: Straying and Overfishing 8-42
4.3.8 Indirect and Cumulative Effects 8-42
4.4 Tribal Treaty Rights and Trust Responsibility 8-43
4.6 Economic Activity and Value 8-43
4.7 Environmental Justice 8-43
4.8 Wildlife 8-44
5.0 Identification of the Environmentally Preferable and Agency Preferred Alternative 8-48
Technical Appendix C Technical Methods, Derivation of Harvest Management Standards and Fishery Impacts 8-48
Technical Appendix D Technical Methods, Economics 8-50

APPENDICES

A Puget Sound Chinook Harvest Resource Management Plan A-1
B Puget Sound Chinook Population Information B-1
C Technical Methods – Derivation of Chinook Management Objectives and Fishery Impact Modeling Methods C-1
D Technical Methods – Economics D-1
E Technical Methods – Environmental Justice E-1
F Applicable Laws, Treaties, Licenses and Permits F-1
G Plant and Animal Database Searches G-1
H Consultation and Coordination H-1

List of Tables

Table 1.5-1. The fourteen salmon and steelhead Evolutionarily Significant Units included in the ESA 4(d) rule and their listing information. 1-11

Table 1.6-1. Fraser River sockeye, pink and incidental chinook catch in Puget Sound, 1995–2001. 1-22

Table 1.6-2. Commercial net fishery harvest of pink salmon from the Nooksack, Skagit, and Snohomish river systems, 1991–2001. 1-22

Table 1.6-3. Landed coho salmon harvest: Puget Sound net fisheries. Regional totals include the freshwater catch. 1-23

Table 2.3-1. Comparison of alternatives considered for detailed analysis. 2-5

Table 2.3-2. Puget Sound chinook resource management plan harvest conservation objectives: Recovery exploitation rates, escapement goals, critical abundance thresholds, and minimum fishing rates under Alternative 1. 2-8

Table 2.3-3. Escapement goal objectives used to analyze Alternative 2 based on objectives provided by the co-managers. 2-14

Table 2.3-4. Escapement goal objectives used to analyze Alternative 3 based on objectives provided by the co-managers. 2-18

Table 3.2-1. Major river systems within the four regions of the Puget Sound Action Area. 3-5

Table 3.2-2. April 1, 2000 resident population of Puget Sound Action Area counties. 3-8

Table 3.3-1. Summary of key characteristics of Pacific salmon species. 3-15

Table 3.3-2. Critical escapement thresholds, viable escapement thresholds, and rebuilding exploitation rates determined by NMFS for Puget Sound chinook populations. 3-21

Table 3.3-3. Summary of status of Hood Canal and Strait of Juan de Fuca native summer chum salmon populations. 3-65

Table 3.3-4. Summary of environmental and harvest-related factors contributing to the decline of Hood Canal and Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum populations in the 1970s and 1980s. 3-65

Table 3.3-5. Summary of assessments of population status of Puget Sound coho salmon. 3-70

Table 3.3-6. Summary of run size and escapement trends for Puget Sound wild coho population groups, 1981 through 2000. 3-71

Table 3.3.7-1. Average age composition of the Puget Sound chinook salmon catch by gear type. 3-100

Table 3.3.7-2. Characteristics of populations chosen for size at age analyses 3-103

Table 3.3.7-3. Changes in size at age and sex for selected Puget Sound chinook populations (significance level (P) = 0.10). 3-105

Table 3.3.7-4. Changes in size at age for selected Puget Sound chinook populations (significance level (P) = 0.05). 3-107

Table 3.3.7-5. Comparison of size at age analyses for hatchery and natural spawning escapement analysis for those population and age strata in common to both analyses. 3-109

Table 3.3.7-6. Observed trends in Puget Sound hatchery chinook salmon adult lengths (cm/year) and corresponding expected trends (cm/year) under directional harvest (Ryding and Reidinger 2004). Model runs incorporated strong stabilizing selection on length ($\omega = 1\sigma$) and a threshold for legal harvest of 50 cm. 3-111

Table 3.3.7-7. Observed trends in Puget Sound hatchery chinook salmon adult lengths (cm/year) and corresponding expected trends (cm/year) under directional harvest selection (Ryding and Reidinger 2004). Model runs incorporated weak stabilizing selection on length ($\omega = 4\sigma$) and a threshold for legal harvest of 50 cm. 3-112

Table 3.3.7-8. Observed trends in Puget Sound hatchery chinook salmon adult lengths (cm yr-1) and corresponding expected trends (cm yr-1) under directional harvest selection (Ryding and Reidinger 2004). Model runs incorporated strong stabilizing selection on length ($\omega = 1\sigma$) and a threshold for legal harvest of 70cm. 3-113

Table 3.3.7-9. Observed trends in Puget Sound hatchery chinook salmon adult lengths (cm yr-1) and corresponding expected trends (cm yr-1) under directional harvest selection (Ryding and Reidinger 2004). Model runs incorporated weak stabilizing selection on length ($\omega = 4\sigma$) and a threshold for legal harvest of 70cm. 3-114

Table 3.6-1. County, regional, and state industrial output by major industrial sector in 2000 (in millions of 2000 dollars). 3-165

Table 3.6-2. County, regional, and state industrial output by specific industrial sectors in 2000 (in millions of 2000 dollars). 3-166

Table 3.6-3. County, regional, and state employment1 by major industrial sector in 2000. 3-167

Table 3.6-4. County, regional, and state employment1 by specific industrial sectors in 2000. 3-168

Table 3.6-5. County, regional, and state personal income1 by major industrial sector in 2000 (in millions of 2000 dollars). 3-169

Table 3.6-6. County, regional, and state personal income1 by specific industrial sectors in 2000 (in millions of 2000 dollars). 3-170

Table 3.7-1. Percentage of persons below the poverty level, by county, within the target area. 3-176

Table 3.7-2. Percentage of minority persons by county, by race, within the target area. 3-177

Table 3.7-3. Tribes considered in the environmental justice analysis. 3-179

Table 3.8-1. Presence and association of marine birds and mammals with the marine habitats of Puget Sound. 3-182

Table 3.8-2. Seasonal abundance of birds and marine mammals in Puget Sound. 3-185

Table 3.9-1. Freshwater and saltwater boat launches in the 12 counties within the Puget Sound action area. 3-207

Table 4.2-1. Scenarios associated with estimated harvest levels within the Puget Sound Action Area. 4-8

Table 4.3-1. Rebuilding Exploitation Rates, and critical and viable escapement standards for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal summer chum, against which impacts of Alternatives were assessed. 4-13

Table 4.3-2. Predicted Southern U.S. catch of Puget Sound chinook populations under Alternatives 1-4 and Scenarios A-D. 4-33

Table 4.3-3. Performance of Alternatives 1 through 4 under Scenario B relative to rebuilding exploitation rate, critical escapement threshold, and viable escapement threshold standards. 4-34

Table 4.3-4 Summary of impacts of Alternatives 2-4 relative to the proposed action under Scenario B 4-35

Table 4.3-5. Performance of Alternatives 1 through 4 under Scenarios A-D relative to rebuilding exploitation rate, critical escapement threshold, and viable escapement threshold standards. .. 4-36

Table 4.3-6 Summary of impacts of Alternatives 2-4 relative to the proposed action under scenarios 1-4. 4-37

Table 4.3-7a Performance of Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) under Scenario A relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-38

Table 4.3-7b Performance of Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) under Scenario B relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-39

Table 4.3-7c Performance of Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) under Scenario C relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-40

Table 4.3-7d Performance of Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) under Scenario D relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-41

Table 4.3-8a-1 Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario A relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-42

Table 4.3-8a-2 Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario A relative to Alternative 1 Scenario A (Proposed Action). 4-42

Table 4.3-8b-1 Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario B relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-43

Table 4.3-8b-2 Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario B relative to Alternative 1 Scenario B (Proposed Action). 4-43

Table 4.3-8c-1 Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario C relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-44

Table 4.3-8c-2 Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario C relative to Alternative 1 Scenario C (Proposed Action). 4-44

Table 4.3-8d-1 Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario D relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-45

Table 4.3-8d-2 Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement Goal Management at Management Unit Level) under Scenario D relative to Alternative 1 Scenario D (Proposed Action). 4-45

Table 4.3-9a-1 Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario A relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-46

Table 4.3-9a-2 Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario A relative to Alternative 1 Scenario A (Proposed Action). 4-46

Table 4.3-9b-1 Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario B relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-47

Table 4.3-9b-2 Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario B relative to Alternative 1 Scenario B (Proposed Action). 4-47

Table 4.3-9c-1 Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario C relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-48

Table 4.3-9c-2 Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario C relative to Alternative 1 Scenario C (Proposed Action). 4-48

Table 4.3-9d-1 Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario D relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-49

Table 4.3-9d-2 Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement Goal Management at Population Level) under Scenario D relative to Alternative 1 Scenario D (Proposed Action). 4-49

Table 4.3-10a-1 Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario A relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-50

Table 4.3-10a-2 Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario A relative to Alternative 1 Scenario A (Proposed Action). 4-50

Table 4.3-10b-1 Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario B relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-51

Table 4.3-10b-2 Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario B relative to Alternative 1 Scenario B (Proposed Action). 4-51

Table 4.3-10c-1 Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario Crelative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-52

Table 4.3-10c-2 Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario C relative to Alternative 1 Scenario C (Proposed Action). 4-52

Table 4.3-10d-1 Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario D relative to NMFS recovery standards, viable salmonid population guidelines, and current condition escapement goals for listed Puget Sound chinook and Hood Canal-Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. 4-53

Table 4.3-10d-2 Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) under Scenario D relative to Alternative 1 Scenario D (Proposed Action)....4-53

Table 4.3-11 Performance of Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) relative to exploitation rate objectives or escapement goals for coho, sockeye, pink, and fall-winter chum salmon....4-56

Table 4.3-12a Performance of Alternative 2 relative to exploitation rate objectives or escapement goals for coho, sockeye, pink, and fall-winter chum salmon....4-58

Table 4.3-12b Performance of Alternative 2 (Escapement goal management at the management unit level) relative to Alternative 1 for coho, sockeye, pink, and chum salmon....4-59

Table 4.3-13a Performance of Alternative 3 relative to exploitation rate objectives or escapement goals for coho, sockeye, pink, and fall-winter chum salmon....4-61

Table 4.3-13b Performance of Alternative 3 (Escapement goal management at the population level) relative to Alternative 1 for coho, sockeye, pink, and chum salmon....4-63

Table 4.3-14a Performance of Alternative 4 relative to exploitation rate objectives or escapement goals for coho, sockeye, pink, and fall-winter chum salmon....4-65

Table 4.3-14b Performance of Alternative 4 (No Fishing) relative to Alternative 1 for coho, sockeye, pink, and chum salmon....4-66

Table 4.3.5-1 Biomass (pounds) of spawning salmon in the Skagit, Snohomish, and Stillaguamish Rivers, under Alternative 1....4-72

Table 4.3.5-2 Biomass (pounds) of spawning salmon in the Skagit, Snohomish, and Stillaguamish Rivers, under Alternative 2....4-75

Table 4.3.5-3 Biomass (pounds) of spawning salmon in the Skagit, Snohomish, and Stillaguamish Rivers, under Alternative 3....4-77

Table 4.3.5-4 Biomass (pounds) of spawning salmon in the Skagit, Snohomish, and Stillaguamish Rivers, under Alternative 4....4-78

Table 4.3.6.1-1. Range of expected total exploitation rates by Puget Sound chinook management unit during the period 2005–2009....4-83

Table 4.3.6.1-2. Range of expected southern U.S. exploitation rates by Puget Sound chinook management unit during the period 2005–2009....4-84

Table 4.3.7-1. Comparisons of hatchery- and naturally-spawning chinook salmon escapement with the Proposed Action or alternatives by scenario....4-89

Table 4.3.7-2. Comparisons of hatchery- and naturally-spawning chinook salmon escapement with the Proposed Action or alternatives under Scenario A....4-90

Table 4.3.7-3. Comparisons of hatchery- and naturally-spawning chinook salmon escapement with the Proposed Action or alternatives under Scenario B....4-91

Table 4.3.7-4. Comparisons of hatchery- and naturally-spawning chinook salmon escapement with the Proposed Action or alternatives under Scenario C....4-92

Table 4.3.7-5. Comparisons of hatchery- and naturally-spawning chinook salmon escapement with the Proposed Action or alternatives under Scenario D....4-93

Table 4.3.7-6. Estimated 1996–2002 average number of hatchery-origin chinook salmon that spawn in the wild as a proportion of the hatchery-origin escapement for key Puget Sound chinook hatchery salmon populations under consideration (hatchery fish spawning in the wild/total hatchery fish returning). 4-95

Table 4.3.7-7. Hatchery contribution to natural spawning escapement by scenario and alternative for five representative Puget Sound chinook populations. 4-97

Table 4.3.7-8. Comparisons of hatchery- and natural-spawning coho salmon escapement with the proposed action and alternatives. 4-103

Table 4.3.7-9. Comparisons of hatchery- and natural-spawning chum salmon escapement with the proposed action and alternatives. 4-103

Table 4.3.8-1. Federal, Tribal, Washington state, and local plans, policies, and programs that influence fish within the Puget Sound Action Area: 2004. 4-111

Table 4.6-1. Performance of economic indicators under alternatives 1-4 relative to conservation standards under scenarios 1-4. 4-146

Table 4.6-2. Impacts to commercial harvest, commercial harvest value, and processing value. Scenario A: 2003 Abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-147

Table 4.6-3. Direct economic impacts to the commercial fishing and salmon processing industries. Scenario A: 2003 Abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-148

Table 4.6-4. Impacts to sport fishing trips and expenditures by region. Scenario A: 2003 Abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-149

Table 4.6-5. Regional economic impacts of the alternatives. Scenario A: 2003 Abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-150

Table 4.6-6. Impacts to commercial harvest, commercial harvest value, and processing value. Scenario B: 2003 Abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-151

Table 4.6-7. Direct economic impacts to the commercial fishing and salmon processing industries. Scenario B: 2003 Abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-152

Table 4.6-8. Impacts to sport fishing trips and expenditures by region. Scenario B: 2003 Abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-153

Table 4.6-9. Regional economic impacts of the alternatives. Scenario B: 2003 Abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-154

Table 4.6-10. Impacts to commercial harvest, commercial harvest value, and processing value. Scenario C: 30% Reduction in abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-155

Table 4.6-11. Direct economic impacts to the commercial fishing and salmon processing industries. Scenario C: 30% Reduction in abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-156

Table 4.6-12. Impacts to sport fishing trips and expenditures by region. Scenario C: 30% Reduction in abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-157

Table 4.6-13. Regional economic impacts of the alternatives. Scenario C: 30% Reduction in abundance and 2003 Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-158

Table 4.6-14. Impacts to commercial harvest, commercial harvest value, and processing value. Scenario D: 30% Reduction in abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-159

Table 4.6-15. Direct economic impacts to the commercial fishing and salmon processing industries. Scenario D: 30% Reduction in abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-160

Table 4.6-16. Impacts to sport fishing trips and expenditures by region. Scenario D: 30% Reduction in abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-161

Table 4.6-17. Regional economic impacts of the alternatives. Scenario D: 30% Reduction in abundance with maximum Canadian/Alaskan Pacific Salmon Treaty fisheries. 4-162

Table 4.6-18. Baseline and change in net economic values of commercial salmon fishing (in millions of 2002 dollars). 4-163

Table 4.6-19. Baseline and changes in angler days and net economic value (NEV) of salmon sport fishing in the Puget Sound area. 4-164

Table 4.6-20. Federal, Tribal, Washington State, and local plans, policies, and programs that influence economic condition within the Puget Sound Action Area (2004). 4-167

Table 4.7-1. Tribal salmon fishing revenue for the action area – 17 fishing tribes (estimates in thousands of dollars). 4-171

Table 4.7-2. Selected data for potentially affected tribes. 4-173

Table 4.7-3. Relative mortality for tribal peoples compared to residents of Washington State. 4-174

Table 4.7-4. Estimated tribal salmon harvested annually under Alternative 1, Scenario B. 4-176

Table 4.7-5. Estimated annual tribal salmon revenue, by species – Alternative 1, Scenario B. 4-176

Table 4.7.6. Predicted tribal harvests of chinook salmon under Alternative 1, Scenarios A, C, or D. 4-177

Table 4.7-7. Number of tribal salmon caught annually under Alternative 2, Scenario B. 4-178

Table 4.7-8. Predicted tribal harvests of chinook salmon under Alternative 2, Scenarios A, C, or D. 4-180

Table 4.7-9. Estimated tribal salmon numbers harvested annually under Alternative 3, Scenario B. 4-180

Table 4.7-10. Predicted tribal harvests of chinook salmon under Alternative 3, Scenarios A, C, or D. 4-181

Table 4.7-11. Estimated tribal salmon numbers harvested annually under Alternative 4, Scenario B. 4-182

Table 4.7-12. Predicted tribal harvests of chinook salmon under Alternative 4, Scenarios A, C, or D. 4-183

Table 4.7-13. Summary of environmental justice indicators associated with potential impacts from alternative management plans under Scenario B. 4-184

Table 4.7-14. Federal, Tribal, Washington State, and local plans, policies, and programs predicted to have a cumulative impact on environmental justice communities within the Puget Sound Action Area (2004). 4-188

Table 4.8.6-1 Cumulative effects on wildlife of the Proposed Action in combination with various plans, policies and laws. 4-208

Table 5.1-1. Abundance and Canadian/Alaskan fishery scenarios evaluated for each alternative. 5-2

Table 5.1-2 Comparison of predicted environmental effects among alternatives and a description of the Proposed Action for Scenario B in the order they appear in the EIS. 5-4

List of Figures

Figure 1.1-1. Washington commercial salmon management marine catch reporting areas....1-2

Figure 1.4-1. Marine range of west coast chinook salmon....1-5

Figure 1.4-2. Fisheries management forums....1-6

Figure 1.4-3. Locations of federally-recognized Puget Sound treaty tribes that are parties to the proposed action....1-8

Figure 1.6-1. Major fishing areas in Alaska, British Columbia and the southern United States where listed Puget Sound chinook salmon are caught....1-14

Figure 1.6-2. Commercial net and troll catch of chinook salmon in Puget Sound, 1980–2001....1-19

Figure 1.6-3. Puget Sound overview....1-21

Figure 1.6-4. Number of chinook salmon caught in Puget Sound marine fisheries....1-24

Figure 1.6-5. Number of chinook salmon caught in Puget Sound freshwater recreational fisheries....1-24

Figure 3.2-1. The Puget Sound Action Area and regions within the action area....3-3

Figure 3.2-2. Washington counties within the Puget Sound Action Area....3-4

Figure 3.2-3. The North Puget Sound region of the Puget Sound Action Area....3-6

Figure 3.2-4. Puget Sound Chinook Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit: Land ownership pattern....3-10

Figure 3.2-5. Proposed demographically-independent populations in the Puget Sound Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit....3-12

Figure 3.2-6. Hood Canal Summer-Run Chum Salmon Evolutionarily Significant Unit: Land ownership pattern....3-13

Figure 3.3-1. North Puget Sound Region....3-24

Figure 3.3-2. Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Nooksack River spring chinook....3-26

Figure 3.3-3. Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Skagit River summer-fall chinook....3-29

Figure 3.3-4. Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Skagit River spring chinook....3-31

Figure 3.3-5. Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Stillaguamish River summer-fall chinook....3-34

Figure 3.3-6. Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Snohomish River summer-fall chinook....3-35

Figure 3.3-7. South Puget Sound Region....3-39

Figure 3.3-8. Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Lake Washington summer-fall chinook....3-41

Figure 3.3-9. Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Green-Duwamish River summer-fall chinook....3-43

Figure 3.3-10. Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for White River spring chinook. 3-46

Figure 3.3-11. Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Puyallup River fall chinook. 3-49

Figure 3.3-12. Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Nisqually River fall chinook. 3-51

Figure 3.3-13. Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Skokomish River fall chinook. 3-53

Figure 3.3-14. Strait of Juan de Fuca Region. 3-56

Figure 3.3-15. Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Dungeness River spring chinook. 3-58

Figure 3.3-16. Spawning escapement, fishing exploitation rate, and geographic distribution of fishing mortality for Elwha River summer-fall chinook. 3-60

Figure 3.3-17. Summer chum salmon spawning escapement to the Big Quilcene, other west Hood Canal streams, and east Hood Canal streams, 1968 –2001. 3-63

Figure 3.3-18. Summer chum salmon spawning escapement to Strait of Juan de Fuca streams, 1971–2001. 3-64

Figure 3.3.7-1. Age composition of Puget Sound chinook salmon catch: relatively stable since 1980. 3-100

Figure 3.3.7-2. Age composition of Puget Sound chinook salmon escapement: stable since the 1970s. 3-101

Figure 3.5-1. Location of federally-recognized Puget Sound Indian tribes that are parties to the proposed action. 3-129

Figure 3.6-1. Annual average ex-vessel value of commercial salmon landed at Puget Sound ports between 1991 and 1998, by county. 3-146

Figure 3.6-2. Annual average catch (tribal and non-tribal) and ex-vessel value of commercially-caught salmon in Puget Sound between 1991 and 2000. 3-147

Figure 3.6-3. Percent of the annual average commercially-caught salmon in Puget Sound between 1991 and 2000, by marine catch area (in pounds landed). 3-148

Figure 3.6-4. Action and impact analysis area for the Puget Sound Harvest Management Plan. 3-150

Figure 3.6-5. Percent of annual average commercially-caught (tribal and non-tribal) harvest of salmon in freshwater areas of Puget Sound. 3-151

Figure 3.6-6. Annual average catch and ex-vessel value of salmon harvested by tribes in Puget Sound (1991-2000). 3-153

Figure 3.6-7. Annual average sport catch (number of fish caught) of salmon in marine and freshwater areas of Puget Sound, by species (1991-2000). 3-156

Figure 3.6-8. Salmon ports and major launch areas in North Puget Sound region. 3-157

Figure 3.6-9. Salmon ports and major launch areas in South Puget Sound/South Hood Canal region. 3-158

Figure 3.6-10. Salmon ports and major launch areas in the Strait of Juan de Fuca/North Hood Canal region. 3-159