

“Fish white paper”

A synthesis of changes in our knowledge of Chinook salmon productivity and habitat uses in WRIA 9 (2004-2016).

THANKS

Overview

- Intent of the paper is be part of the addendum to the Strategic Assessment—the technical basis for which policy actions are based on
- Had a broad swath of the ITC review/comment on the document--~ 12 members
- MIT has expressed interest in reviewing the new draft
- The paper has gone through 2 reviews
- Want quick turn around on this, the final review, so Forum can adopt 3 of the 4 white papers during their Nov 9th meeting
- ***Comments are due by Oct 31st***

Minor Issues

- To Chinook or not to chinook?
- Lots of small grammar fixes and the like
- Paper was reorganized in various ways
 - More clearly consolidated into two main parts—
 - watershed wide issues
 - subwatershed
 - Headers modified to try to be more clear and obvious about topics
 - Broke out some denser text into bullets
- Will add a map of ‘new’ spawning locations—it is still being produced
- As requested expanded the info around habitat above HHD
- Expanded the Survival/Otolith section and added a graphic

Bigger Issues

VSP-Spatial Structure. We don't have a metric.

- We have a concept of 'number of spawning patches occupied' in the plan
 - This has never been pursued due inability to accurately delineate 'spawning patches' **Should we keep it?**
- Tyler suggested adding distribution of Parr as a potential metric.
 - This would add emphasis on the need for off-channel habitats.
 - Does this make sense?
 - How could we measure this affordably?

Bigger Issues--Middle Green and Ag

“The projects that are most likely to create the type of necessary rearing habitat unfortunately overlap with both the County’s ‘Upper Green Agricultural Production District as well as many Farmland Protection Program easements. County agricultural policies and programs create regulatory and implementation hurdles to implementing the aforementioned high priority restoration projects in the Middle Green. With the ongoing downward trend in Chinook abundance and the urgent need for more fry habitat, the Forum should work with the County to find ways to fully implement these high priority projects.”

Should we?

- Be more pointed or forceful than “the Forum should work with the County”
- Add text like “and find ways to also improve agricultural productivity in other parts of the watershed if necessary to offset impacts to agriculture”.

Bigger Issues-Duwamish

- Do we incorporate what we now know into project prioritization in the Duwamish? Received limited feedback on what was proposed. Should we suggest anything different than the status quo?
- Keep in mind superfund clean up will not likely be completed till roughly 2030
- Paper currently proposes
 - RM 0 to 4.3 (just upstream of slip 6):
 - Focus on acquiring land over next 10 years
 - Wait for contamination/recontamination issues to be better understood before undertaking restoration projects with salmon dollars.
 - RM 4.3 to 11: Same as above, but if moving forward on restoration, WRIA/Sponsor should fund extensive feasibility analyses to evaluate the current contamination as well as the likelihood of recontamination before fully funding 100% design

OTHER issues?

- *Comments are due by Oct 31st*