

Hatchery and Fishery Reform Policy (C-3619)
(Briefing/Public Comment)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary Sheet.....	1 of 21
SEPA Environmental Checklist	3 of 21
SEPA Determination of Non-significance	19 of 21



Fish and Wildlife Commission Presentation Summary Sheet

Meeting date:

3/27/2021

Agenda item:

18. C-3619 Hatchery and Fishery Reform Policy – Briefing and Public Comment

Presenter(s):

Ron Warren, Director of Fish Policy and Dr. Ken Warheit, Director of Molecular Genetics and Fish Health

Background summary:

Over the course of the last two years, beginning at the June 15, 2018 Fish and Wildlife Commission (FWC) meeting, the department conducted a review of all sections and aspects of the Hatchery and Fishery Reform Policy (C-3619). The Commission's June 10–13, 2020 meeting, the fish committee members took the lead in drafting the initial language modifications based on the review the department conducted as well as comments received. At the August 1st Commission meeting a draft Anadromous Salmon and Steelhead Hatchery Policy was approved for continued public input leading up to the briefing and public hearing September 12, 2020. At the November 6, 2020, Special Commission meeting staff provided the Commission with a summary of public comment received through the extended comment period. The Commission considered revisions to the August 1 Public Review Draft containing draft language changes to Policy C-3619, and approved for further public review. At the January 30, 2021, meeting the Commission approved a new version of the policy for a review through and under SEPA. The policy has been reviewed through SEPA and received a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS). The public comment period concludes on March 24th, a review of comments to assure all critical elements were considered is on-going. We will attempt to complete this review and inform the Commission of our status at the briefing on March 27, 2021. If the Commission takes action to approve this policy at a future meeting - the draft policy now subjected to SEPA is now a new policy (C-3624), which would supersede C-3619.

Staff recommendation:

Policy issue(s) and expected outcome:

Fiscal impacts of agency implementation:

Public involvement process used and what you learned:

Action requested and/or proposed next steps:

Draft motion language:

Post decision communications plan:

Form revised 8-4-20

SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of checklist:

Governmental agencies use this checklist to help determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant. This information is also helpful to determine if available avoidance, minimization or compensatory mitigation measures will address the probable significant impacts or if an environmental impact statement will be prepared to further analyze the proposal.

Instructions for applicants:

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Please answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. You may need to consult with an agency specialist or private consultant for some questions. You may use "not applicable" or "does not apply" only when you can explain why it does not apply and not when the answer is unknown. You may also attach or incorporate by reference additional studies reports. Complete and accurate answers to these questions often avoid delays with the SEPA process as well as later in the decision-making process.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Instructions for Lead Agencies:

Please adjust the format of this template as needed. Additional information may be necessary to evaluate the existing environment, all interrelated aspects of the proposal and an analysis of adverse impacts. The checklist is considered the first but not necessarily the only source of information needed to make an adequate threshold determination. Once a threshold determination is made, the lead agency is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the checklist and other supporting documents.

Use of checklist for nonproject proposals:

For nonproject proposals (such as ordinances, regulations, plans and programs), complete the applicable parts of sections A and B plus the [SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS \(part D\)](#). Please completely answer all questions that apply and note that the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proponent," and "affected geographic area," respectively. The lead agency may exclude (for non-projects) questions in Part B - Environmental Elements –that do not contribute meaningfully to the analysis of the proposal.

A. Background [\[HELP\]](#)

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:
Anadromous Salmon and Steelhead Hatchery Policy C-3624 supersedes policy C-3619
2. Name of applicant:
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

Eric Kinne
Hatchery Division Manager
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
1111 Washington St SE
Olympia, WA 98501
360-902-2418

4. Date checklist prepared:

March 8, 2021

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

Policy C-3624 is a complete revision and supersedes the original policy C-3619 adopted November 5, 2009. Pending completion of public comment period and SEPA determination, the Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission intends to vote on the implementation of C-3624 in Spring 2021. The environmental review of this Policy will be through a phased approach in accordance with WAC 197-11-060-5(c)(i). This SEPA checklist concerns the first phase of our environmental review – a review of the actions specified in the Policy C-3624. The second phase will concern an environmental review of a technical procedures document, to be developed as a requirement of Policy C-3624. A new SEPA checklist will be submitted following the completion of the technical procedures document, estimated in Spring or Summer 2022.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

This is a phased environmental review. As required by Policy C-3624 the following future additions will occur: (1) the development of a technical procedures document, and (2) following the completion of the technical procedures document the development of hatchery program specific Hatchery Management Plans (HMPs). The HMPs will be based on the technical and management requirements included in the technical procedures document. The environmental review of the technical procedures document is the second phase of this SEPA process and is estimated to occur in Spring or Summer 2022.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

A SEPA Determination of Non-Significance (DNS 20-045) on an earlier version of Policy C-3624 was issued and posted on September 14, 2020. This earlier version of the policy is now outdated and has been superseded by an extensively modified version of Policy C-3624. Therefore DNS 20-045 was withdrawn on January 11, 2021. When a hatchery program may affect one or more populations listed under the Federal Endangered Species Act, WDFW files a Hatchery Genetic Management Plan (HGMP) with NOAA. NOAA, in consultation with USFWS, conducts an environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) on each HGMP.

If a hatchery program operating under this policy requires an HGMP and does not have an HGMP developed, WDFW will file the HGMP with NOAA, initiating steps that will result in a NEPA assessment of

the program.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

Yes, there are currently 45 HGMPs under review by NOAA or USFWS. See #8 above.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

No government approvals are needed for the proposed policy.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

This proposal is non-project specific and will guide the management of WDFW hatcheries in Washington state using the best available science and adaptive management practices. The purpose of policy C-3624 is to guide hatcheries and their individual rearing programs to advance the conservation and recovery of wild salmon and steelhead by continuing to implement hatchery reform measures; to perpetuate salmon and steelhead in accordance with existing mitigation programs and agreements for permanently lost habitat; and to provide sustainable economic and stability benefits to recreational, commercial and tribal fisheries in Washington State as appropriate. Policy C-3624 implements the following elements:

- 1) Establishes an overall philosophy as to the purpose, intent, and goals of anadromous salmon and steelhead hatchery production from WDFW-operated hatchery facilities. This philosophy establishes the conservation of natural resources as the highest priority for the policy. The policy also directs WDFW to “safely perpetuate salmon and steelhead resources to support sustainable fisheries.”
- 2) The policy directs WDFW to establish “clear goals for each hatchery program, conducting scientifically defensible-operations, and using a well-informed monitoring and evaluation program to make adaptive changes to achieve hatchery program goals.”
- 3) Hatchery programs will be designated as either conservation, mitigation, or fishery supplementation programs.
- 4) WDFW will operate hatcheries consistent with all applicable state and federal laws and state-tribal fishery management agreements, and by maintaining strong working relationships with tribes.
- 5) Makes clear that this policy is not a “Tribal Co-Manager-agreed joint policy agreement, an element of Tribal fishing rights case law, or a component of the Puget Sound Salmon Management Plan.” However, the policy does direct WDFW to work with Tribal Co-managers to establish a joint hatchery policy that would supersede all or parts of C-3624. The new joint policy would require a separate SEPA environmental review.
- 6) The policy makes clear that there exist significant risks and benefits to hatchery programs, and that hatchery operations should be conducted by balancing these risks and benefits. The Policy directs WDFW to achieve balance through a structured decision-making process that includes science-based risk management and adaptive management frameworks. The policy does not define how risks and benefits will be balanced, but directs the agency to establish the risk management framework, adaptive management framework, and the structured decision making process in a technical procedures document to be produced within a year of the approval of this policy.
- 7) Requires that management direction for each hatchery program be described in a Hatchery Management Plan (HMP). The HMPs will be based on the technical procedures document described above. The policy establishes a priority order for the production of HMPs, including the

fact that HMPs cannot be implemented until the technical procedures document has been subjected to an appropriate SEPA environmental review, and approved by the Commission.

- 8) Consistent with Governor Inslee's Executive Order, the Governor's Southern Resident Orca (SRO) Task Force, and the Fish and Wildlife Commission's SRO Prey Initiative, WDFW is to consult with "Tribal Co-Managers and work with the National Marine Fisheries Service to develop an implementation plan for the SRO prey initiative."
- 9) All Chinook, Coho, and steelhead propagated in WDFW operated hatcheries will be externally marked, except where exempt by the policy.
- 10) WDFW should seek funding to accomplish specific tasks, including the identification of wild populations that would receive "an elevated level of protection," and compliance with environmental regulations.
- 11) WDFW will plan and implement methods to "separate hatchery and natural origin salmon and steelhead below natural spawning grounds where scientifically justified, logistically feasible, and agreed to with area-specific Tribal Co-Managers."
- 12) Finally, until HMPs are developed, approved, and implemented, which first requires the development and environmental review of the technical procedures document, all "existing hatchery operational plans, goals and objectives in effect on June 14, 2018 shall remain intact as current policy direction." There are three exceptions to this policy directive: The SRO prey initiative described above, Columbia River Salmon Fishery Management Policy, and the Willapa Bay Salmon Fishery Management Policy, will take precedent on any issues where they may be inconsistent with the hatchery policy and objectives in effect on June 14, 2018.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

This is a statewide policy. The scope or range for implementation will be conducted by geographic regions such as Puget Sound, Washington Coast, Lower Columbia River, Middle Columbia River, Upper Columbia River and Snake River that match or are similar to the federal ESA salmon recovery units (ESU/DPS) and will be addressed during Phase 2.

B. Environmental Elements [help]

This project will be implemented using a phased environmental review. Policy C-3624 provides direction for the development and implementation of internal agency tasks and documents, but the policy itself is not project specific and does not call for any explicit department actions that would impact the environment. Therefore, the environmental elements sections do not apply to this first phase of the environmental review.

1. Earth [help]

a. General description of the site:

(circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other _____

Does not apply. Not site specific.

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them, and note any agricultural land of long-term commercial significance and whether the proposal results in removing any of these soils.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- e. Describe the purpose, type, total area, and approximate quantities and total affected area of any filling, excavation, and grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

2. Air [help]

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal during construction, operation, and maintenance when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

3. Water [help]

a. Surface Water: [help]

- 1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- 2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- 3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- 4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- 5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- 6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

b. Ground Water: [help]

- 1) Will groundwater be withdrawn from a well for drinking water or other purposes? If so, give a general description of the well, proposed uses and approximate quantities withdrawn from the well. Will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- 2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: Domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals. . . ; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

c. Water runoff (including stormwater):

- 1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- 2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- 3) Does the proposal alter or otherwise affect drainage patterns in the vicinity of the site? If so, describe.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water, and drainage pattern impacts, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

4. Plants [help]

- a. Check the types of vegetation found on the site:

N/A ___deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other

N/A ___evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other

N/A ___shrubs

N/A ___grass

N/A ___pasture

N/A ___crop or grain

N/A ___ Orchards, vineyards or other permanent crops.

N/A ___ wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bullrush, skunk cabbage, other

N/A ___water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other

N/A ___other types of vegetation

- b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- c. List threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

e. List all noxious weeds and invasive species known to be on or near the site.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

5. Animals [help]

a. List any birds and other animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site.

Examples include:

birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other: N/A
mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other: N/A
fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other _____ N/A

b. List any threatened and endangered species known to be on or near the site.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

e. List any invasive animal species known to be on or near the site.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

6. Energy and Natural Resources [help]

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

7. Environmental Health [help]

a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

1) Describe any known or possible contamination at the site from present or past uses.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

2) Describe existing hazardous chemicals/conditions that might affect project development and design. This includes underground hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines located within the project area and in the vicinity.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

3) Describe any toxic or hazardous chemicals that might be stored, used, or produced during the project's development or construction, or at any time during the operating life of the project.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

4) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

5) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

b. Noise

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

8. Land and Shoreline Use [help]

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties? Will the proposal affect current land uses on nearby or adjacent properties? If so, describe.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- b. Has the project site been used as working farmlands or working forest lands? If so, describe. How much agricultural or forest land of long-term commercial significance will be converted to other uses as a result of the proposal, if any? If resource lands have not been designated, how many acres in farmland or forest land tax status will be converted to nonfarm or nonforest use?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

1) Will the proposal affect or be affected by surrounding working farm or forest land normal business operations, such as oversize equipment access, the application of pesticides, tilling, and harvesting? If so, how:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- c. Describe any structures on the site.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as a critical area by the city or county? If so, specify.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

m. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts to agricultural and forest lands of long-term commercial significance, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

9. Housing [help]

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

10. Aesthetics [help]

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

C. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

11. Light and Glare [help]

- a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

12. Recreation [help]

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

13. Historic and cultural preservation [help]

- a. Are there any buildings, structures, or sites, located on or near the site that are over 45 years old listed in or eligible for listing in national, state, or local preservation registers? If so, specifically describe.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- b. Are there any landmarks, features, or other evidence of Indian or historic use or occupation? This may include human burials or old cemeteries. Are there any material evidence, artifacts, or areas of cultural importance on or near the site? Please list any professional studies conducted at the site to identify such resources.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- c. Describe the methods used to assess the potential impacts to cultural and historic resources on or near the project site. Examples include consultation with tribes and the department of archeology and historic preservation, archaeological surveys, historic maps, GIS data, etc.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- d. Proposed measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for loss, changes to, and disturbance to resources. Please include plans for the above and any permits that may be required.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

14. Transportation [help]

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site or affected geographic area and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- b. Is the site or affected geographic area currently served by public transit? If so, generally describe. If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- c. How many additional parking spaces would the completed project or non-project proposal have? How many would the project or proposal eliminate?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- d. Will the proposal require any new or improvements to existing roads, streets, pedestrian, bicycle or state transportation facilities, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- e. Will the project or proposal use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project or proposal? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur and what percentage of the volume would be trucks (such as commercial and nonpassenger vehicles). What data or transportation models were used to make these estimates?

Does not apply. Not site specific.

g. Will the proposal interfere with, affect or be affected by the movement of agricultural and forest products on roads or streets in the area? If so, generally describe.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:

Does not apply. Not site specific.

15. Public Services [help]

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, public transit, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

16. Utilities [help]

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:
electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system,
other _____

Does not apply. Not site specific.

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

Does not apply. Not site specific.

C. Signature [help]

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: Eric Kinne

Name of signee Eric Kinne

Position and Agency/Organization Hatchery Division Manager, WDFW

Date Submitted: 3/8/2021

D. Supplemental sheet for nonproject actions [HELP]

(IT IS NOT NECESSARY to use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment.

When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

Policy C-3624 provides no direction in terms of changes in hatchery production, except with the possibility that production may increase associated with the SRO prey initiative. Additional discharge to water may occur at hatcheries if an increase in production occurs. WDFW facilities currently operate under National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits and water quality is measured monthly at all facilities. Facilities also have settling ponds on-site to minimize sediment laden water from being discharged into waterbodies. No additional emissions to air or release of toxins into the environment will occur. This section will be addressed in more detail during Phase 2 of the SEPA process.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:

There are currently no measures outside what is described above to reduce additional discharges to water.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

Policy C-3624 provides no direction in terms of changes in hatchery production, except with the possibility that production associated with the SRO prey initiative may increase production. Therefore, the policy itself will not result in effects to plants, animals, fish, or marine life. The environmental review associated with the technical procedures documents will concern the likely effects to plants, animals, fish, or marine life.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

Not applicable. See above.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

Would not affect any of these elements as no additional energy resources will need to be developed.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

Not applicable. See above.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

Would not affect any of these elements.

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

Not applicable. See above.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

Would not affect any of these elements.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:

Not applicable. See above.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

Would not affect any of these elements.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:

Not applicable. See above.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

Policy is not in conflict with any local, state, or federal law in place to protect the environment.



State of Washington
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 43200, Olympia, WA 98504-3200 • (360) 902-2200 • TDD (360) 902-2207
Main Office Location: Natural Resources Building, 1111 Washington Street SE, Olympia, WA

DETERMINATION OF NONSIGNIFICANCE (DNS)

Name of Proposal: DNS 21-008: ANADROMOUS SALMON AND STEELHEAD
HATCHERY POLICY C-3624 SUPERSEDES POLICY C-3619

Description of Proposal:

This proposal is non-project specific and will guide the management of WDFW hatcheries in Washington state using the best available science and adaptive management practices. The purpose of policy C-3624 is to guide hatcheries and their individual rearing programs to advance the conservation and recovery of wild salmon and steelhead by continuing to implement hatchery reform measures; to perpetuate salmon and steelhead in accordance with existing mitigation programs and agreements for permanently lost habitat; and to provide sustainable economic and stability benefits to recreational, commercial and tribal fisheries in Washington State as appropriate. Policy C-3624 implements the following elements:

- 1) Establishes an overall philosophy as to the purpose, intent, and goals of anadromous salmon and steelhead hatchery production from WDFW-operated hatchery facilities. This philosophy establishes the conservation of natural resources as the highest priority for the policy. The policy also directs WDFW to “safely perpetuate salmon and steelhead resources to support sustainable fisheries.”
- 2) The policy directs WDFW to establish “clear goals for each hatchery program, conducting scientifically defensible-operations, and using a well-informed monitoring and evaluation program to make adaptive changes to achieve hatchery program goals.”
- 3) Hatchery programs will be designated as either conservation, mitigation, or fishery supplementation programs.
- 4) WDFW will operate hatcheries consistent with all applicable state and federal laws and state-tribal fishery management agreements, and by maintaining strong working relationships with tribes.
- 5) Makes clear that this policy is not a “Tribal Co-Manager-agreed joint policy agreement, an element of Tribal fishing rights case law, or a component of the Puget Sound Salmon Management Plan.” However, the policy does direct WDFW to work with Tribal Co-managers to establish a joint hatchery policy that would supersede all or parts of C-3624. The new joint policy would require a separate SEPA environmental review.
- 6) The policy makes clear that there exist significant risks and benefits to hatchery programs, and that hatchery operations should be conducted by balancing these risks and benefits. The Policy directs WDFW to achieve balance through a structured decision-making process that includes science-based risk management and adaptive management frameworks. The policy does not define how risks and benefits will be balanced, but directs the agency to establish the risk management framework, adaptive management framework, and the structured decision making process in a technical procedures document to be produced within a year of the approval of this policy.

- 7) Requires that management direction for each hatchery program be described in a Hatchery Management Plan (HMP). The HMPs will be based on the technical procedures document described above. The policy establishes a priority order for the production of HMPs, including the fact that HMPs cannot be implemented until the technical procedures document has been subjected to an appropriate SEPA environmental review, and approved by the Commission.
- 8) Consistent with Governor Inslee’s Executive Order, the Governor’s Southern Resident Orca (SRO) Task Force, and the Fish and Wildlife Commission’s SRO Prey Initiative, WDFW is to consult with “Tribal Co-Managers and work with the National Marine Fisheries Service to develop an implementation plan for the SRO prey initiative.”
- 9) All Chinook, Coho, and steelhead propagated in WDFW operated hatcheries will be externally marked, except where exempt by the policy.
- 10) WDFW should seek funding to accomplish specific tasks, including the identification of wild populations that would receive “an elevated level of protection,” and compliance with environmental regulations.
- 11) WDFW will plan and implement methods to “separate hatchery and natural origin salmon and steelhead below natural spawning grounds where scientifically justified, logistically feasible, and agreed to with area-specific Tribal Co-Managers.”
- 12) Finally, until HMPs are developed, approved, and implemented, which first requires the development and environmental review of the technical procedures document, all “existing hatchery operational plans, goals and objectives in effect on June 14, 2018 shall remain intact as current policy direction.” There are three exceptions to this policy directive: The SRO prey initiative described above, Columbia River Salmon Fishery Management Policy, and the Willapa Bay Salmon Fishery Management Policy, will take precedent on any issues where they may be inconsistent with the hatchery policy and objectives in effect on June 14, 2018.

The environmental review of this Policy will be through a phased approach in accordance with WAC 197-11-060-5(c)(i). This SEPA determination concerns the first phase of environmental review – a review of the actions specified in the Policy C-3624. The second phase will concern an environmental review of a technical procedures document, to be developed as a requirement of Policy C-3624.

Proponent/Applicant: Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)
Contact: Eric Kinne, Hatchery Division Manager
1111 Washington St SE
Olympia, WA 98501
(360) 902-2418
Eric.Kinne@dfw.wa.gov

Location of Proposal, including street, if any: This is a statewide policy. The scope or range for implementation will be conducted by geographic regions such as Puget Sound, Washington Coast, Lower Columbia River, Middle Columbia River, Upper Columbia River and Snake River that match or are similar to the federal ESA salmon recovery units (ESU/DPS) and will be addressed during Phase 2.

Lead Agency: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)

WDFW has determined that this proposal will likely not have a significant adverse impact on the environment. Therefore, state law¹ does not require an environmental impact statement (EIS). WDFW made this determination of nonsignificance (DNS) after we reviewed the environmental checklist and other information on file with us.

We issued this DNS according to state rules.² **We will not act on this proposal for 14 days** from the date we issued the DNS. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public are invited to comment on this proposal or DNS. We must receive your comments within 14 days of the date of this letter. The comment period will end at **5:00 pm on March 23, 2021**.

Method of Comment:

The following procedures shall govern the method to comment on agency SEPA proposals. Comments received through these procedures are part of the official SEPA record for this proposal.

You can submit your comments any one of the following ways:

- Email to SEPADesk2@dfw.wa.gov
- Online at the WDFW SEPA website comment link at: <http://wdfw.wa.gov/licenses/environmental/sepa/open-comments>
- Fax to (360) 902-2946
- Mail to the address below.

Responsible Official: Lisa Wood

Position/Title: SEPA/NEPA Coordinator, WDFW Habitat Program, Protection Division

Address: P.O. Box 43200, Olympia, WA 98504-3200

After the comment period closes, applicants may view the updated status of this proposal on the WDFW SEPA website: <https://wdfw.wa.gov/licenses/environmental/sepa/closed-final>. Once the status is posted as final, applicants and permittees may take action on the proposal. When a proposal is modified or withdrawn, notice will be given in accordance with state law.¹

If you have questions about this DNS or the details of the proposal, contact Lisa Wood at the address above or email SEPADesk2@dfw.wa.gov.

DATE OF ISSUE: March 9, 2021

SIGNATURE: 

Footnotes

1. RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c)
2. WAC 197-11-340(2).

SEPA Log Number: 21-008.dns

Individuals who need to receive this information in an alternative format or language, or who need reasonable accommodations to participate in WDFW-sponsored public meetings or other activities may contact Dolores Noyes at (360-902-2349), or TTY 771, or email (dolores.noyes@dfw.wa.gov). For more information https://wdfw.wa.gov/accessibility/reasonable_request.html.