

Conservation Caucus Preferred Alternative A4(10%)

1. Minimize Electrofishing
2. Covering the majority of anadromous fish reference data
3. F/N Overshoots
4. 10% gradient well below default physical criteria in rule
5. Re-calibrating risk balancing
6. Repeatable, enforceable, and implementable
7. Application of the AFF statewide
8. Urgency


Conservation Caucus Preferred Alternative A4(10%)

1. Minimize Electrofishing

- a. FP Board motion – 8/11/2015
- b. FPHCP does not provide coverage for e-fishing to water type
- c. E-fishing is imperfect (small, cryptic, low density fish can be missed, esp. at low temps and conductivity common in headwaters)
- d. Overreliance on fish presence (low abundance, prevalence of culverts, imperfect tool) misses Type F as defined in 222-16-010.

Conservation Caucus Preferred Alternative A4(10%)

2. Covering the majority of anadromous fish reference data
 - a. A4(10%) is second-most risk-averse alternative –
 - b. Captured the majority of the model's anad. fish ref. data



Addendum Figure 4 (equivalent to Figure 10 in main report). Bar chart showing the length of stream in which the modeled AFF ends downstream of the 'other anadromy' data (False Negatives).

Conservation Caucus Preferred Alternative A4(10%)

3. F/N Overshoots

- a. All alternatives overshoot F/N breaks to varying degrees
- b. A number of possible explanations

Conservation Caucus Preferred Alternative A4(10%)

4. 10% gradient well below default physical criteria in rule
 - a. WAC 222-16-031 defines default Type F fish habitat in stream reaches that extend up to 16% or 20% channel gradient depending on basin area (<50 acres).
 - b. Where A4(10%) may overshoot modeled anadromous reference data, it is most often still well within default physical criteria defining Type F waters.

Conservation Caucus Preferred Alternative A4(10%)

5. Re-calibrating risk balancing

- a. We have already made numerous concessions in the interest of balancing risk.
 - 1) Alt A. is integral to the Westside Tribe's FHAM PHB criteria.
 - 2) A4(10%) has a smaller footprint than Alt A.

Conservation Caucus Preferred Alternative A4(10%)

6. Repeatable, enforceable, and implementable

- a. Field components similar to those currently in use – BFW, gradient, vertical and non-vertical obstacle measurements
- b. Details to be worked out in BM23 and Rule dev'p.

Conservation Caucus Preferred Alternative A4(10%)

7. Application of the AFF statewide

- a. Based on our understanding from Eastside WA policy rep, Ray Entz.
- b. The same issues that necessitate the AFF in western half of the state are present in the eastside.
- c. Dev'p of eastern WA PHBs assumes the AFF.

Conservation Caucus Preferred Alternative A4(10%)

7. Urgency

- a. Salmon populations are a fraction of historical abundance
- b. Habitat impacts are a significant driver
- c. Climate change is exacerbating those impacts
- d. Huge public investments in habitat restoration, but recovery will require better protection of existing habitat
- e. The FPHCP provides riparian protections assuming implementation of an effective (permanent) water typing system to meet CWA and ESA, and provide a harvestable supply of fish.

A4(10%) w/ ID Teams to address site-specific issues best achieves the FP Board Motions and commitments made in the FPHCP.