Comprehensive Hatchery Management Plan

Carson National Fish Hatchery



U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Planning Report: Number 1
October 2002

COMPREHENSIVE HATCHERY MANAGEMENT PLAN

Carson National Fish Hatchery

Planning Report: Number 1

Prepared by:

Carson National Fish Hatchery
14041 Wind River Highway
Carson, WA 98610

Columbia River Fisheries Program Office
9317 Highway 99, Suite 1
Vancouver, WA 98665

Lower Columbia River Fish Health Center
61552 State Route 14
Underwood, WA 98651

Columbia River Gorge Information and Education Office
122 Coho Road
Cook, WA 98605

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Region One

October 2002

Explanation of Purpose

Carson National Fish Hatchery - Comprehensive Hatchery Management Plan

This Comprehensive Hatchery Management Plan (CHMP) for the Carson National Fish Hatchery (NFH) is an operational management plan which outlines policy, legal mandates, goals and objectives relevant to the overall management of the station. This document is a planning and reference tool and is not a decision-making or policy-making document.

Additional documents developed in separate processes are referenced in this CHMP and provide biological, policy, legal, and management analysis of the Carson NFH. These documents are the Biological Assessment and Biological Opinion on Artificial Production in the Columbia River Basin, the Federal Columbia River Power System Biological Opinion, the Hatchery and Genetic Management Plan, and the U.S. v Oregon Columbia River Fisheries Management Plan.

The correct citation for this plan is:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2002. Comprehensive Hatchery Management Plan for the Carson National Fish Hatchery. Planning Report Number 1, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carson National Fish Hatchery, Carson, Washington.

This Comprehensive Hatchery Management Plan for the Carson National Fish Hatchery (Planning Report: Number 1) addresses the Pacific Region's requirement to integrate U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service objectives and priorities with those of co-managers, other agencies, and resource programs; fulfill obligations under the Endangered Species Act and relevant fisheries conservation, mitigation, and management programs; identify and define in specifics what hatchery reforms are implemented to achieve objectives; and, provide a foundation for future program and budget development and review.

Submitted by: _____ _____

Project Leader, Carson NFH — Date

_____ _____

Project Leader, Columbia River FPO — Date

_____ _____

Project Leader, Lower Columbia River FHC — Date

Approved: _____ _____

Assistant Regional Director, Fisheries — Date

Approved: _____ _____

Regional Director, Pacific Region — Date

Acknowledgments

Dan Diggs and Doug DeHart coordinated the initial development of this plan, along with Chuck Dunn, Lee Hillwig, Ed Forner, Kate Benkert, Bob Semple, Larry Marchant, Ed Lamotte, Bob Wunderlich, Ron Wong, Ray Jones, Thomas Trock, Brian Cates, and Rich Johnson. Donna Allard provided assistance in the publication of this report.

CONTENTS

Page

Explanation of Purpose i
Signature Page ii
Acknowledgments iii
List of Attachments viii
Executive Summary x

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Purpose of and Need for Plan 1
Description of Planning Process 2
Composition of Planning Team 2
Review and Update of Plan 3
Fisheries Program Mission, Goals, and Priorities 3
National Fish Hatchery System Overview 4
Regional Fishery Goals and Priorities 5
Legal and Policy Guidance 7

CHAPTER 2. HATCHERY AND RESOURCE DESCRIPTIONS

Hatchery Overview 8
Hatchery Purpose 8
Facility and Site Descriptions 8
Archeology/Cultural Resources 9
Watershed/Ecosystem Setting 9
- General Description 9
- Geology 9
- Climate and Hydrology 10
- Fish and Wildlife 10
- Vegetation 11
- Habitat Condition 12
- Current and Future Development 12

History of Hatchery Stocks 13
- Legal Authority 13
- Production and Management History 14

Biological Risks and Ecological Interactions 16
- Hatchery Water Intake and Use 17
- Brood Stock Collection 17
- Genetic Introgression 18
- Hatchery Production 18

Disease . . . 18
Competition . . . 19
Predation . . . 20
Residualism . . . 22
Migration Corridor/Ocean . . . 22
Harvest . . . 23
Cutthroat Trout . . . 23
Bull Trout . . . 23
Beneficial Uses . . . 23
Public Uses . . . 23
Harvest Contribution . . . 24
Economic Benefit . . . 24
Cultural Values . . . 24

CHAPTER 3. HATCHERY AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Hatchery Goals, Objectives, and Tasks . . . 26
Current Practices to Achieve Goals, Objectives, and Tasks . . . 31
Water Use and Management . . . 31
Screening . . . 32
Conveyance System to Hatchery and Ponds . . . 32
Effluent Treatment and Monitoring . . . 33
Brood Stock Management . . . 33
Surplus Adult Returns . . . 34
Spawning Protocol . . . 35
Other Acceptable Stocks . . . 35
Upstream Passage . . . 35
Special Concerns . . . 36
Incubation Strategies and Procedures . . . 36
Rearing Strategies . . . 36
Release Strategies . . . 38
Fish Health Management Program . . . 38
Fish Health Policy . . . 38
Fish Health Examinations . . . 39
Chemotherapeutant Use . . . 40
Other Fish Health Precautions . . . 41
Monitoring, Evaluation and Coordination . . . 42
Database Management . . . 42
Marking/Tagging Program . . . 42
Bio-sampling and Reporting . . . 43
Hatchery Evaluation Studies . . . 43

Stock Assessment and Contribution to Fisheries 44
Juvenile Monitoring 44
ESA Assessments, Ecological Interactions, and Natural Production Studies 45
Environmental Monitoring 46
Coordination/Communication 46
Fish and Egg Transfers 47
Interagency Coordination/Communication 47
Ocean Fisheries Management 47
Freshwater Fisheries Management 47
Public Outreach Activities 48
On Station 48
Off Station 49
Partnerships/Cooperators 49
Special Concerns 51
Planning Issues 51
Marking 52
Juvenile Salmon Distribution and Production Numbers 52
Water Use (Drought) 53
Surplus Adult Salmon Distribution 53
Fish Passage and Ladder Management 53
Negative Impacts to Listed and Other Aquatic Resources 53
Insufficient Operations and Maintenance Funding Through the Mitchell Act 53

CHAPTER 4. IMPLEMENTATION

Budget Overview 55
Budgetary Needs and Strategies 55
Fisheries Operational Needs System (FONS) 55
Maintenance Management System (MMS) 56
Five-Year Construction Plan 56
Five-Year Maintenance Plan 56
Mitchell Act and Other Reimbursable Funding Processes 56
ESA Compliance and Needs 57
Service and Station Guidance 58
Quarters Policy 58
Required On-Station Housing 58
Overtime/Compensatory Time/Standby 58
Distribution of Surplus Fish/Eggs 59
Drugs and Anesthetics 59
Employee Training 59
Service Required Planning Documents 59

Safety and Health Plan 60
Fire Management Plan 60
Integrated Pest Management Plan 60
Station Development Plan 60
Monitoring and Evaluation Plan 60
Distribution of Surplus Fish 61
Small Water Systems Management Plan (Drinking Water) 61
Continuity of Operation Plan 61
Spill Prevention, Control, and Counter Measure Plan 61
Outreach Plan 61
Watershed/Sub-basin Plan 62
National Pollution Discharge Elimination System 62
Hazardous Waste 62
Investigative New Animal Drugs (INAD) 63
Monitoring and Reporting 63
Fisheries Information System (FIS) 63
Fisheries Operational Needs System (FONS) 63
Accomplishment Module 63
Fish and Egg Distribution 63
Imperiled Species Module 63
Maintenance Management System (MMS) 64
Station Guides 64
Real Property Inventory 64
Columbia River information System (CRiS) Reports 64
Energy Use Report 64

References 65

Attachments 70

Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms 147

List of Attachments

Attachment 1.—Map of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Region including Location of Carson National Fish Hatchery and associated field offices.

Attachment 2.—Historical Background of National Fish Hatcheries in Region 1.

Attachment 3.—Statutory Mandates and Authorities.

Attachment 4.—Map of Wind River Watershed in Southwest Washington and Location Map of Carson National Fish Hatchery.

Attachment 5.— Hatchery Buildings, Primary Use, and Improvements.

Attachment 6.— Carson NFH Physical Description of Holding, Incubation, and Rearing Units.

Attachment 7.—Layout Diagram of Carson National Fish Hatchery.

Attachment 8.—Aerial Photographs of Carson National Fish Hatchery.

Attachment 9.—Listed and Candidate Species under the Endangered Species Act.

Attachment 10.—Spawning Ground Survey Data for Spring Chinook Salmon in the Wind River, 1970 - 2001.

Attachment 11.—Special Use Permit from the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Circa 1937.

Attachment 12.—Historical Releases from Carson National Fish Hatchery, 1938-1980.

Attachment 13.—Releases of Juvenile Spring Chinook Salmon from Carson National Fish Hatchery into the Wind River since 1980.

Attachment 14.—Carson National Fish Hatchery Spring Chinook Return Data, 1980-2001.

Attachment 15.—Age at Return of Carson National Fish Hatchery Spring Chinook Salmon.

Attachment 16.—Smolt to Adult Survival of Carson National Fish Hatchery Spring Chinook Salmon, 1980-1996 Broods.

Attachment 17.—Fisheries Contribution of Spring Chinook Salmon from Carson National Fish Hatchery.

Attachment 18.—Budget by Funding Source and Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Personnel for Fiscal Years (FY) 2000 through 2002.

Attachment 19.—Regional and National Calender for the Budget Formulation Process.

Attachment 20.—Projects Submitted as of Fiscal Year 2001 which are Linked to Carson NFH Goals and Objectives.

Attachment 21.—Projects Submitted to FONS in 2001 by the Service's Columbia River Fisheries Program Office (Vancouver, Washington), Lower Columbia River Fish Health Center and Abernathy Fish Technology Center to Support Carson NFH which are Linked to Carson NFH Goals and Objectives.

Attachment 22.—MMS.

Attachment 23.—Quarters Policy.

Attachment 24.—Quarters Plan.

Attachment 25.—Surplus Fish as Government Property.

Attachment 26.—Drugs and Anesthetics.

Attachment 27.—Fisheries Pest Management Policy.

Executive Summary

Plan Overview

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has recognized the need for a comprehensive hatchery planning process to assist in meeting the challenge of changes to hatchery management as required by the conservation status of most Pacific salmon and other anadromous and freshwater fish species. The development of plans, such as this one, will help to: 1) integrate Service objectives and priorities with those of co-managers, other agencies, and resource programs; 2) fulfill our obligations under the Endangered Species Act and relevant fisheries conservation, mitigation, and management programs; 3) identify and define in specifics what hatchery reforms we are implementing to achieve our objectives; and, 4) provide a foundation for future program and budget development and review. This plan recognizes and complies with all management plans and Biological Opinions affecting the Columbia River Basin in general and the Wind River in particular.

Hatchery Purpose

Carson NFH was authorized by Special Act 50 Stat. 220, May 28, 1937, and placed into operation in December 1937 to mitigate for the effects of federal water projects, primarily Bonneville Dam. The hatchery was reauthorized by the Mitchell Act (16 USC 755-757; 52 Stat. 345) May 11, 1938 and amended on August 8, 1946, (60 Stat. 932) for conservation of fishery resources in the Columbia River Basin. The hatchery was remodeled in 1956 to establish a hatchery spring Chinook run in the Wind River, and is currently used for adult collection, egg incubation and rearing of spring Chinook. It also provides eggs for re-establishing spring Chinook runs in other Columbia River tributaries, as needed.

The following Hatchery Management Goals were adapted from the Mitchell Act, Endangered Species Act (ESA) Biological Opinions, U.S. v. Oregon agreements, and the Integrated Hatchery Operations Team - Operation Plans for Anadromous Fish Production Facilities in the Columbia River Basin Volume III - Washington, Annual Report for 1995 (IHOT 1996).

Hatchery Goals [1]

Goal 1: Conserve Columbia River spring Chinook salmon in the area upstream of Bonneville Dam (as defined in the Mitchell Act of 1937).

Goal 2: Assure that hatchery operations support Columbia River Fish Management Plan (U.S. v Oregon) production and harvest objectives.

---

[1]Objectives, tasks and current practices to achieve goals are described in Chapter 3.

Goal 3: Minimize impacts to listed (ESA) and other native species, their habitat, and the environment.

Goal 4: Develop outreach to enhance public understanding, participation and support of Service and Carson NFH programs.

Hatchery Benefits

Harvest Contribution.—Spring Chinook salmon from Carson NFH have, over the years, supported successful sport and tribal fisheries in the Columbia and Wind rivers. Fisheries occur almost exclusively in the Columbia and Wind rivers with the majority of fish harvested in the freshwater sport fishery, followed by tribal treaty and Columbia River gill net fisheries (Refer to Chapter 3 for more discussion on harvest). For example in 2001, the sport catch in the Wind River was 11,956 fish, with tribal catch at 1,840, and escapement to the hatchery at 12,075 fish (WDFW, Southwest Region, Vancouver, WA, July 13, 2001 data).

Economic Benefit.— During times of good ocean and river conditions that result in healthy adult returns, significant economic activity is generated through harvest of Carson NFH spring Chinook salmon. For example in 2001, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife estimated that 32,442 angler-days (one person fishing for at least part of one day) occurred on the Wind River as a direct result of a record return of Carson NFH adult spring chinook salmon.

In addition, the role of a Federal mitigation hatchery is to compensate for natural habitat lost to Federal hydro-projects. It follows then, that the economic benefit of the mitigation hatchery is interwoven into the economic benefit of the hydro-power project/s being mitigated for and that the hatchery can be characterized as an operating expense of the hydro-power project. The Service recognizes that mitigation hatcheries serve a significant role in supporting economically important fisheries.

Planning Issues

Several federal, state and tribal entities share responsibilities for development of sub-basin plans, hatchery production, harvest management, and ESA considerations. The CHMP recognizes and complies with all management plans and Biological Opinions affecting the Columbia River Basin in general and the Wind River in particular. Operations at Carson NFH pose a number of potential issues in the watershed.

Marking.—

- To help protect wild and naturally produced fish, the states of Washington, Oregon and Idaho are implementing selective sport and commercial fisheries (non-tribal) on marked hatchery fish.

- Columbia River Treaty Tribes generally disagree with the management strategy for mass marking and selective fisheries.

- The Service has not made any unilateral decisions on marking.

Juvenile salmon distribution and production numbers.—

- Juvenile salmon are released from the hatchery in the spring as yearling smolts to promote quick downstream migration from the hatchery.

- The Yakama Nation has expressed an opinion that juvenile fish from the hatchery should be released throughout the watershed.

Water shortage (drought).—

- During drought conditions the hatchery may need to make early releases of juvenile spring Chinook into the lower Wind River.

- Conservation groups are highly concerned about potential actions undertaken by the hatchery to address drought conditions and their impact to listed steelhead and resident cutthroat trout.

Surplus adult salmon distribution.—

- The Service, Yakama Nation, and other conservation groups would like to see plans developed to determine the number of salmon carcasses, if any, suitable for stream enrichment, both dead and alive.

Fish passage and ladder management.—

- The Yakima Nation would like an early closure (August 1 or earlier) of the ladder to the hatchery to allow adult salmon to spawn and die naturally in the Wind River allowing potential natural production and stream enrichment.

- Conservation groups are concerned about impacts from hatchery fish to listed steelhead and resident cutthroat trout.

- The Service is concerned about potential disease risks from allowing adult salmon to spawn and die above the hatchery water intakes.

Negative impacts to listed and other aquatic resources and what actions are being taken to help recover listed and depressed populations.—

- Concerns on present hatchery operations have been expressed by conservation groups, such as The Native Fish Society and Skamania Flyfishers. Of particular concern at Carson NFH is the potential impact to the Lower Columbia River Ecologically Significant Unit (ESU) of federally threatened steelhead.

Insufficient operations and maintenance funding through the Mitchell Act

- Mitchell Act Funding has been flat for over ten years, and may result in reductions in hatchery production programs, and preclude the Service's mitigation and tribal trust responsibilities.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Purpose of and Need for Plan

The Carson National Fish Hatchery (NFH) was placed in operation in December 1937 with the intent to mitigate for the loss of fall Chinook and coho salmon spawning grounds lost in the lower Wind River from the backwaters of the Bonneville Dam pool. Over the years the Carson NFH production program has included a variety of fish species: rainbow trout, yellowstone cutthroat, brook trout, coho salmon, sockeye salmon and kokanee, spring and fall Chinook. Since 1981 Carson NFH has focused almost exclusively on spring Chinook. Though not native to the Wind River system, spring Chinook adapted well to the Carson NFH environment, and the resulting program has emerged from that success. In the past, hatchery programs were allowed to evolve based on perceived needs and the capabilities of the facility. Today's hatchery programs are still dynamic and the origin of change is driven by public appeal, legislative mandates, judicial decrees, and ESA. The need to develop thoughtful planning processes based on sound policy and scientific information has never been greater.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has recognized the need for a comprehensive hatchery planning process to assist in meeting the challenge of changes to hatchery management required by the conservation status of most Pacific salmon and other anadromous and freshwater fish species. The development of plans, such as this one, will help to: 1) integrate Service objectives and priorities with those of co-managers, other agencies, and resource programs; 2) fulfill our obligations under the Endangered Species Act and relevant fisheries conservation, mitigation, and management programs; 3) identify and define in specifics what hatchery reforms we are implementing to achieve our objectives; and, 4) provide a foundation for future program and budget development and review.

The Service is committed to developing and maintaining a sound scientific and management underpinning for its programs. The Service has participated with State, Tribal and Federal partners in reviewing and assessing hatchery operations as they evolve to become, more than ever, part of the solution to fisheries restoration and recovery goals. The Service has involved our cooperators in defining and evaluating our respective roles, and the Service continues to reach out to the general public, individual constituent groups, and local governments to explain our programs and initiatives. The Service has put in place a system of program evaluation that utilize principles of adaptive management to integrate new information and expectations. All this and more is embodied in development of this plan. The journey of developing these plans, the research, analysis, thought, and outreach, is as important as the product itself. The Service looks into this process to stabilize and strengthen Service fish production programs in fisheries restoration and recovery efforts of the Nation.

Description of Planning Process

The planning process began in February 2001 with establishment of the Carson CHMP Team, the core group responsible for drafting and revising the CHMP as it moves towards its anticipated completion in June 2002. The Team is composed of Service staff directly involved with the hatchery program. Additional coordination was provided by members from the Regional CHMP Steering Committee. The Steering Committee, composed of Service representatives from the Pacific Region, provided oversight to the CHMP process. In addition, the Steering Committee developed the general format and time line for completing the CHMP process, reviewed drafts of the Carson CHMP to ensure consistency with both the approved format and other CHMPs under development in Region 1, and ensured consistency with Regional and National goals of the Service Fishery Program.

Composition of Planning Team

The planning team was made up of Service representatives from the following offices:

Carson National Fish Hatchery
14041 Wind River Highway
Carson, WA 98610
Bill Thorson, Plan Co-Lead (Carson NFH)
Curt Friez (Carson NFH)
Randy Berge (Carson NFH)

Columbia River Fisheries Program Office
9317 NE Highway 99, Suite I
Vancouver, WA 98665
Doug Olson, Plan Co-Lead (Vancouver CRFPO)
Steve Olhausen (Vancouver CRFPO)
Steve Pastor (Vancouver CRFPO)

Columbia River Gorge Information and Education Office
122 Coho Road
Cook, WA 98605
Cheri Anderson (I&E Columbia River Gorge NFH's)

Lower Columbia River Fish Health Center
61552 State Route 14
Underwood, WA 98651
Susan Gutenberger

Regional Office - Fishery Resources
Eastside Federal Complex
911 NE 11the Ave
Portland, OR 97232-4181
Rich Johnson, - Steering Committee Liaison

Mid-Columbia River Fishery Resource Office
7501 Icicle Road
Leavenworth, WA 98826
Brian Cates - Steering Committee Liaison

Review and Update of Plan

Because the biological, sociological, economic, and political environment is constantly changing, the role and responsibilities of Carson NFH can also be expected to change. It was the intent from the beginning that the CHMP would itself be dynamic to reflect that nature. Therefore, it was necessary to include a process for reviewing and updating the plan on a periodic basis. Review and updating will take place at least once every five years and will be the responsibility of the HET.

Fisheries Program Mission, Goals, and Priorities

Our National Fish Hatcheries have authority for construction, operation, and maintenance that is contained in a variety of specific and general statutes. The remainder of the Fisheries Program is guided by a variety of general statutory mandates and authorities. Without the specific direction that would come from organic legislation, the Service has continually adjusted the priorities of the entire Fisheries Program, at the national level, to guide the Program and ensure that each Region within the Service is focusing their limited resources on the highest priorities of the Nation (Attachment 1: Map of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Region).

To provide long-term management direction for fishery resources, the Service in January 1985, issued its most complete description of priorities to date for the Fisheries Program in a document entitled, "Statement of Responsibilities & Roles" (U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Fishery Resources Program, January 31, 1985). In May 1994, to incorporate those priorities within an ecosystem approach, the Service combined the fisheries resources and aquatic priorities of the Fisheries, Ecological Services and Refuges Programs into a single document titled, "Action Plan For Fishery Resource and Aquatic Ecosystems". This document included a comprehensive ecosystem and watershed based conservation, restoration, and enhancement program. As the Fisheries Program further evolved to include a conservation perspective to the management of natural populations, a revision to the Fisheries Program priorities was announced in November 1997. The Director approved and announced the following six priorities for the Service's Fishery Program:

- Recovery of listed and candidate aquatic species
- Restoration of interjurisdictional fisheries and aquatic ecosystems
- Management of interjurisdictional fisheries
- Fulfilling mitigation obligations
- Restoring depleted aquatic populations to preclude listing
- Providing fish and wildlife management assistance to tribes and on Fish and Wildlife Service land

Across the Nation, the Fisheries Program continues to be guided by these priorities, but there is an ongoing effort that, when completed, may revise these priorities. At the request of Congress and the Office of Management and Budget, the Service began development of a strategic plan for the National Fish Hatchery System in 2000. In 2001, the Service then began preparation of a strategic plan for the entire Fisheries Program. When completed, these documents will set the new direction for the Fisheries Program and the role of National Fish Hatcheries in implementing program priorities.

National Fish Hatchery System - National/Regional Overview and Statutory Mandates/Authorities

The Service's stewardship of the Nation's varied and valuable fishery resources dates from the appointment of Spencer Baird as Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries by President Ulysses S. Grant in 1871. That initial Federal involvement was in response to concern over the widespread decline in domestic food fish supplies. In 1872, Congress provided the first appropriation for the Fishery Program when it funded the introduction of shad, salmon, whitefish, and other food fishes into waters to which they were best adapted. A little later that year, "The propriety was strongly urged, at the Boston meeting, of sending some experienced fish-culturist to the west coast for the purpose of securing a large amount of spawn of the California salmon." Mr. Livingston Stone traveled to California and established a hatching-works on the McCloud River. This was the first salmon breeding unit in the United States, the first hatchery to be established with federal funds, and the beginning of the National Fish Hatchery System.

During the early years of the hatchery program, most National Fish Hatcheries were established under general authorizations for fisheries development as specified in appropriation acts. Then in the 1930's a series of acts provided authorizations for hatchery development. This permitted the National Fish Hatchery System to expand on a planned basis.

The Service has a 130-year history of leading Federal fishery conservation efforts in the Pacific Northwest. During this time, our Federal fishery resource involvement and responsibilities have grown, diversified, and undergone several modifications in response to continually changing needs. The program shifts and expansions evolved to address the circumstances of each era. Today, the Service is taking a holistic approach to fishery conservation. Present activities focus on a broad array of scientific fishery management and conservation efforts.

A historical background into the establishment and operation of National Fish Hatcheries in Region 1 is provided in Attachment 2 (Note: Region 1 is the Pacific Region and includes Washington, Oregon, Idaho, California, Nevada, Hawaii and the Pacific Territories). Since the establishment of the first salmon hatchery on the McCloud River, 67 hatcheries or fish facilities have been established in California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. Only 19 of those hatcheries, 2 fish facilities, and 1 technology center are in operation today. The remainder have either been closed or transferred to State or other Federal agencies.

The development of a broad range of statutory mandates and authorities under which the Service conducts its hatchery program along with numerous other fishery related activities conducted in cooperation with other Federal, State, Tribal, and private entities is documented in Attachment 3. Vested with significant legal responsibilities under State and international agreements, treaties and laws, the Service conducts an extensive conservation effort in order to help protect and restore native aquatic species and their habitats with the goal of preempting severe declines and potential listings under the Endangered Species Act (ESA).

The Region 1 Fisheries Program consists of four major program activities: National Fish Hatcheries, Fish Health Centers, the Abernathy Fish Technology Center, and Fishery Resource Offices/Fish and Wildlife Offices. Successful implementation of the Service's hatchery activities requires close coordination and cooperation with the other three Fisheries Program activities. The Abernathy Salmon Technology Center provides state-of-the-art applied research in several fields including development of new fish diets for salmonid and sturgeon culture, use of genetic identification in the recovery and restoration of native stocks, and development of new and improved techniques to increase the efficiency of fish culture and captive brood stock operations. Fish Health Centers participate in Investigational New Animal Drug registration, provide diagnostic and veterinarian services on wild fish stocks and hatchery-reared fish, and supply health certifications for the export of fish and fish eggs. Fishery Resource Offices/Fish and Wildlife Offices participate in a wide variety of activities including coast-wide stock assessment and evaluation, coded-wire tagging of hatchery indicator stocks for the U.S./Canada Treaty, evaluation of hatchery production, and assessment of new approaches to produce "wild type" fish at culture facilities. These offices also participate in a broad range of other activities including habitat assessment and restoration, non-indigenous species coordination, natural production studies, harvest assessment, fish passage coordination, and endangered species listing and recovery activities.

Regional Fishery Goals and Priorities

The Pacific Region Fisheries Program is committed to focusing its priorities and resources toward the conservation, recovery, and restoration of native resident and interjurisdictional species. The Fisheries Program works with State, Federal, Tribal and other partners, as well as

on Service, Tribal, and other Federal lands, to ensure that its actions purposefully contribute to these objectives. Regional priorities are as follows:

Implementing Hatchery Reform.—National Fish Hatcheries are reforming hatchery practices to conform with their associated scientific foundations and management evaluations of those efforts. National Fish Hatcheries in the Pacific Region produce and release fish, and stocks of fish, as identified in approved Hatchery Genetic Managements Plans (HGMPs).

Implementing Comprehensive Hatchery Management Plans.—Implementation of the Comprehensive Hatchery Management Plan is a highly significant Regional priority. Comprehensive plans incorporate the rationale, authorities and supportive documentation for operation and management of National Fish Hatchery programs.

Hatchery Evaluations.—Monitoring and evaluation of hatchery production programs are a critical component of effective hatchery operations. Completion of hatchery management plans, including this one, will further identify research needs and assure quality.

Hatchery Evaluation Teams.—To foster and enhance communication in the hatchery production and evaluation process, active participation in Hatchery Evaluation Teams by Service programs, resource agencies, and public partners is a Fisheries Program priority.

Habitat Restoration and Technical Assistance to Other Regional Programs.—Providing technical assistance to other Regional programs on Service lands with Partners for Fish and Wildlife and other Service habitat restoration efforts is a high priority of the Fisheries Program.

Tribal and Federal Lands.—Providing support to Tribal Governments and Federal land management agencies for fish and wildlife resources on their lands has always been and continues to be a high priority.

Fish Passage Improvement.—An important part of the Fisheries Program is habitat restoration which re-establishes access to important historic habitats for fish. As such, emphasis is placed on fish passage improvement. A high priority is given to identifying and correcting fish passage problems at National Fish Hatcheries, other Service and non-Service lands.

Endangered Species Act.—The Fisheries Program promotes and initiates actions that ensure all Fisheries Stations in the Pacific Region are in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.

Compliance With Court Agreements and Other Legal Obligations.—The Fisheries Program complies with court agreements and other legal obligations, and enhancement efforts that contribute to the mitigation, conservation, restoration, and recovery of listed, candidate and imperiled fish species, both anadromous native fish and resident native fish, such as, bull trout, cutthroat trout, desert fishes, and others.

Mitigation.—The Fisheries Program implements artificial production to comply with mitigation responsibilities consistent with Congressional mandates and funding.

Restoration and Recovery of Native Fishes.—Restoration and recovery of native fishes is a Regional priority. Healthy stocks of native fish are indicators of clean water and healthy aquatic ecosystems. Healthy stocks of native fish also provide harvest opportunities for recreational, commercial, and tribal fishers.

Ecosystem and Cross-program Approach.—The Fisheries Program continues to work within an ecosystem and cross-program approach using the collective expertise of our employees and Programs in coordinated fashion.

Make Full Use of Computer and Database Technology.—It is an ongoing Regional priority to strengthen our staff capabilities and make full use of computer and database technology in order to increase program effectiveness and efficiency, and meet the needs of resource management agencies, tribes, and other Federal agencies.

Outreach.—Educational and outreach opportunities are pursued to enhance public understanding of program responsibilities, capabilities, and accomplishments, and will continue to be an important component of the Fisheries Program.

Legal and Policy Guidance

National Fish Hatchery programs in the Columbia River Basin are shaped by various policies, regulations, laws, agreements and legislative mandates. National Fish Hatchery managers and policy makers are constantly challenged with the complex task of implementing a comprehensive state-of-the-art hatchery program while complying with legal, regulatory, and legislative mandates which have different and sometimes conflicting purposes. For example, the Mitchell Act and subsequent amendments, Endangered Species Act and subsequent Biological Opinions, Treaty of 1855 with Columbia River Tribes, U.S. v Oregon court order of 1969 and subsequent Columbia River Fish Management Plan all guide production in the Columbia River. Chapters 2, 3 and 4 further discuss legal justification and operational guidance for Carson National Fish Hatchery.

CHAPTER 2. HATCHERY AND RESOURCE DESCRIPTIONS

Hatchery Overview

Carson NFH is located 13 miles northwest of the village of Carson in Skamania County, Washington. It lies in a heavily forested valley within the Gifford Pinchot National Forest at the confluence of Tyee Creek and Wind River (Map-Attachment 4). The hatchery sits on 20 acres of developed river-bottom at rivermile (RM)18 on the Wind River which enters the Columbia River 155 miles upstream from the Pacific Ocean and 10 miles upstream from Bonneville Dam. The hatchery is bounded by the Wind River on the west and by the steep slopes of 2,300 ft. Big Butte on the east. Ninety of the 225 mi^2 Wind River drainage are located upstream from the hatchery. Elevation of the basin ranges from 1,187 ft. mean sea level (MSL) at the hatchery, to nearly 5,000 ft. at Red Mountain, nine miles to the northeast.

Currently Carson NFH operates with a staff of seven. This includes the Hatchery Manager, Assistant Hatchery Manager, one Animal Caretaker, two Motor Vehicle Operators, one Maintenance Mechanic, and one Program Assistant. The hatchery also provides partial support to the Columbia River Basin Outreach Office, located at Willard NFH. Volunteers are utilized to assist with outreach activities and station operations when available.

Hatchery Purpose

Carson NFH was authorized by Special Act 50 Stat. 220, May 28, 1937, and placed into operation in December 1937 to mitigate for the effects of federal water projects, primarily Bonneville Dam. The hatchery was reauthorized by the Mitchell Act (16 USC 755-757; 52 Stat. 345) May 11, 1938 and amended on August 8, 1946, (60 Stat. 932) for conservation of fishery resources in the Columbia River Basin. The hatchery was remodeled in 1956 to establish a hatchery spring Chinook run in the Wind River, and is currently used for adult collection, egg incubation and rearing of spring Chinook. It also provides eggs for re-establishing spring Chinook runs in other Columbia River tributaries, as needed.

Facility and Site Descriptions

The hatchery has five buildings involved in fish production, five residences, and a large pond cover. Currently, there are no plans for new buildings; however, the hatchery would like to construct an outreach/visitor center near the main entrance. A description of hatchery buildings, their primary use, and improvements are listed in Attachment 5.

The hatchery's outdoor rearing units include 46 raceways, 2 rearing ponds and 2 adult holding ponds (see Attachment 6 for physical measurements of holding incubation and rearing units).

The physical layout of the hatchery is diagramed in Attachment 7 and an aerial photograph shows the hatchery in relation to the forest and Wind River in Attachment 8.

Archeology / Cultural Resources

The three wood-frame residences were constructed in 1937-38 the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). The houses are the only remaining intact cluster of CCC constructed houses in the area. The road leading to Tyee Springs is an abandoned railroad grade circa 1920 and is considered significant by the U.S.D.A. Forest Service. Finally, numerous large cedar stumps notched for spring boards are remnants of early logging techniques.

There are no recorded prehistoric sites in the immediate vicinity of the hatchery (Alex Bourdeau, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, personal communication). However, the Wind River Subbasin is part of the Yakama Indian Nation lands ceded to the United States in the Treaty of June 9, 1855. Within this area the tribe reserves the right to hunt and fish at all usual and accustomed places in common with citizens of the territory (WDFW 2000).

Watershed/Ecosystem Setting

General Description[2].—The Wind River Subbasin, located in southwestern Washington, originates in McClellan Meadows in the western Cascades on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest (Wind River Ranger District) and enters the Columbia River's Bonneville Reservoir at River Mile (RM) 155 near Carson, Washington (Map-Attachment 4). Wind River, a fifth order stream, drains approximately 225 mi^2 of Skamania County over a distance of approximately 31 miles. Principle tributaries to Wind River include Little Wind River, Bear, Panther, Trout, Trapper, Dry, Nineteenmile, Falls and Paradise creeks. The largest tributary, Panther Creek, enters at RM 4.3 and drains 18% of the Wind River subbasin (26,466 acres). Trout Creek, which drains 15% of the subbasin (21,732 acres), enters at RM 10.8.

Topography varies within the watershed; it is steep in the northwest and lower southeast, gentle in the northeast-McClellan Meadows area, and it is benchy in Trout Creek Flats and middle portions of the Wind River Valley. The mainstem of the Wind River drops 3,820 ft in 30.5 miles for an average gradient of 2.3%. Shipherd Falls, located at RM 2, is a series of four falls ranging from 8 to 12 ft that were a barrier to all anadromous salmonids except steelhead until the construction of a fish ladder in 1956.

Geology.—The Wind River Watershed has been shaped through 25 million years of volcanic activity and glacial action. Most of the watershed was formed 12 to 25 million years ago with some younger flows out of Indian Heaven and Trout Creek Hill being dated between 350,000 to

---

[2]Adapted from the Draft Wind River Subbasin Summary, November 15, 2000, prepared for the Northwest Power Planning Council (WDFW 2000).

three million. The majority of the watershed is in the older volcaniclastic material. These areas are more susceptible to erosion and mass failure due to weathering of the materials to silts and clays.

Glacial activity has had an effect on the landscape especially in the upper regions of the watershed by Indian Heaven, where volcanic flows have scoured and smoothed the land. Outwash and alluvial material from this time period have been eroding down through the Wind River Valley. Since the construction of Bonneville Dam, this material has been accumulating at the mouth of the Wind River. Other material that has been moving into the streams in the lower parts of the valley are flood deposits left from the Bretz Floods from ancient Lake Missoula. Sediment input has also resulted from large landslides in the watershed.

Climate and Hydrology.—The mean annual average precipitation in this watershed is 110 in at Stabler, Washington (elevation 800 ft). Approximately 80% of the precipitation occurs between October and April. The average ambient air temperature is 66EF during the summer and 40E F in the winter.

Stream flows in the watershed range from summer low flows to peak flows in the winter. Some streams only flow during high flow events and are dry the remainder of the year (ephemeral streams). Others such as the mainstem of the Wind River increase from an average daily flow of less than 250 ft^3 per second (cfs) during August and September to over 2,000 cfs in December and January. The largest stream flows typically occur in response to rain-on-snow events, when heavy rains combine with high air temperatures and high winds to cause widespread snowmelt. Low flows are maintained by late season snowmelt and areas of water retention or recharge.

Fish and Wildlife.—Listed and candidate species which may occur in the area of the hatchery are included in Attachment 9.

The only anadromous salmonids that historically ascended Shipherd Falls were winter and summer steelhead. It is probable that pacific lamprey also ascended the falls, but there is no data to verify this claim. Both steelhead and pacific lamprey have been and are important fisheries to the Yakama Nation. Steelhead provided sport fishing opportunities for decades until recent declines in the early 1990's.

Wind River native steelhead populations are depressed and Federally listed as Threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). This stock is part of the lower Columbia River steelhead Ecologically Significant Unit (ESU). Although historical estimates are not well documented, historic run size has been estimated at 2,500 fish (WDFW 2000). The average number of summer steelhead spawners in the Wind River during 1991-96 was 222 fish, only 14% of the 1,557 escapement goal (NMFS 1999a).

The southwestern Washington/Columbia River coastal cutthroat trout ESU is proposed for listing as threatened under the ESA. Historically both resident and migratory (sea-run) cutthroat are known to exist in Wind River, but little is known of abundance or range. Sea-run cutthroat are probably limited to the lower Wind River and Little Wind River (2.2 river kilometers from mouth of Wind River) in terms of spawning area.

Bull trout in the Columbia River basin were Federally listed as Threatened in 1998. The Wind River Subbasin Summary (WDFW 2000) described the current status and distribution of bull trout in the Wind River. "Bull trout have been observed in the lower river below Shipherd Falls and managers believe these fish are part of an adfluvial population, which uses the Bonneville Pool. The WDFW has initiated a bull trout sampling project in the Columbia Gorge Province to determine the distribution of bull trout in the Wind River and other Washington tributaries. Until this project is completed, there is insufficient information to determine distribution, assess population status, or develop a recovery plan for these fish."

The current status of pacific lamprey is unknown. Native stocks of fall Chinook, coho and rainbow trout are also indigenous to Wind River but their population sizes are limited and largely unknown. Small populations of native trout and introduced brook trout are found throughout the Wind River basin. The fall Chinook and coho salmon production area was downstream of Shipherd Falls and has been impacted by backwaters from Bonneville Dam. Additional information on the historical and present information for fish and wildlife in the Wind River watershed can be found in WDFW (2000).

Spring Chinook salmon are non- native to the Wind River and natural spawners constitute a low productivity population in the Wind River and are not an ESA issue (Myers et al. 1998). In most years, spawning ground surveys have shown that the number of natural spawning spring Chinook in Wind River is relatively small compared to the total run (Attachment 10). Even though naturally spawning spring Chinook produce fry in the Wind River, very little smolt production has been observed (Dan Rawding, WDFW, unpublished data).

Vegetation.—Listed and candidate species which may occur in the area of the hatchery are included in Attachment 9.

Presently, vegetation is approximately 90% Douglas fir, western hemlock and grand fir. Prior to European settlement, the forest of the Wind River Basin contained either late-successional old growth or early-successional young growth. Currently, mid-successional stands dominate. Late-successional stands contain trees over 21 inches in diameter with multiple canopy layers. Mid-successional stands also contain trees with diameters over 21 inches but with a single canopy layer consisting of nine to 21 inch trees. Early-successional stands consist of trees from 0 to 9 inches. Circa 1850 was classified as follows: 6,700 acre non-forest, 40,700 acre early-successional, 12,485 acre mid-successional, and 83,556 acre late-successional. Current

classification is: 9,887 acre non-forest, 34,118 acre early-successional, 67,628 acre mid-successional, and 31,816 acre late-successional.

Habitat Condition.—Stream surveys, sub-basin assessments, and watershed analyses were used to evaluate factors limiting fish production in the Wind River. All watershed assessments indicate that fish production in the Wind River is primarily limited by habitat and water quality. Past riparian timber harvest, stream clean-outs, road building, and regeneration harvest within the rain on snow zone all have contributed to a decline in fish production. Alluvial reaches within the mainstem Wind River and tributaries, which contain the majority of steelhead spawning habitat, have been significantly impacted. Many of these reaches were initially disturbed over eighty years ago, yet habitat and water quality have not recovered and in some cases are getting worse. Habitat problems noted in the subbasin plan are mainly related to timber harvesting practices. Throughout the subbasin there continues to be a need to restore riparian vegetation to reduce water temperatures and peak flows, reduce sediment delivery to streams, and ensure continuous recruitment of large woody debris into the system.

Current and Future Development.—The Wind River Subbasin is part of the Yakama Nation lands ceded to the United States in the Treaty of June 9, 1855. Within this area the tribe reserves the right to hunt and fish at all usual and accustomed places in common with citizens of the territory. The upper portion of the basin is situated within the legislated boundary of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest (GPNF) and federal ownership accounts for 127,682 acres (89%) of the watershed. Non-federal ownership includes Washington Department of Natural Resources at 3,757 acres (2%), private timber interests at 8,122 acres (6%), and other private ownership at 3,943 acres (3%). Most of the first six miles of mainstem river and its drainage are outside GPNF, but a large portion of this area lies within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area (CRGNSA). The remaining 25 mainstem miles consist primarily of U.S. Forest Service ownership. The President's Forest Plan (ROD) categorizes the Wind River Basin as a Tier 1, Key Watershed that provides habitat for anadromous salmonids.

The Wind River drainage has traditionally been managed for timber production; however, under the Northwest Forest Plan, much of the drainage has been designated as late successional reserves, wilderness areas (wilderness areas pre-dated the Forest Plan), riparian reserves, or reserved through other means. In addition to GPNF and DNR, there is limited amount of commercial timberland ownership in the lower valley. Those holdings within CRGNSA are regulated by their land use regulations as administered by Skamania County. Those outside the CRGNSA are regulated by the Washington State Forest Practices Regulations.

Urban development has been concentrated in Carson, Washington which is located at RM 2 and Stabler, Washington at RM7. There are individual dwellings throughout the first 12 miles of the river, with the majority located in the lower reaches. In addition, a number of vacation cabins are located near Government Mineral Springs along Trapper Creek. These cabins are privately

owned on leased lands from the USFS. Large-scale industrial activities are limited by lack of available land outside the National Forest and Scenic Area. The two major industrial uses in the watershed are a plywood mill on the east side of the river near the mouth and a lumberyard north of Carson. Both are owned and operated by WKO Company. A gold mine is operated near the Upper Wind River approximately one mile south (downstream) of the mouth of Paradise Creek. In addition, the USFS recently conveyed approximately 190 acres and infrastructure of former nursery land to Skamania County.

History of Hatchery Stocks

Legal Authority.—The Columbia River was the largest producer of salmon in the world. Cannery records reveal that catches in the late 1800s and early 1900s were in the millions. But this extraordinary harvest could not last, and it was recognized fairly early in the century that something must be done to preserve the salmon. Therefore, in 1938, Congress passed the Mitchell Act, which was intended to help remedy the decline, particularly from the negative effects from the construction of Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River near Portland. On August 8, 1946, the Act was amended (60 Stat. 932) by Congress to authorize the Secretary of Interior the transfer of funds to the states for specific projects to develop salmon resources (i.e. hatcheries). In 1947, the Columbia River Fisheries Development Program was formed to plan and coordinate the use of Mitchell Act funds. In 1956, Congress expanded the Mitchell Act to include the preservation of fisheries resources above McNary Dam. Administration of the Mitchell Act was shifted from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Commerce by the Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1970 (84 Stat. 2090). The Act is currently administered by the NOAA Fisheries (also known as: National Marine Fisheries Service) which provides funding to the Service for operation and maintenance of the hatchery.

Construction of Carson NFH was authorized by the Special Act of May 28, 1937 (50 Stat., 220), to mitigate for fall Chinook salmon and coho salmon spawning grounds lost when the lower two miles of the Wind River were flooded by the backwaters of Bonneville Dam (Smith 1995). The hatchery was re-authorized under the Mitchell Act May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 345).

In addition to the initial authorizations listed above, hatchery operations are authorized, sanctioned and influenced by the following treaties, judicial decisions and specific legislation:

Treaty with the Walla Walla, Cayuse, Umatilla Tribes, 06/09/1855;
Treaty with the Yakama, 06/09/1855;
Treaty with the Nez Perce, 06/11/1855;
Treaty with the Tribes of Middle Oregon, 06/25/1855;
Mitchell Act, 52 STAT. 345, 05/11/1938;
Mitchell Act (Amended), 60 STAT. 932, 08/08/1946;
U.S. v. Oregon (Sohappy v. Smith, “Belloni” decision:, Case 899), 07/08/1969;
Endangered Species Act of 1973, 87 STAT. 884, 12/28/1973;

Salmon and Steelhead Conservation and Enhancement Act, 94 STAT. 3299, 12/22/1980; and Pacific Salmon Treaty Act of 1985 (U.S./Canada Pacific Salmon Treaty), Public law 99-5, 16 U.S.C. 363, 03/15/1985.

Production and Management History.—A Washington State operated fish hatchery established at the mouth of the Wind River in 1899 was closed in 1938 when the hatchery grounds and buildings were flooded by the backwaters of Bonneville Dam. The state facility supported a significant fall Chinook salmon run taking a high of 20,357,000 eggs in 1917. The Service operated this facility for a two year period (1936-37). In 1938, it's final year of operation, 1,907,300 eggs were taken. A Special Use Permit issued by the U.S. Forest Service reserved 10 acres within the Gifford Pinchot National Forest for the purpose of establishing a fish cultural station (Attachment 11). Construction of Carson NFH began in June 1937 and production was launched in December of that same year with the arrival of 3,000,000 fall Chinook salmon eggs from the Little White Salmon NFH.

In 1953, protection was provided to the hatchery water supplies when approximately 220 acres were ".. withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public-land laws, including the mining laws but not the mineral-leasing laws, and reserved for use by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior as the Carson Fish-Cultural Station". (Federal Register Volume 18, Number 204 Saturday, October 17, 1953). The area withdrawn was described in a letter from the Chief of Forest Service 05/27/53 as ". . .the hatchery site occupying around 20 acres, and the rights-of-way for a 3,385 ft and a 2,700 ft pipeline. The balance of the area lies between the pipelines and around the development." Primary jurisdiction of the withdrawn land, with the exception of the 20 acre developed hatchery site, remained with the Forest Service. Approximately 130 acres surrounding Tyee Springs were designated as Wildlife Special by the Forest Service providing additional protection from some U.S.D.A. Forest Service management activities.

Hatchery expansion began in 1952 and was nearly complete by the end of 1955. Prior to expansion, lack of outdoor facilities limited production to indoor rearing troughs. The expansion included the construction of 46 raceways, two adult holding ponds, a service building with space for an office, cold storage and a feed room, 3 duplex housing units, and a paint and oil house.

Fall Chinook salmon were the dominate species reared at Carson NFH from 1937 to 1964. Rainbow trout, black spotted trout (yellowstone cutthroat), brook trout, steelhead, spring Chinook salmon, coho salmon, sockeye salmon (shipped as eyed eggs), and kokanee were raised intermittently in large numbers from 1938 through 1981 at which time production was switched exclusively to spring Chinook salmon. Nearly all of the fall Chinook were released into Tyee Creek or the main stem Wind River as were most of the trout. Coho were primarily released in the Wind and Columbia Rivers.

Prior to completion of fish passage facilities at Shipherd Falls in 1954, Carson NFH had many false starts with Chinook salmon. Spring Chinook eggs were transferred from the Clackamas River, Oregon Camas Creek, Idaho, and a Willamette River hatchery, Oregon. All attempts to get Chinook salmon back to the hatchery to develop a hatchery brood stock failed until adequate passage was provided past Shipherd Falls. Attachment 12 documents historical releases, starting in 1938.

The fish ladder around Shipherd Falls is located approximately two miles from the mouth of the Wind River and was completed in 1955 as part of the Columbia River Fishery Development Program (Mitchell Act). Coincident to the construction of the fish ladder, was an extensive expansion of the hatchery. The goal of the expansion was to produce spring Chinook, fall Chinook, coho, blue-back (sockeye) salmon, and steelhead to artificially enhance natural production of the Wind River Basin. No more than half the fish of any run were to be artificially spawned with the exception of the blue-back (Lower Columbia Fisheries Development Program, Wind River Area, 1951). Although the expansion was completed, no serious attempts to raise other than spring Chinook materialized. A long-range cooperative federal/state program was implemented to trap upriver spring Chinook adults at Bonneville Dam and transport them to Carson NFH for stock development.

From 1955 thru 1964 approximately 500 spring Chinook salmon were trapped annually at Bonneville Dam on the Washington side of Columbia River and transported to the holding ponds at Carson National Fish Hatchery. Genetic data indicate that the Carson stock was derived from a mixture of upper Columbia and Snake River populations passing Bonneville Dam (Campton 2000 Draft). The adult fish were held and spawned, with their progeny reared and released at Carson. Although small numbers of spring Chinook were counted past the newly constructed Shipherd Falls fishway on Wind River in 1956,1957, and 1958, the first returns to Carson NFH did not occur until 1959 when 107 fish entered the hatchery (99 jacks, 2 adult females and 6 adult males). This run of spring Chinook has been maintained since then and continues to flourish. Annual returns to Carson NFH have averaged 3,797 since 1980 with over 10,000 returning in 1990, 2000 and 2001. Recent production and run data for spring Chinook salmon returning to Carson NFH is summarized and provided in Attachments 13 and 14.

Spring Chinook smolt production was reduced from 2.1 to 1.42 million beginning with brood year 1996. Pond density was reduced to the level suggested as optimum by Banks (1994) to result in a more “fit” smolt, thus increasing post-release survival. In combination with reduced densities, culling of eggs from adult fish with high titre Bacterial Kidney Disease (BKD), has nearly eliminated fingerling and smolt losses to this disease. As a result of these practices, prophylactic erythromycin treatments are no longer necessary during juvenile rearing.

Carson origin spring Chinook eggs, fry, and fingerlings have been transferred to a wide range of localities including Alaska (over 2 million eggs in the early 1970's), Oregon (22.9 million eggs from 1957 to 1993), Idaho (15.9 million eggs from 1960 to 1980), and several hatcheries in

Washington (29.7 million eggs from 1957 to1991). The strain has prospered at many locations, for example Leavenworth and Little White Salmon NFHs, Washington and Umatilla River, Oregon.

From 1960 to 1997, juvenile hatchery steelhead (Skamania stock) were outplanted in the Wind River from a State of Washington hatchery. Hatchery outplanting of Skamania stock summer steelhead was terminated by WDFW in 1997 because of possible genetic and ecological impacts from hatchery steelhead on wild steelhead.

Biological Risks and Ecological Interactions Between Hatchery Spring Chinook Salmon and Wild (Listed) Summer Steelhead Trout

All hatcheries must consider their potential for adversely affecting the aquatic community. To help assess potential impacts, the Service is developing Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans (HGMP) for National Fish Hatcheries in the lower Columbia River, including Carson NFH. These management plans are being drafted to assess our program and meet Endangered Species Act requirements identified by NOAA Fisheries. It is anticipated that these plans will be updated regularly and re-submitted to NOAA Fisheries and the Service.

In the December 1999 Draft HGMP, the Service assessed the potential impacts from hatchery operations including: water withdrawal and effluent discharge, brood stock collection, genetic introgression, juvenile fish releases, disease, competition, predation, residualism, and migration corridor and ocean impacts. Our assessment to date, with NOAA Fisheries concurrence, concludes that operation of Carson NFH will not jeopardize listed fish populations. However, we also recognize that more research is needed to more fully understand the impacts of hatchery operations, releases, and impact of natural spawning spring Chinook on steelhead in the Wind River (refer to Chapter 3 Monitoring and Evaluation discussion). In addition to completing documentation to comply with our ESA responsibilities, we must also meet our mitigation responsibilities under the Mitchell Act as well as meet our Tribal Trust and U.S. v Oregon obligations. In order to balance these sometimes conflicting mandates, we regularly meet with our co-managers to discuss operation and management of the hatchery.

The following information was primarily extracted from our December 1999 Draft HGMP and discusses biological risks and ecological interactions between hatchery spring Chinook salmon and wild (listed) summer steelhead trout (USFWS 1999):

The Carson NFH spring Chinook program may adversely affect listed populations, but impacts are substantially below the jeopardy threshold (NMFS 1999a). The 1999 Biological Assessment for the Operation of Hatcheries Funded by the NOAA Fisheries under the Columbia River Fisheries Development Program (NMFS 1999a) and the 1999 Biological Opinion on Artificial Propagation in the Columbia River Basin (NMFS 1999b) present a discussion of the potential effects of hatchery programs on listed salmon and steelhead populations. A discussion of

ecological interactions and biological risks relative to the Carson spring Chinook program follows:

Hatchery Water Intake and Use.—The primary water source for the Carson NFH is Tyee Creek which is not accessible to anadromous fish. During limited periods of the year, water may be drawn from the Wind River to adjust water temperatures for rearing and to supplement Tyee Creek withdrawals. Intake screening for the Wind River withdrawal pipe does not meet current NOAA Fisheries ESA screening standards. However, with the reduced production program at Carson NFH, water withdrawal from the Wind River for hatchery operations are significantly reduced and short-lived when it does occur, which is primarily late in the summer. Work is underway to bring this water intake structure into NOAA Fisheries ESA compliance. Until the Wind River water intake structure is upgraded, withdrawal of Wind River water for hatchery operations will be minimized. A temporary screen is utilized when withdrawal from the Wind River is necessary. Water withdrawals for hatchery operations are not expected to have a significant negative impact on natural spawning populations. Entry of listed species into the hatchery through the river intake structure has not been observed.

In 1998 the Washington State Legislature passed Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2496 authorizing the establishment of Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs) to catalogue anadromous fish limiting factors in Washington streams. The Wind River water diversion and blockage of Tyee Creek by hatchery facilities is a medium impact limiting factor for salmon and steelhead in the Wind River (Washington Conservation Commission 1999). The Wind River diversion is listed because water withdrawal can exacerbate already low summer flows in the Wind River. However the report recognizes that "recent modification to withdrawal methods may have improved conditions" in the Wind River. For example, push up dams are no longer used for hatchery water withdrawal. Furthermore in 1995, the numbers of fish produced at the hatchery were reduced significantly cutting back hatchery demand for Wind River water. Tyee Creek is listed because hatchery facilities are a total blockage to fish passage. There is some question concerning the suitability of Tyee Creek for salmon and steelhead spawning prior to hatchery construction. Much of Tyee Creek may have been a swampy area with little spawning gravel and much of the stream was channeled to facilitate water collection.

Hatchery effluents meet established water quality standards and are diluted by the flow in the Wind River.

Brood Stock Collection.—Returning spring Chinook are collected for brood stock at the hatchery rack. Hatchery fish volitionally return to the hatchery using the hatchery's fish ladder, homing into Tyee Creek. There is no barrier dam in the Wind River at the hatchery. This is significant because the Wind River watershed upstream of the hatchery is an important spawning and rearing area for native summer steelhead trout (listed).

Natural spawning of spring Chinook occurs in the Wind River drainage (Pettit 1999a) but these fish are believed to be Carson NFH fish that do not return to the hatchery. Stray hatchery spring Chinook from other locations or returns from natural production from other areas are not known to occur at Carson NFH, however genetic testing would provide better information on the hatchery and natural spring Chinook populations in the basin.

Genetic Introgression.—Coded-wire tag recoveries show that Carson NFH spring Chinook stray into the Little White Salmon NFH and are caught in the Drano Lake sport and tribal fisheries. However, the Carson spring Chinook stock is also released from Little White Salmon NFH. Straying of Carson spring Chinook is not considered a major problem for other streams where spring Chinook are listed based on a general lack of Carson recoveries in other areas. Therefore, genetic introgression of spring Chinook released from Carson NFH with other listed spring Chinook stocks is not considered a significant problem. The Service is currently analyzing data to quantify the degree of straying of fish from our National Fish Hatcheries.

Hatchery Production.—Carson NFH spring Chinook releases are moderate in magnitude relative to other Columbia River spring Chinook production programs. Carson NFH releases have been reduced from a previous program level of over 2 million smolts to the current 1.42 million smolt level. Reduced production decreases density dependent effects and other potential ecological effects on other natural stocks. Juvenile out-migration trapping and PIT tag monitoring at Bonneville Dam (see Chapter 3 Monitoring and Evaluation discussion on PIT tagging) indicate that Carson spring Chinook exit the Wind River quickly after release, further reducing potential density dependent effects. The Service will continue to evaluate our release strategies and production numbers to minimize any negative effect upon the aquatic community, especially on listed species.

Disease.— Hatchery programs are routinely monitored to prevent and subsequently treat fish in response to disease outbreaks that occur. Most pathogens now enter hatcheries through returning adult fish, surface water supplies, and other mechanisms involving direct contact with naturally spawning fish. Crowding and stress decrease the physiological resistance of salmonid fishes to disease and increase the likelihood of infection (Salonius and Iwama 1993; Schreck et al. 1993). Consequently, concern exists that the release of hatchery fish may increase the risk of disease in naturally spawning populations.

Fish managers largely understand the kinds, abundance and virulence (epidemiology) of pathogens and parasites in hatchery fish. Recent studies suggest that the incidence of some pathogens in naturally spawning populations may be higher than in hatchery populations (Elliot and Pascho 1994). Indeed, the incidence of high ELISA titers for *Renibacterium salmoninarum*, the causative agent of Bacterial Kidney Disease (BKD), appears, in general, to be significantly more prevalent among wild smolts of spring/summer Chinook salmon than hatchery smolts (Congleton et al. 1995; Elliot et al. 1997). For example, 95% versus 68% of wild and hatchery smolts, respectively, at Lower Granite Dam in 1995 had detectable levels of *R. salmoninarum*

(Congleton et al. 1995). Although pathogens may cause significant post-release mortality among hatchery fish, there is little evidence that hatchery origin fish routinely infect naturally produced salmon and steelhead in the Pacific Northwest (Enhancement Planning Team 1986; Steward and Bjornn 1990). Many biologists believe disease-related losses often go undetected, and that the impact of disease on naturally spawning populations may be underestimated (Goede 1986; Steward and Bjornn 1990). Nevertheless, the Service is unaware of any studies or scientific literature which show hatchery fish infecting a naturally spawning population of salmon or steelhead in the Pacific Northwest, however more research is needed.

Carson NFH follows Integrated Hatchery Operations Team (IHOT 1995) and Pacific Northwest Fish Health Protection Committee protocols for disease sampling and treatment. The Lower Columbia River Fish Health Center is located nearby at Spring Creek NFH so fish health sampling, diagnosis, and treatment are readily available as fish health issues arise. Chapter 3 provides more detail on Fish Health practices. The fish health goal for Carson NFH is to release healthy fish that are physiologically ready to migrate. Carson spring Chinook are released directly into the Wind River at the hatchery site and only pass one mainstem Columbia River dam (Bonneville Dam) en route to the ocean. Carson spring Chinook have a much reduced potential for transmission of disease to other populations relative to other upriver programs which are subjected to the high density impacts and stresses of collection for transport and/or diversion through multiple bypass systems. Disease transmission is believed to be triggered by increased population density and unusual changes in environment such as would occur at transport collection facilities and juvenile bypass systems.

Our general conclusion at this time is that Carson NFH is, as are all federal hatcheries in the Columbia River Basin, currently taking extensive measures to control disease and the release of diseased fish. As a consequence, infection of natural fish by hatchery fish is being minimized. Based on the relative prevalence of BKD among hatchery and wild Chinook salmon (Elliot et al. 1997; Congleton et al. 1995), the crowding and handling of fish at transportation dams at the time of barging or bypass may have a greater likelihood of increasing the incidence of disease among naturally produced fish than direct infection from hatchery fish.

Competition.—The impacts from competition are assumed to be greatest in the spawning and nursery areas at points of highest density (release areas) and diminish as hatchery smolts disperse (USFWS 1994). Salmon and steelhead smolts actively feed during their downstream migration (Becker 1973; Muir and Emmett 1988; Sager and Glova 1988). Competition in reservoirs could occur where food supplies are inadequate for migrating salmon and steelhead. However, the degree to which smolt performance and survival are affected by insufficient food supplies is unknown (Muir et al.1994). On the other hand, the available data are more consistent with the alternative hypothesis that hatchery-produced smolts are at a competitive disadvantage relative to naturally produced fish in tributaries and free-flowing mainstem sections (Steward and Bjornn 1990). Although limited information exists, available data reveal no significant relationship between level of crowding and condition of fish at mainstem dams. Consequently, survival of

natural smolts during passage at mainstem dams does not appear to be affected directly by the number (or density) of hatchery smolts passing through the system at present population levels. While smolts may be delayed at mainstem dams, the general consensus is that smolts do not normally compete for space when swimming through the bypass facilities (Enhancement Planning Team 1986). The main factor causing mortality during bypass appears to be confinement and handling in the bypass facilities, not the number of fish being bypassed.

Juvenile salmon and steelhead, of both natural and hatchery origin, rear for varying lengths of time in the Columbia River estuary and pre-estuary before moving out to sea. The intensity and magnitude of competition in the area depends on location and duration of estuarine residence for the various species of fish. Research suggests, for some species, a negative correlation between size of fish and residence time in the estuary (Simenstad et al. 1982).

While competition may occur between natural and hatchery juvenile salmonids in, or immediately above, the Columbia River estuary, few studies have been conducted to evaluate the extent of this potential problem (Dawley et al. 1986). The general conclusion is that competition may occur between natural and hatchery salmonid juveniles in the Columbia River estuary, particularly in years when ocean productivity is low. Competition may affect survival and growth of juveniles and thus affect subsequent abundance of returning adults. However, these are postulated effects that have not been quantified or well documented.

The release of hatchery smolts that are physiologically ready to migrate is expected to minimize competitive interactions as they should quickly migrate from the release site. Carson spring Chinook are released into the Wind River at the hatchery site and migrate quickly into the mainstem Columbia River migration corridor en route to the ocean based on juvenile out-migrant trapping and PIT tag monitoring at Bonneville Dam (see Chapter 3), reducing potential competitive interactions within the Wind River basin. Because Carson spring Chinook releases occur "low" in the Columbia Basin system relative to many other upriver programs, there is reduced opportunity for competitive interactions.

Predation.—The Service presented information that salmonid predators are generally thought to prey on fish approximately one-third or less their size (USFWS 1994). Depending on species and population, hatchery smolts are often released at a size that is greater than their naturally-produced counterparts. In addition, for species that typically smolt at one year of age or older (e.g. steelhead and spring Chinook salmon), hatchery-origin smolts may displace younger year classes of naturally-produced fish from their territorial feeding areas. Both factors could lead to predation by hatchery fish on naturally produced fish, but these effects have not been extensively documented, nor are the effects consistent (Steward and Bjornn 1990). A primary concern is the potential impact of predation by residualized hatchery steelhead on naturally-spawning populations.

In general, the extent to which salmon and steelhead smolts of hatchery origin prey on fry from naturally reproducing populations is not known, particularly in the Columbia River basin. The available information, while limited, is consistent with the hypothesis that predation by hatchery-origin fish is, most likely, not a major source of mortality to naturally reproducing populations, at least in freshwater environments of the Columbia River basin (Enhancement Planning Team 1986). However, virtually no information exists regarding the potential for such interactions in the marine environment.

There is little potential for Carson spring Chinook to prey on natural steelhead fry or parr in the Wind River. Based on time of spawning, steelhead fry would be emerging from the gravel after Carson Chinook had exited the river. In addition, much of the spawning and early rearing stage (egg to parr) production areas for natural populations of Wind River steelhead are in the tributaries and upper basin areas above Carson NFH. However, the life history rearing stage for steelhead, age-1 parr to age-2 smolt, does occur below the hatchery with the parr moving into the area as smolts vacate the area during their annual migration which peaks from May 10-15 (Dan Rawding, WDFW, personal communication). Mr. Rawding indicated that age-1 parr typically range in size from 80-100mm and age-2 smolts from 140-200mm so neither life history stage would be at a size susceptible to Carson spring Chinook predation. Out-migrant sampling conducted by WDFW indicates that steelhead smolts/pre-smolts are not drawn out of the Wind River system early by release of Carson spring Chinook. Available data indicate that Carson spring Chinook smolts exit the Wind River very quickly and that potential negative impacts on listed steelhead within the basin are likely to be negligible.

Carson spring Chinook releases may contribute to indirect predation effects on listed stocks by attracting predators (birds, fish, pinnipeds) and/or by providing a large forage base to sustain predator populations. Releasing large numbers of hatchery fish may lead to a shift in the density or behavior of non-salmonid predators, thus increasing predation on naturally reproducing populations. Conversely, large numbers of hatchery fish may mask or buffer the presence of naturally produced fish, thus providing sufficient distraction to allow natural juveniles to escape (Park 1993). Prey densities at which consumption rates are highest, such as northern pikeminnow in the tailraces of mainstem dams (Beamesderfer et al. 1996; Isaak and Bjornn 1996), have the greatest potential for adversely affecting the viability of naturally reproducing populations, similar to the effects of mixed fisheries on hatchery and wild fish. However, hatchery fish may be substantially more susceptible to predation than naturally produced fish, particularly at the juvenile and smolt stages (Piggins and Mills 1985; Olla et al. 1993).

Predation by birds and marine mammals (e.g. seals and sea lions) may also be significant source of mortality to juvenile salmonid fishes, but functional relationships between the abundance of smolts and rates of predation have not been demonstrated. Nevertheless, shorebirds, marine fish, and marine mammals (NMFS 1997) can be significant predators of hatchery fish immediately below dams and in estuaries (Bayer 1986; Ruggerone 1986; Beamish et al. 1992; Park 1993; Collis et al. 2001). Unfortunately, the degree to which adding large numbers of hatchery smolts affects predation on naturally produced fish in the Columbia River estuary and marine

environments is unknown, although many of the caveats associated with predation by northern pikeminnow in freshwater are true also for marine predators in saltwater.

Residualism.—Carson spring Chinook releases are not known to residualize in the Wind River. Available out-migrant trap and PIT tag monitoring information indicate a rapid exit of Carson spring Chinook from the Wind River (see Chapter 3 Monitoring and Evaluation discussion).

Migration Corridor/Ocean.— The Columbia River hatchery production ceiling called for in the Proposed Recovery Plan for Snake River Salmon of approximately 197.4 million fish (1994 release levels) has been incorporated by NOAA Fisheries into their recent hatchery biological opinions to address potential mainstem corridor and ocean effects as well as other potential ecological effects from hatchery fish. Although hatchery releases occur throughout the year, approximately 80 percent occur from April to June (NMFS 1999a) and Columbia River out-migration occurs primarily from April through August. Carson's spring Chinook production is typically released in April at the beginning of the normal hatchery and natural stock out-migration season. The total number of hatchery fish released in the Columbia River basin has declined by about 26 percent since 1994 (NMFS 1999c) reducing potential ecological interactions throughout the basin.

Ocean rearing conditions are dynamic. Consequently, fish culture programs might cause density-dependent effects during years of low ocean productivity, especially in near shore areas affected by upwelling (Chapman and Witty 1993). To date, research has not demonstrated that hatchery and naturally produced salmonids compete directly in the ocean, or that the survival and return rates of naturally produced and hatchery origin fish are inversely related to the number of hatchery origin smolts entering the ocean (Enhancement Planning Team 1986). If competition occurs, it most likely occurs in near shore areas when (a) upwelling is suppressed due to warm ocean temperatures and/or (b) when the abundance or concentration of smolts entering the ocean is relatively high. However, we are only beginning to understand the food-chain effects of cyclic, warm ocean conditions in the eastern north Pacific Ocean and associated impacts on salmon survival and productivity (Beamish 1995; Mantua et al. 1997). Consequently, the potential for competition effects in the ocean cannot be discounted (Emlen et al. 1990).

Alternatively, the hatchery program may be filling an ecological niche in the freshwater and marine ecosystem. A large number of species are known to utilize juvenile and adult salmon as a nutrient and food base (Groot and Margolis 1991; and McNeil and Himsworth 1980). Pacific salmon carcasses are also important for nutrient input back to freshwater streams (Cederholm et al. 1999). Reductions and extinctions of wild populations of salmon could reduce overall ecosystem productivity. Because of this, hatchery production has the potential for playing an important role in population dynamics of predator-prey relationships and community ecology. The Service speculates that these relationships may be particularly important (as either ecological risks or benefits) in years of low productivity and shifting climactic cycles.

Harvest.—Biological Assessments are completed by the management agencies to ensure risks to listed species are not jeopardized (NMFS 1999c).

Cutthroat Trout.—Since there is likely a small breeding population of coastal cutthroat trout in the lower Wind River, program fish from Carson NFH could potentially encounter out-migrants of sea-run cutthroat in the Wind or Columbia rivers. Time of out-migration of the sea-run cutthroat in the Columbia River may begin as early as March and peaks in mid-May (Trotter 1997) similar in time to the release of hatchery smolts. The size of the sea-run cutthroat trout smolts observed in other lower Columbia River tributaries, 100mm-260mm (USFWS Columbia River Fisheries Program Office, Vancouver, WA unpublished data), is very similar to the size of the yearling hatchery smolts released from Carson NFH. Instances of predation by hatchery smolts are thought to be low.

Bull Trout.—As previously mentioned, until WDFW completes surveys, the information base is insufficient to determine status and distribution of bull trout in the Wind River and potential impact from our hatchery program. However, hatchery juveniles may be providing a forage base benefit to adfluvial bull trout.

Beneficial Uses (historic and present cultural and public uses, fishery benefits, harvest contribution, economic value)

Public Uses.—The river's proximity to the Portland/Vancouver area makes it a popular recreation destination for cross country skiing, tubing, sledding, fishing, mineral prospecting, swimming, golfing, camping, hiking, picnicking, waterfall viewing, hunting, and berry picking. In addition, the Wind River Valley is a significant transportation corridor for travelers, including significant summer tourism traffic. Forest Road 30, which follows the river through much of its length, offers access to the upper Lewis River basin and to Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument (paragraph extracted from WDFW 2000).

Historically, public use of Carson NFH has been limited. The Forest Service had a developed campground located at Tyee Springs until 1951 when the improvements were relocated to other Forest Service campgrounds. The area surrounding Tyee Springs is very sensitive and not appropriate for public use. Not only is this source of nearly pure water critical to fish production, it is also the site of collection for potable domestic water for hatchery residents, hatchery visiting public and hatchery employees. Although visitors were welcomed, no record of any real effort to encourage visitation or to enhance the visitor's experience can be found until 1994 at which time nine interpretive signs were purchased and placed strategically around the hatchery grounds.

An annual Kid's Fishing Day Event and Open House were initiated in 1999 in the hopes of increasing both hatchery visibility within the local community and use by visiting public. It is

anticipated that improvements to the highway leading past the hatchery to the Mt. St. Helens National Monument will increase exposure to and use of the hatchery by visiting public.

Harvest Contribution.—Spring Chinook salmon from Carson NFH have, over the years, supported successful sport and tribal fisheries in the Columbia and Wind rivers. Fisheries occur almost exclusively in the Columbia and Wind rivers with the majority of fish harvested in the freshwater sport fishery, followed by tribal treaty and Columbia River gill net fisheries (Refer to Chapter 3 for more discussion on harvest). For example in 2001, the sport catch in the Wind River was 11,956 fish, with tribal catch at 1,840, and escapement to the hatchery at 12,075 fish (WDFW, Southwest Region, Vancouver, WA, July 13, 2001 data).

Economic Benefit.—When attempting to estimate the benefits of an anadromous fish hatchery, environmental conditions outside the hatchery are cyclic and beyond the control of hatchery administrators (e.g. ocean conditions). This environmental variability can subsequently affect post-release survival of juveniles and number of adult returns. During times of good ocean and river conditions that result in healthy adult returns, significant economic activity is generated through harvest of Carson NFH spring Chinook salmon. For example in 2001, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife estimated that 32,442 angler-days (one person fishing for at least part of one day) occurred on the Wind River as a direct result of a record return of Carson NFH adult spring chinook salmon.

In addition, the role of a Federal mitigation hatchery is to compensate for natural habitat lost to Federal hydro-projects. It follows then, that the economic benefit of the mitigation hatchery is interwoven into the economic benefit of the hydro-power project/s being mitigated for and that the hatchery can be characterized as an operating expense of the hydro-power project. The Service recognizes that mitigation hatcheries are extremely important in supporting economically important fisheries.

Cultural Values.—The Yakama Nation share the in-river harvest of spring Chinook salmon returning to Carson NFH and is the primary beneficiary of surplus spring Chinook salmon which have entered the hatchery holding ponds. The cultural significance of these fish to the tribes is best characterized by the following quotations:

"For the Yakama people salmon is seen as one of the gifts from the Creator. Since the beginning of time the Yakama people have relied upon salmon as well as the roots, berries, deer, elk and herbal medicines still important today. When the Yakama people were placed on this part of Mother Earth they were told by the Creator that He was going to give us some gifts. Those gifts came in the form of salmon and other natural resources.

He also instructed the Yakama people on how to care for the resources and warned that if any of the resources disappear, then we too as people, would disappear. That is why the Yakama people continually care for the salmon, the deer, the elk, the roots, the berries and the herbal

medicines. We are also taught at a very young age that the we are not here on Mother Earth to live and go away. Our Yakama elders tell us that we are only borrowing the water, the salmon, the Yakama language and everything else and we are preparing for the up and coming generations. It's like remembering the future." Carol Craig, Yakama Nation Fisheries Resource Management, Public Information Officer, personal communication.

"Salmon was presented to me and my family through our religion as our brother. The same with the deer. And our sisters are the roots and berries. And you would treat them as such. Their life to you is just as important as another person would be." Margeret Saluskin,Yakama Nation, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission Web-Page.

CHAPTER 3. HATCHERY AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Hatchery Goals, Objectives, and Tasks [3]

The following Hatchery Management Goals were adapted from the Mitchell Act, Endangered Species Act (ESA) Biological Opinions, U.S. v. Oregon agreements, and the Integrated Hatchery Operations Team - Operation Plans for Anadromous Fish Production Facilities in the Columbia River Basin Volume III - Washington, Annual Report for 1995 (IHOT 1996):

Goal 1: Conserve Columbia River spring Chinook salmon in the area upstream of Bonneville Dam (as defined in the Mitchell Act of 1937).

Objective 1: Successfully maintain a brood stock of spring Chinook salmon at Carson NFH without the need for out-of-basin egg or fish transfers to the hatchery (achieve a minimum 0.1% smolt to adult return back to the hatchery)

Task 1: Implement measures to efficiently manage and conserve water use at the hatchery.

Task 2: Implement measures for brood stock management to maintain integrity and genetic diversity of Carson hatchery stock, as identified in the HGMP.

Task 3: Implement management practices for incubation strategies and procedures at the hatchery.

Task 4: Implement management practices for hatchery rearing strategies.

Task 5: Implement management practices for release strategies at the hatchery.

Task 6: Maximize survival at all life stages using disease control and prevention techniques. Prevent introduction, spread or amplification of fish pathogens.

Objective 2: Conduct monitoring and evaluation to ensure goal #1 is achieved.

Task 1: Conduct hatchery evaluation studies to investigate alternative strategies to improve water management, brood stock management (electroanesthesia), incubation, rearing (NATURES) and release strategies (volitional).

[3]Tasks and current practices to achieve objectives are described in this chapter.

Support research on physiology, diet, fish health, and genetics (unfunded), and other Columbia River projects.

Task 2: Biosample returning adults.

Task 3: Hold Hatchery Evaluation Team meetings each spring and fall to review progress.

Task 4: Complete a Station Development Plan (Engineering) to identify facility needs in addressing the needs of hatchery conservation goals (unfunded).

Task 5: Monitor health and disease status of fish, following the Service Fish Health Policy and Integrated Hatchery Operation Team (IHOT) Guidelines.

Goal 2: Assure that hatchery operations support Columbia River Fish Management Plan (U.S. v Oregon) production and harvest objectives.

Objective 1: Collect sufficient brood stock to produce 1.42 million smolts for on-station release into the Wind River.

Task 1: Collect between 1,000 to 1,400 brood stock, depending on pre-spawning mortality and fecundity.

Task 2: Work with co-managers to manage adult fish returning in excess of brood stock need.

Objective 2: Contribute to a meaningful harvest for sport, tribal and commercial fisheries from March through July of each year in the Columbia and Wind Rivers (achieve a 10-year average of 0.5% smolt to adult survival, harvest plus escapement).

Task 1: Work with states and tribes to establish meaningful fisheries (through U.S. v. Oregon forums).

Task 2: Mass mark juvenile hatchery fish prior to release to enable state agencies to implement selective fisheries.

Objective 3: Meet tribal trust responsibilities.

Task 1: Follow pertinent Laws, Agreements, Policies and Executive Orders on Consultation and Coordination with Native American Tribal Governments.

Task 2: Hold an annual coordination meeting between the Service and Yakama Nation to identify and report on issues of interest and coordinate management.

Objective 4: Communicate and coordinate effectively with co-managers in the Columbia River Basin.

Task 1: Participate in U.S. v Oregon Production Advisory Committee (PAC) and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings.

Task 2: Develop technical reports for PAC and TAC.

Task 3: Discuss management issues for Carson NFH at an annual coordination meeting each February between the Service, WDFW, NOAA Fisheries, and Yakama Nation.

Task 4: Hold Hatchery Evaluation Team meetings each spring and fall to review progress.

Objective 5: Conduct monitoring and evaluation to ensure goal #2 is achieved.

Task 1: Coded-Wire-Tag production lots of fish.

Task 2: Biosample returning adults.

Task 3: Produce an annual report on stock assessment and contribution to fisheries.

Task 4: Compare survival, life history, fisheries contribution, and fish health parameters at Carson NFH to other National Fish Hatcheries producing spring Chinook salmon in the Columbia River.

Task 5: Determine natural production potential for spring Chinook salmon in the Wind River (unfunded).

Goal 3: Minimize impacts to listed (ESA) and other native species, their habitat, and the environment.

Objective 1: Minimize interactions with other fish populations by implementing state-of-the-art fish culture technology.

Task 1: Draft and implement actions identified in a Hatchery and Genetic Management Plan.

Task 2: Release juvenile fish that are ready to migrate downstream (smolts).

Task 3: Mass mark all production fish to identify them from naturally produced fish.

Task 4: Support projects for restoration of ESA listed steelhead (threatened) in the Wind River (unfunded).

Task 5: Investigate the hatchery's role in recovery of ESA listed steelhead (threatened) in the Wind River (unfunded).

Task 6: Upgrade hatchery intake to meet NOAA Fisheries screening criteria for steelhead in the Wind River (unfunded).

Task 7: Manage hatchery ladder within acceptable impacts to listed and native fish.

Task 8: Monitor interactions between hatchery and wild fish in the Wind River (see Objective 2 below).

Objective 2: Conduct monitoring and evaluation to ensure goal #3 is achieved.

Task 1: Conduct environmental monitoring to ensure that hatchery operations comply with water quality standards and to assist in managing fish health.

Task 2: Develop a study plan for in-stream evaluation of hatchery and wild fish interactions and reproductive success (unfunded).

Task 3: Develop a study plan to assess physiological status of juveniles prior to release (unfunded) and determine downstream migration rates (PIT tagging).

Task 4: Assess straying (rates and where) of hatchery fish from Carson NFH (funds pending per HGMP development).

Task 5: Monitor health and disease status of fish, following the Service Fish Health Policy and IHOT guidelines.

Goal 4: Develop outreach to enhance public understanding, participation and support of Service and Carson NFH programs.

Objective 1: Increase visibility of Carson NFH.

Task 1: Coordinate with other federal, state, and local information/public affairs offices to incorporate information about Carson NFH.

Task 2: Facilitate interagency cooperation with existing and new programs in the Lower Columbia River Gorge.

Task 3: Coordinate with NOAA Fisheries to host special events, such as National Fishing and Boating Week and National Wildlife Refuge Week activities, and open houses at the hatchery.

Task 4: Interact with Regional Office, CRFPO, and NOAA Fisheries outreach coordinators and actively seek to integrate Lower Columbia River fisheries outreach activities with the Regional and National Outreach Strategies.

Task 5: Increase public use of the hatchery facilities by inviting special interest groups to tour the hatchery.

Objective 2: Provide information and education about the Service programs and Carson NFH to internal and external audiences.

Task 1: Continue existing and develop new cooperative agreements and partnerships with public, private and home school groups.

Task 2: Maintain website for the Carson NFH to inform cyber-visitors of the Carson NFH programs, history and general information.

Task 3: Staff the hatchery on weekends with Information and Education assistance during peak adult fish returns (May - June) to give tours, answer questions, and disseminate general information.

Task 4: Develop a strong working relationship with the local media (newspaper, radio, other Gorge publications) and provide regular news releases and articles regarding agency issues and station activities.

Objective 3: Develop forums for public participation (or input) into Carson NFH issues.

Task 1: Regularly participate in Wind River Watershed Technical Advisory and Council meetings.

Task 2: Hold an annual meeting with local conservation groups each Spring to discuss Carson NFH, Wind River, and other issues of concern.

Objective 4: Conduct monitoring and evaluation to ensure goal #4 is achieved.

Task 1: Evaluate use and/or exposure of program materials and exhibits as they help support goals of the Information and Education program.

Task 2: Distribute teacher evaluations of our education programs to assure education goals are met.

Current Practices to Achieve Goals, Objectives, and Tasks

Water Use and Management.—Carson NFH holds the following certificates of water right:

Source	Certificate No.	Date	Flow (ft^3/s)	Use
Tyee Creek	5856	Jan. 12, 1953	53	Fish propagation year-round
Tyee Springs	5854	Jan. 12, 1953	2	Fish propagation and domestic supply
Wind River	7378	Sept. 28, 1950	40	Fish propagation year-round

The main water source for the hatchery is Tyee Creek, while the Wind River is used as a secondary supply. Incubation and domestic water is provided by Tyee Springs. All water is supplied by gravity flow and all rearing units receive single-pass water with the exception of the lower earthen dirt pond which receives second use water from the upper earthen pond. Carson NFH does not have a mechanical water reuse system.

Tyee Springs (also known as Siouxon Springs) is located about one-half mile north of the hatchery and is the source for Tyee Creek. This almost pure water is not only the sole source of potable domestic water, it is also the source of all water used to incubate eggs and larva and operate the spawning facility.

In response to repeated failure to pass Washington Department of Health (DOH) fecal coliform standards, and because the springs were classified as “ground water under the influence of

surface water" by DOH, the Tyee Springs intake was modified in 2000 to eliminate surface water influence. The existing perforated collection pipe was removed and a replacement pipe located closer to the spring pool bank. The existing bank was then extended to cover the collection pipe and approximately 2,400 square feet of the spring pool was filled in.

Domestic water and water to the nursery and spawning building share a common pipeline from the spring to the hatchery. Domestic water and water to the spawning building is then split off, passed through an ultraviolet filter, and pumped to a concrete holding tank for gravity distribution.

Tyee Creek flows year-round, although water volume fluctuates seasonally with the greatest flow in the winter and the lowest flow in late summer. Tyee Creek water remains clear except during the most severe storms and then quickly recovers, is always oxygen saturated, and a near constant 44° F. The creek is also relatively pathogen free, with the biggest concern coming from a feral brook trout population which may be a source of bacterial kidney disease.

In contrast to Tyee Creek and Tyee Springs, the temperature of Wind River water fluctuates from near freezing in the winter to the mid-sixties during the late summer months, and has a tendency to become muddy with increased flow. It is suspected of harboring a much higher pathogen load (primarily IHN virus) than Tyee Creek due to the presence of adult spring Chinook from May to August, steelhead, and other resident fish populations year-round. Wind River water use is generally limited to late September well after naturally spawning Chinook carcasses have decomposed. Wind River is usually confined to the earthen ponds because it can be hydraulically isolated from the rest of the rearing units.

Screening.—The Wind River intake structure is located approximately one-half mile upstream of the hatchery. In order to bring the Wind River intake into compliance with NOAA Fisheries fish screening criteria, two 3/32" mesh screens have been temporarily placed over the existing intake grill. The screens must be removed each winter and replaced each summer and require constant attention to ensure that the small openings do not clog with pine needles, small rocks and other detritus. There are plans to permanently replace the intake structure and bring it into compliance with the ESA screening criteria in 2005.

Conveyance System to Hatchery and Ponds.—Wind River water flows to the hatchery through a 36" pipeline and then to the adult ponds, the raceways or the upper earthen pond. The route of the water is determined by manipulating valves or dam boards.

The configuration of the water conveyance is such that it is possible to send second use water to the middle bank and to the adult ponds which is rarely, if ever, done. Water is routinely reused from the upper earthen to the lower earthen pond. Studies are underway to determine if there are any deleterious effect on fish receiving second use water.

Effluent Treatment and Monitoring.—Raceway cleaning effluent is sent to a pollution abatement pond where solids are removed prior to discharge to the Wind River. Cleaning effluent and total discharge (normal operation) effluent are monitored weekly for suspended and settleable solids. Environmental Protection Agency standards have never been exceeded for either cleaning effluent discharge or total discharge since monitoring began in the early 1980s.

The east adult holding pond is used to overwinter spring Chinook smolts. This pond is too large to clean using standard draw down and brushing techniques, nor can effluent from this pond be directed to the pollution abatement pond. So, starting in 2000, a trash pump has been used to periodically vacuum fish waste that typically collect in slack water along the pond sides. A 2 ½ inch fire hose is used to direct the pumped fish waste to the drains in the spawning building and then to the pollution abatement pond.

The earthen ponds present another challenge because they cannot be brushed or vacuumed. While a large percentage of fish waste is self digested, there always remains some which escapes when fish are released. Beginning in 2002, a solution of beneficial bacteria has been added to the culture water in hopes of increasing the digestion rate. Preliminary observations suggest that the pond is cleaner after treatment. The hatchery will continue to monitor the effects of beneficial bacteria on accumulated fish waste.

Brood Stock Management

The following performance measures have been established at the hatchery:

Performance Measure	Hatchery Goal	5-Year Average	Range
Spawning Population[1]	1,000	980	894 - 1,131
Fish release (millions)[2]	1.42	1.32	0.91 - 2.2
Egg transfers (thousands)[2]	0	3	0 - 9
Fish transfers (thousands)[2]	0	183	0 - 419
Adults passed upstream[3]	--		
Percent survival juvenile to adult[4]	0.50	0.34	0.05 - 0.97
Smolt size at release (fish/lb)[2]	18	17.90	13 - 24

[1]females plus males (including jacks) spawned, five year average and range from calendar years 1997-2001
[2]five year average and range from calendar years 1998-2002
[3]volitional passage upstream and into hatchery
[4]includes all adult recoveries (fisheries plus hatchery), five year average and range from completed brood years 1992-1996

Carson NFH is currently a single species facility rearing only Carson strain spring Chinook salmon. Brood stock collection at the hatchery is managed to maintain the genetic integrity of the stock. The Service ensures that adult brood stock are randomly collected for spawning across the run in proportion to the rate at which they return. To accomplish this, two adult holding ponds are utilized. The west pond, is designated as the "keep" pond and the east pond is designated as the "excess" pond. Fish are trapped weekly into the "keep" pond at the historical rate of return for that week. For example, if records indicate that 10% of the total run returns the second week of May, then 10% of the number needed to meet the spawning goal is trapped that week. The "keep" pond is then closed and subsequently returning adults are trapped into the excess pond. This process is repeated throughout the run. Adjustments are made as the season progresses as indicated by shifts in return rate.

Adult spring Chinook return to the hatchery from May through August. Prior to 2001, the ladder was kept open throughout the return. In 2001, the ladder was closed on August 1 as a negotiated settlement in order to provide natural stream enrichment and potential natural production from late returning hatchery spawners. The action taken in 2001 will occur in 2002 as well, until another agreement is reached with our co-managers. This issue is discussed in more detail in the section "Special Concerns Over Broodstock Management".

The adult brood stock remain in the west holding pond until removed for spawning. The first spawn date is usually scheduled for mid-August and all spawning is usually completed by the end of the month. The holding ponds are supplied with Tyee Creek water so the temperature remains at 44E to 46E F. The volume of the pond is such that density is not a concern. However, pond loading is managed to meet or exceed one gallon of inflow per fish on the "keep" side and one-half gallon of inflow per fish on the "surplus" side. The adults are injected with erythromycin 60 days prior to spawning and again 30 days prior to spawning to control bacterial kidney disease. The adults are also treated three times weekly with formalin to control external parasites.

Eggs are taken each Wednesday to allow time between egg takes for fish to develop viable eggs and to coordinate sampling by the Lower Columbia River Fish Health Center. The adults are crowded to the lift system on the morning of the spawn day and hoisted in small numbers to the anesthetic vat. Once the fish are anaesthetized, they are sorted for ripeness. Unripe fish are returned to the holding pond and held there until the following week. Ripe fish are killed with a guillotine and bled prior to spawning.

Surplus Adult Returns.—More fish enter the hatchery than are needed for brood stock. Brood stock excess to hatchery needs are transferred to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for distribution to the Yakama Nation for Ceremonial and Subsistence (C&S) use, other tribes for C&S use, or the Bureau of Federal Prisons for inmate rations. Surplus fish or spawned carcasses may also be available for stream enrichment. Adult spring Chinook held for brood stock must be treated (injected) with erythromycin to control bacterial kidney disease infection. Erythromycin has not

been cleared for use on food fish by the Federal Drug Administration, therefore, carcasses previously injected with erythromycin cannot be used for human consumption and must be buried on site. Prespawn mortalities are unfit for human consumption and, in accordance with the Pacific Northwest Fish Health Protection Committee's draft Salmon and Steelhead Carcass Distribution Protocols, cannot be used for stream enrichment outplants and must be buried on site as well.

Spawning Protocol.—The goal mentioned earlier of maintaining the genetic integrity of the Carson strain by applying as much randomness to brood stock collection and selection as possible is continued through the spawning process. Fish are randomly selected and randomly mated as close to a 1:1 male/female spawning ratio as possible. It is nearly impossible to attain a strict 1:1 ratio, however, because the sex ratio of returning adults is typically skewed 60/40 in favor of the females. There are times when, simply by chance, insufficient numbers of males come across the spawning table to exactly match the desired 1:1 spawning ratio. The actual ratio attained is usually 1.0 males : 1.1 females (i.e. some males are used more than once). When culling excess eggs (non BKD detected parent) or when removing eggs for off-station transfers, a portion of eggs from each mating is removed rather than a complete family unit. Jack size fish (usually age three males) are randomly included in the spawning population. Should an extraordinary number of jacks return, the number included in the spawning population will be limited to 5% of the total number of males used per our Regional genetics guidelines.

To achieve a spawning population of 1,000 fish, up to 1,400 spring Chinook brood stock are retained based on the following assumptions:

1. 1,420,000 smolt release goal
2. 18% loss green egg to smolt
3. 20% BKD cull
4. 4,200 eggs/ female
5. 5% prespawn mortality
6. 60/40 female:male ratio at return

Other Acceptable Stocks.—If brood stock numbers are insufficient to meet hatchery production objectives, the hatchery will rear fewer fish. In case of a natural or man-made disaster, Carson stock from Little White NFH or Leavenworth NFH Complex would be acceptable for use at this facility.

Upstream Passage.—Since there is no barrier dam at the hatchery, fish are not prevented from passing upstream of the hatchery. Hatchery fish volitionally enter the hatchery, homing to Tyee Creek. Wild steelhead pass on their own volition upstream of the hatchery. Few steelhead home into Tyee Creek. For example, for the last four years, only three steelhead have been observed swimming into the hatchery ladder.

Special Concerns Over Brood Stock Management.—Co-managers are involved in brood stock management decisions through participation in Hatchery Evaluation Team meetings, through direct contact with the Columbia River Fisheries Program Office, or through other regional forums. For example, discussions with NOAA Fisheries, Yakama Nation and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife biologists led to the recent (2001 and 2002) decision to close the fish ladder on August 1 unless more than 2,350 remained in the river. The purpose of this action was to increase the number of naturally spawning spring Chinook and to increase marine nutrient contribution to the Wind River ecosystem. The number 2,350 is based on the highest historical spawning escapement observed in 1971. There is a concern that excess adults left in the river serve as a source of pathogens, creating the potential for disease transmission to native and hatchery fish as well as concern over in-stream competition of juvenile fish for food and space. Discussions and evaluation of this action will continue.

Biologists with WDFW have made inquiries on rearing captive brood summer steelhead should the native population reach dangerously low levels. To address this issue a feasibility report was prepared for the Wind River Restoration Team (Smith 1995). No further actions have transpired.

Incubation Strategies and Procedures

The eggs from each female are individually incubated until the eyed stage at which time dead eggs are removed. Viable eggs are counted and moved into vertical stack incubators for hatching and larval development. All incubation takes place in 44^0 F Tyee Springs water. Eggs from females with high levels of Bacterial Kidney Disease are discarded unless needed to meet production goals. The first take of eggs hatches in mid-October.

Rearing Strategies

Fry are moved outside to the covered middle bank of 18 raceways for first feeding in early January. The remaining 28 raceways contain yearling fish at this time. Starter feeds from two manufacturers are used in combination (BioProducts and Moore-Clarke[4]). Implementation of this protocol has nearly eliminated losses due to gut fungal (*Phoma sp.)* infections. The practice of alternating feed from two manufacturers has been continued throughout the rearing cycle with excellent results. The pond cover provides protection from predators and from the elements for the early feeding fry. Anecdotal evidence from the first year of use suggests that the pond cover improves both survival and feed conversion of early fry.

In May, the fry, fingerlings by now, are spread across all 46 raceways. This occurs after the April smolt release and raceways are cleaned. The large earthen ponds and the adult holding pond are generally filled in late fall after fall rains have recharged Tyee Springs providing sufficient flow to support these rearing units. The upper and lower earthen ponds are allowed to

[4]Reference to trade-names and products does not signify endorsement by the Service.

set fallow over the summer, drying them out and reducing the chance of spreading disease from one brood year to the next. A persistent flagtail infection in the upper earthen pond was virtually eliminated after allowing the pond to remain fallow over the summer. Use of the adult pond for rearing juveniles must be delayed until after spawning season.

Mid-May is the optimal time to mark fish at this facility for a variety of reasons: (1) The fingerlings are 100 fish/pound or larger, a good size for marking; (2) Marking at this time facilitates spreading or "splitting" of fingerlings to empty raceways (it is a simple matter to direct fish processed through the marking trailer to the appropriate raceway or pond);and (3) Marking at a later date could negatively impact fish health through additional handling when the fish are growing rapidly.

"NATURES" rearing is the practice of employing techniques such as the addition of substrate, coloration, and cover to rearing units in order to mimic natural environs. The earthen ponds provide a NATURES rearing opportunity at the hatchery. Terrestrial vegetation, 2 to 3 feet tall, grows in these ponds during the summer fallow period providing excellent cover when the ponds are re-filled. Shade cloth placed over the upper earthen pond in 2001 to provide protection from the sun also seemed to work very well. Fish in this pond utilized nearly the entire pond after the shade cloth was hung rather than crowding into small areas shaded by the central walkway as they did prior to placement of the shade cloth. NOAA Fisheries biologists have proposed a full scale production test of NATURES rearing techniques at Carson NFH but have not been received funding. The production ponds were upgraded in 2002. The ponds were coated with Lifelast[4] polyurethane and colored to approximate Wind River substrate. The middle bank of raceways are also enclosed which provide shade.

Beginning with brood year 1997, rearing space has been managed so that density indices (the ratio of weight of fish to rearing unit volume and fish length) at no time exceed 0.25 (Banks 1994). In order to achieve the low indices, total production was reduced from over 2 million to 1.42 million smolts. The results have been very encouraging. For example, prophylactic erythromycin treatments to control BKD are no longer given to fingerlings, and losses to BKD have declined dramatically. Reduced production numbers have also led to minimal use of Wind River water for production and, hopefully, minimal introduction of pathogens.

The raceways are brushed twice weekly for cleaning from first ponding until the fish are switched from a crumble feed to an extruded pellet at about 450 fish to the pound. The raceways are then brushed once weekly until the fish are released. The adult pond is vacuumed twice, once about mid-way to release and once just prior to release.

Release Strategies

Smolts are mass released directly into the Wind River at 18 fish/pound or larger to minimize interaction with other fish populations. As discussed in Chapter 2, there are no native spring Chinook stocks in the Wind River above Shipherd Falls. However, steelhead listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act are present throughout the Wind River drainage. Releasing fish at 18 fish/pound or larger helps ensure that the released fish are functional smolts which actively migrate through the Wind River corridor, reducing competition with listed steelhead. Rearing the smolts almost exclusively on Tyee Springs water minimizes straying of adults, further reducing competition with native steelhead.

Smolts are released around the third week of April to coincide with normal spring migration and spill at Bonneville Dam. It is likely that the fish are functional or near functional smolts at this time as evidenced by their rapid migration to the mouth of the Wind River (smolt trap data) and detection at Bonneville Dam. Detecting PIT tagged fish at Bonneville Dam bypass facilities provide an indication of travel time for releases from Carson NFH. For example, in 1999 the average travel time to Bonneville Dam for a release date of April 29, 1999 from Carson NFH was 10.2 days (n=1,800 detected). The quickest time was less than 24 hours (0.8 days) and the slowest was 94.3 days (Columbia River Fisheries Program Office, Vancouver, WA unpublished data). Since releases from the hatchery are targeted during Bonneville Dam spill schedules, most PIT tagged fish released from Carson NFH go undetected at Bonneville Dam's fish bypass facilities with most fish utilizing the spillway.

Fish Health Management Program

The primary objective of fish health management programs at Service hatcheries is to produce healthy smolts that will contribute to the program goals of that particular stock. Equally important is to prevent the introduction, amplification or spread of certain fish pathogens which might negatively affect the health of both hatchery and naturally reproducing stocks.

Fish Health Policy.—The Lower Columbia River Fish Health Center (FHC) in Underwood, WA provides fish health care for Carson NFH under the auspices of the published policy 713 FW in the Fish and Wildlife Service Manual (FWM). In addition to this policy, the 1994 annual report "Policies and Procedures for Columbia Basin Anadromous Salmonid Hatcheries", by the Integrated Hatchery Operations Team (IHOT 1995) provide further fish health guidelines as approved by northwestern state, federal, and tribal entities. The directives of these two documents more than meet the requirements of Washington's state and tribal fish health entities which follow the directives in the Co-Managers' Salmonid Disease Control Policy of 1998.

The documents mentioned above provide guidance for preventing or minimizing diseases within and outside of the hatchery. In general, movements of live fish into or out of the hatchery must be approved in the U.S. v Oregon Production Advisory Committee forum (Objective 6) and be

noted on the State of Washington Brood Document for the hatchery. If a fish transfer or release is not on the Brood Document, permits from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Service, and any other states through which the fish travel must be obtained and approved by co-managers. Fish health exam and certification must be done prior to any releases or transfers from the hatchery to minimize risks from possible disease transmittance.

Fish Health Examinations.—Monthly examination: A pathologist from the FHC visits once per month to examine fish at the hatchery. From each stock and broodyear of juveniles, fish are randomly sampled to ascertain general health. Based on pathological signs, age of fish, concerns of hatchery personnel, and the history of the facility, the examining pathologist determines the appropriate tests. This usually includes a necropsy with an external and internal exam of skin, gills, and internal organs. Kidneys (and other tissues, if necessary) will be checked for the common bacterial pathogens by culture and by a specific test for bacterial kidney disease (BKD). Blood is checked for signs of anemia or other infections, including viral anemia. Additional tests for virus or parasites are done if warranted. The pathologist will also examine fish which are moribund or freshly dead to ascertain potential disease problems in the stocks.

Diagnostic Examination: This is done on an as-needed basis as determined by the pathologist or requested by hatchery personnel. Moribund, freshly dead fish or fish with unusual signs or behavior are examined for disease using necropsy and appropriate diagnostic tests. A pathologist will normally check symptomatic fish during a monthly examination.

Ponding Examination: The first health exam of newly hatched fish occurs when approximately 50% of the animals are beyond the yolk sac stage and begin feeding. Sixty fish will be sampled and tested for virus.

Pre-release Examination: At two to four weeks prior to a release or transfer from the hatchery, 60 fish from the stock of concern are necropsied and tissues taken for testing of listed pathogens. The listed pathogens, defined in Service policy 713 FW (Fish and Wildlife Service Manual) include infectious hematopoietic necrosis virus (IHNV), infectious pancreatic necrosis virus (IPNV), viral hemorrhagic septicemia virus (VHSV), *Renibacterium salmoninarum, Aeromonas salmonicida, Yersinia ruckeri*, and *Myxobolus cerebralis*.

Adult Certification Examination: At spawning, tissues from adult fish are collected to ascertain viral, bacterial, and parasite infections and to provide a brood health profile for the progeny. The FHC tests for all of the listed pathogens, except *Myxobolus cerebralis*, and including *Ceratomyxa shasta*. The minimum number of samples collected is defined by 713 FW. At Carson NFH, all brood females are tested for *R. salmoninarum* (causative agent of BKD), with an identifying fish health number corresponding to each female's eggs so that selective culling and/or segregation is possible. This is done to reduce/control BKD, a vertically-transmitted disease. Progeny from females with high levels of BKD are culled (if not needed to make

production goals) or segregated from progeny at lower risk. The FHC provides results from testing within four weeks to allow management decisions.

Chemotherapeutant Use.—Erythromycin injections for brood stock are critical to the control of bacterial kidney disease which is caused by a vertically transmitted bacterium (*Renibacterium salmoninarum*) that can reside in the ovarian and seminal fluids. In addition, erythromycin injections control the mortality and reduce horizontal transmission of BKD between adults in the brood pond. The injection schedule is set to maximize the number of adults injected, with a goal of two injections for the early arriving adults and one injection for the later arrivals. To reduce bacterial numbers in the reproductive fluids and to deposit the drug inside the ova, erythromycin must be injected at a dosage of 20 mg drug/kg of fish at 30 days prior to spawning. At Carson NFH, the first injection is scheduled on about June 12th and the second injection on about July 12th. Except for fish arriving too close to the time of spawning for safe handling and injection, all spring Chinook salmon adults kept for broodstock will be injected. Injections were formerly done under INAD 6430 (Investigational New Animal Drug regulation) but now require a prescription from a veterinarian. The injected drug is Erythro-200 or Erythro-100 (200 mg/ml or 100 mg/ml, respectively, of active erythromycin base in PEG, ethly actate and ethyl alcohol), to be injected in the dorsal sinus at 20 mg drug/kg of body weight.

Since 1998 (brood year 97 juveniles) prophylactic medicated feedings to control BKD in juveniles has been deemed unnecessary. The reduced levels of BKD in the juveniles is attributed to lowered densities ($\leq$ 0.25 density index and < 1.0 flow index) during rearing, regular cleaning and maintenance of individual equipment (nets, etc.) for each pond, erythromycin injection of the adults, culling/segregation of progeny from highly infected females, and the use of Tyee Springs water for rearing. Should prophylactic feeding be necessary, as determined by the FHC, juveniles are to be fed at a daily dosage of 100 mg/kg of fish for a minimum of 21 days unless contraindicated by drug toxicity or needed feeding rate adjustments. The time and number of treatments will be dictated by circumstances. As of 2001, there is a temporary INAD 4333 that allows feeding of Aquamycin 100 (erythromycin thiocyanate in a wheat flour base) and prescription by a veterinarian is not required.

Formalin treatment of adults held for brood stock are used to control external pathogens three times per week prior to spawning.

Salmonid egg hardening and disinfection treatment with a polyvinylpyrrolidone iodine compound (approximately 1% iodine) is required by 713 FW policy to minimize/prevent transmittance of viral and bacterial pathogens. The eggs shall be disinfected in 50 ppm iodine in water buffered by sodium bicarbonate (at 0.01%) for 30 minutes during the water-hardening process. Eggs received at the hatchery must be disinfected before they are allowed to come in contact with the station's water, rearing units or equipment. Specifics are provided in 713 FW policy.

Other Fish Health Precautions.—Unless knowledge regarding vertical transmittance of BKD proves otherwise, eggs from female brood stock with high levels of BKD (a cut-off point selected by the NFH and FHC managers based on results from the Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay or ELISA) will not be used in production unless egg production is low. If the number of brood females is low, progeny from highly infected females shall be segregated into rearing units apart from the rest of the production and absolute fastidiousness maintained as to using equipment that is disinfected and/or dedicated to these rearing units.

Where feasible, a yearly draw down, pressure wash, and drying of the dirt ponds is recommended to reduce problems induced by fungus, bacteria and parasites. If necessary, a formalin treatment may be applied to the surface.

Returning spring Chinook salmon that are allowed to remain in the Wind River upstream of the hatchery can serve as a reservoir of pathogens for the fish in the hatchery. Because of this, the standard practice is to rear juveniles on Tyee Creek water. Returning spring Chinook salmon have a relatively high incidence of infectious hematopoietic necrosis virus (IHNV), ranging from 41 to 88% and in 1988 to 1995 when water from the river was used for rearing, the juveniles in the hatchery experienced small to large epizootics of IHNV. In addition, the juveniles also succumbed to furunculosis which is found in about 1/3 of dying spring Chinook salmon adults. The risk from bacterial kidney disease in the juveniles is also enhanced, with evidence from this and other hatcheries that horizontal transmission occurs when infected adults are in the water supply. Since 1996 Wind River water is no longer used for rearing, there have been no isolations of IHNV, no detection of furunculosis, and a reduced incidence of BKD in the juveniles. A precautionary consideration might be to remove all spring Chinook salmon adults from the Wind River prior to spawning to reduce the potential of infecting native steelhead that could also serve as a reservoir of infection.

Drugs and chemicals for treating fish are used on an “as needed” basis. Formalin treatments for adult brood stock are given to control external parasites and as a fungicide on eggs. Studies are currently (2001) underway to determine if egg antifungal treatments are truly necessary. It is becoming increasingly difficult to comply with OSHA, safety and fire codes and regulations. Minimizing chemical and drug use will not only reduce impacts on the local environment but will make compliance with the various safety regulatory agencies much easier, as well as reduce risks to employees. Towards that end, an electro-anesthesia system should be in place by the BY 2002 spawning season. Use of this device will virtually eliminate the need for the anaesthetic MS-222[4] reducing one more chemical at the hatchery.

Tank trucks and tagging trailers are disinfected before being brought onto the station and after use at the hatchery.

Abernathy Fish Technology Center provides quarterly feed quality analysis to prevent disease and meet nutritional requirements of fish.

Monitoring, Evaluation, and Coordination

The Columbia River Fisheries Program Office (CRFPO) provides monitoring, evaluation, and coordination services concerning Carson NFH production. The CRFPO staff monitors hatchery returns, biological characteristics of the hatchery stock, fish marking, tag recovery, and other aspects of the hatchery program. They maintain the database that stores this information and serve as a link to databases maintained by other entities. The CRFPO also cooperates with the hatchery, fish health center, Abernathy Fish Technology Center, and co-managers to evaluate fish culture practices, assess impacts to native species, and coordinate hatchery programs both locally and regionally. These activities are described in the following section:

Database Management.—The Fisheries Information System (FIS) is a national database system for the Service's Fisheries Program. Each Service field office contributes to this database. The FIS consists of five different databases, two of which, Fish and Egg Distribution databases document production accomplishments from all National Fish Hatcheries. This database is discussed further in Chapter 4.

Information from and about Carson NFH is connected to the broader fisheries community of the West Coast of the North American Continent through the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Columbia River (information) System (CRiS). The following information is recorded in files that are components of the CRiS database: adult, jack and mini-jack returns to the hatchery; age, sex, length, mark and coded-wire tag information for returning fish that are sampled; egg development and disposition; the origin of fish raised at the hatchery; and fish transfers and releases. Carson NFH maintains files containing information generated at the hatchery (brood stock management, incubation, rearing, and release). Staff from CRFPO maintain files containing information on marked juvenile fish and on sampled adult fish (adult bio-samples).

Use of CRiS database files and programs achieves the following multiple purposes: 1) reduces the amount of effort expended to meet reporting requirements, 2) increases the quality and consistency of data, 3) facilitates development of software usable at all stations, 4) provides a platform on which to build effective evaluation tools which can be used by hatcheries, fisheries management and regional offices, and 5) facilitates the exchange of information with other agencies. For example, release and recovery information is reported to both the Regional Mark Information Center and the StreamNet databases.

Computer programs that are components of the CRiS database are used to transform data into formats required by other agencies. These formats can be either electronic or printed. Other CRiS programs combine data from the hatchery, CRFPO, and from databases maintained by other agencies into other formats to accomplish reporting, monitoring, and evaluation.

Marking/Tagging Program.—Juvenile fish are fin clipped, coded-wire tagged and/or PIT tagged at Carson NFH by CRFPO to monitor and evaluate fish cultural techniques, survival and

fishery contribution. Presently all spring Chinook salmon are fin clipped at Carson NFH to identify hatchery fish in selective fisheries and to measure the impact on wild anadromous and resident stocks of fish in Wind River. This action is in compliance with recommendations of the Biological Opinions of NMFS's 1999 Artificial Propagation in the Columbia River Basin and the 2000 Reinitiating of Consultation on Operation of the Federal Columbia River Power System, under the Endangered Species Act-Section 7 Consultation.

Bio-sampling and Reporting.—State and tribal coast-wide sampling of sport, tribal, and commercial fisheries and hatchery rack return sampling, by CRFPO and the hatchery staff, provides total recovery and survival estimates for each brood year released.

Coded-wire tag recovery information is used to evaluate the relative success of individual brood stocks and compare performance between years and hatcheries. This information is used by salmon harvest managers to develop plans to allow the harvest of excess hatchery fish while protecting threatened, endangered, or other stocks of concern.

Until 2001, snouts were removed from all adipose fin-clipped fish to recover coded-wire tags. A percentage of unmarked fish were sampled for length, sex, and scales (age). The percentage of fish sampled was set high enough that at least 500 fish were sampled. CRFPO personnel did all sampling except during the period of returns from the WDFW mark evaluation study beginning with brood year 1989. These samples, and a subset of fish sampled for coded-wire tags, were used to determine the age composition of fish returning to the hatchery (Attachment 15). Starting with brood year 2000 all production fish were adipose fin clipped. All returning fish are now checked for coded-wire tags by passing them through a tag detection unit. Mass marking will allow selective fisheries and will help us determine production of wild or feral spring Chinook salmon in the Wind River.

Hatchery Evaluation Studies.—Hatchery evaluation is the use of replicable, statistically defensible studies to guide management decisions. The hatchery evaluation vision action plan developed in 1993 for Region 1 Fisheries describes hatchery evaluation in greater detail (USFWS 1993). The purpose of hatchery evaluation is to simply determine what works and doesn't work through planning, implementing, documenting, monitoring, analyzing, and reporting.

Past studies include National Marine Fisheries Service's (NOAA Fisheries) coded-wire tagging of Willard stock coho and Carson stock spring Chinook salmon reared at Carson NFH in the late 1970's and early 80's. This study evaluated imprinting and homing mechanisms of fish released at various locations in the Columbia River basin (Slatick 1988). Abernathy Fish Technology Center has also conducted hatchery evaluation studies at the hatchery. For example, brood years 1982 to 1985 spring Chinook from Carson were marked and coded-wire tagged for a rearing density study (Banks 1994). As a result of this study, rearing densities in hatchery raceways were reduced. The guidelines being implemented as a result of the density study are to keep the

rearing density index at 0.25 or lower with a flow index greater than 1.0. The present production goal at Carson NFH is 1.42 million smolts.

A study to evaluate survival of spring Chinook from the effects of fin clipping and coded-wire tagging was completed as part of a three brood year (1989-91), three hatchery investigation (Carson NFH, Oregon's South Santiam, and Washington's Cowlitz hatcheries). The results and conclusions of this study are forthcoming.

Stock Assessment and Contribution to Fisheries.—Routine coded-wire tagging of production fish under the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) funded "Stock Assessment" program began with fish from brood year 1988 (Pastor 1999). A representative group of 75,000 fish continues to be adipose fin clipped and coded-wire tagged to assess survival and fisheries contribution. All release information, including marked to unmarked ratios, is reported by CRFPO to the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC). Mark and tag information from sampled fish, recovered in the various fisheries and at the hatchery, are also reported.

As assessed by CRFPO, the average survival for 12 brood years with complete coded-wire tag recovery information (1982-95) is estimated to be 0.23% with a standard deviation of 0.18%. The minimum survival was 0.022% for brood year 1991 and maximum was 0.59% for brood year 1992 (Attachment 16). A more optimistic outlook is appearing for returns in 2000, 2001and 2002 (brood years 1996, 1997 and 1998) with over 1% survival expected for brood year 1997. As previously mentioned, the marking program has also made it possible for CRFPO to determine contribution rates to various fisheries (Attachment 17). Since brood year 1980, an average 74% of adults returned to the hatchery with remaining recoveries of Carson spring Chinook salmon occurring almost exclusively in the Columbia River Basin. The majority of fish were harvested in the freshwater sport fishery, followed by tribal treaty and subsistence fishery, and the Columbia River gill net fishery. A very small percentage may also be picked up in the Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California and British Columbia commercial fisheries.

Juvenile Monitoring.—Juvenile fish at Carson NFH are monitored on a routine basis by the hatchery staff to determine the condition factor of fry, fingerling and yearling fish. Samples are taken monthly for Bio-analysis by the Lower Columbia River Fish Health Center (LCRFHC) to determine the health condition of fry, fingerling, yearling and smolts prior to release. Sampling of fingerling fish for tag retention and fin mark quality, prior to release, is conducted by CRFPO. Length measurements are recorded for all PIT tagged fish by CRFPO.

Use of passive integrated transponder (PIT) tags began with brood year 1995 fish at Carson NFH. PIT tagging at Carson NFH is part of a larger comparative survival study conducted by the Fish Passage Center, Portland, Oregon. Carson NFH serves as a lower river hatchery to compare survival and passage to upper Columbia River and Snake River facilities. Up to 15,000 juvenile fish at Carson NFH have been PIT tagged each year by CRFPO for this study.

ESA Assessments, Ecological Interactions, and Natural Production Studies.—The Service completes Biological Assessments and Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans to comply with the Endangered Species Act (ESA). These assessments and plans help guide production, considering the potential impacts on the biological community.

To comply with ESA, the Service initiated a Biological Assessment for the hatchery back in 1993 and subsequently initiated a Hatchery and Genetic Management Plan (HGMP) for Carson NFH in 1999 (USFWS 1999). This initial draft HGMP followed an older format and was produced under consultation with NOAA Fisheries to meet our ESA Section 7 obligations. The Service and NOAA Fisheries agreed that we would complete a more thorough HGMP once the format was finalized by NOAA Fisheries and the Service. The Service is now in the process of completing this more detailed HGMP and anticipate having it completed by fall of 2002. This document, considered a "phase I draft", will describe current operations at the hatchery and will comply with ESA obligations, covering both NOAA Fisheries and Service trust species. It is anticipated that the phase I drafts for all hatcheries, including Carson, will be distributed to the co-managers and other interested parties and will serve as the focus for a collaborative, phase II part of the process. Collaboration meetings should begin in late 2002 and continue through the first half of 2003. Drafts for any proposed new project/programs will be developed by appropriate proponents and also discussed and reconciled during phase II. This process will produce phase II draft plans which will be provided to subbasin planning processes and the appropriate technical recovery team (TRT) for consideration and interaction with those groups. For HGMPs that involve unreconciled differences, the phase II options could create "scenarios" that can be presented to the TRT for consideration and advice. The phase II draft plans will be completed and set aside (parked) until all HGMPs relevant to an Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) are completed, allowing for ESU-wide considerations and feedback with the TRT/Recovery Planning processes. The HGMP collaborators will incorporate TRT advice as appropriate to ensure consistency with broader recovery objectives. This step culminates in Phase III drafts, which become final and ready to implement after approval by NOAA Fisheries and the Service.

Of special concern in the Wind River is wild (listed) summer steelhead trout production. Natural production of juvenile, smolt and adult steelhead is monitored by WDFW, USFS and USGS. The Service is developing study proposals to assess the effects of hatchery spring Chinook salmon on the aquatic community in the Wind River, especially on the listed summer steelhead population. The Lower Columbia River Fish Health Center can also help assess the status of wild fish health in the watershed.

Additional monitoring needs have also been identified in the Draft Wind River Subbasin Summary (WDFW 2000). These fish and wildlife needs are: 1) determine abundance, distribution, survival and status of fish and wildlife native to the watershed including steelhead, coastal cutthroat, fall chinook, bull trout, coho, lamprey, and crawfish; 2) determine genetic and life history types of native fish and wildlife and the strength of their current expression relative

to historical and desired future conditions; 3) assess effect of natural escapement of hatchery spring Chinook and feral brook trout on natural production of steelhead; 4) determine if high infestations of the ciliated protozoan *Hydropolaria lwoffi* lowers survival of juvenile steelhead and determine if degree and distributions of infestations in juvenile steelhead is related to water quality, habitat conditions, or other environmental stressors; 5) determine the effectiveness of habitat restoration projects on achieving the desired physical change and measure response of wild steelhead populations to these changes; 6) assess effect of operations of Bonneville and The Dalles dams on the fish and wildlife production capacity and migration corridor of the portion of the Wind River that is inundated with the impounded waters; 7) assess straying (rates and where) of hatchery fish from Carson NFH.

Environmental Monitoring.—Environmental monitoring is conducted at Service facilities to ensure these facilities meet the requirements of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and is also used in managing fish health. On a short-term basis, monitoring helps identify when changes to hatchery practices are required. Long-term monitoring provides the ability for our cooperators to quantify water quality impacts resulting from changes in the watershed (e.g., logging, road building and urbanization). The following parameters are currently monitored at this hatchery:

- Total Suspended Solids (TSS)--- 1 to 2 times per week on composite effluent, maximum effluent and inflow samples. Once per month on pollution abatement pond inflow and effluent samples.

- Settleable Solids (SS)—1 to 2 times per week on inflow and inflow samples. Once per week on pollution abatement pond inflow and effluent samples.

- In-hatchery Water Temperatures—maximum and minimum daily.

- In-hatchery Dissolved Oxygen—as required by stream flow or weather conditions.

Coordination/Communication.—The hatchery holds Hatchery Evaluation Team (HET) meetings each spring and fall. These meetings include representatives from Carson NFH, CRFPO and LCRFHC. Topics of concern include reports on current activities and accomplishments, present management programs, and future plans or studies that might affect, or be affected by hatchery operations. Other aspects include survival, life history, fisheries contribution, and fish health parameters at Carson NFH and how it compares to other National Fish Hatcheries producing spring Chinook salmon in the Columbia River. These meetings have evolved into combination HET/Coordination meetings. Cooperators (NOAA Fisheries, WDFW, YN) are invited to all HET meetings and are especially encouraged to attend when significant hatchery management decisions are scheduled. The fall HET meeting reviews adult returns with emphasis on production decisions for the next year. Production is also coordinated with the co-

managers through the Production Advisory Committee (see below) and with concurrence of the Regional Office and NOAA Fisheries.

Fish and Egg Transfers.—All fish and egg requests and transfers are coordinated through Carson NFH, LCRFHC, and CRFPO. Any request for fish and/or eggs, either in or out of Carson NFH, will be in writing and a National Fish Hatchery Planned Release or Transfer Schedule will be prepared by the requester. All transfers of fish and/or eggs require a fish health certification from LCRFHC prior to transfer. All fish and egg transfers are made in accordance with the co-managers fish disease control policy and the Service's fish health policy and implementation guidelines. If the fish and/or eggs are determined to be healthy the LCRFHC arranges for all appropriate state permits involving the transport. The transfer schedule is signed by the Carson NFH manager and LCRFHC and sends the document and permits to the CRFPO for approval. These requests and permits are kept on file at the CRFPO for future reference.

Interagency Coordination/Communication.—As part of the U.S. v Oregon Columbia River Management Plan, the Technical Advisory and Production Advisory Committees are comprised of harvest and production assessment biologists, including representatives from the Service, Tribes, NMFS, and states of Oregon, Washington and Idaho. These groups provide management direction used in establishing hatchery fish production goals and harvest rates.

The Integrated Hatchery Operations Team (IHOT) was comprised of representatives from fish management agencies, including CRFPO and tribes. IHOT developed a series of regional hatchery policies and operational plans. The IHOT group has since been replaced by the Artificial Production Review process funded by the Northwest Power Planning Council. The Service is represented by our Regional Office staff.

Pacific Northwest Fish Health Protection Committee (PNFHPC) is comprised of representatives from U.S. and Canadian fish management agencies, including LCRFHC, tribes, universities, and private fish operations. The group meets twice a year to monitor regional fish heath policies and to discuss current fish health issues in the Pacific Northwest.

At the Carson NFH Annual Coordination Meeting (February) the Service discusses management issues for Carson NFH, on an annual basis with representatives from WDFW, NOAA Fisheries, and the Yakama Nation.

Ocean Fisheries Management.—Carson NFH spring Chinook salmon are not recovered in ocean fisheries in significant numbers and do not influence ocean fishery management decisions.

Freshwater Fisheries Management.—Washington, Oregon, and the four treaty tribes (Yakama, Warm Springs, Umatilla and Nez Perce), that are parties to the Columbia River Fish

Management Plan (U.S. v. Oregon), prepare harvest strategies based on run size predictions made by their respective fishery agencies. They then jointly present their findings to the Columbia River Compact through the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The Columbia River Compact, created by Congress, has the authority to approve or reject sport and commercial fishery proposals for the main stem Columbia River. In their deliberations, the Compact will consider the findings of the TAC. If those findings are in compliance with the management plan, brood stock goals and ESA guidelines, and the run size prediction shows a harvestable surplus, the Compact will set seasons for non-tribal and/or tribal fisheries in the main stem Columbia River.

If a harvestable surplus is predicted for the Wind River, the State of Washington and Yakama Nation will set regulations for terminal area non-tribal sport and/or tribal subsistence fisheries. Fishing regulations are established to also provide adequate escapement for hatchery production and meet ESA guidelines.

Public Outreach Activities

The Columbia River Gorge Information and Education (I&E) Office services the Carson and Spring Creek National Fish Hatcheries and the Lower Columbia River Fish Health Center. The Office shares/distributes its time and staffing between these stations. The I&E program is mainly funded by the Spring Creek NFH with assistance from the Carson NFH and the Lower Columbia River Fish Health Center.

The goal of the Columbia River Gorge I&E Office outreach program is to increase the visibility of the Fish and Wildlife Service facilities in the Columbia River Gorge and to provide information about Service programs to internal and external audiences. Staff and volunteers show how Service programs benefit the public and the environment in keeping with the Service's mission "To conserve, protect, and enhance the Nation's fish and wildlife and their habitats for the continuing benefit of people."

Recognizing that it is increasingly important for all staff to be involved in gaining or retaining public support for our programs, the I&E program will strive to insure that staff are well-informed about policies, procedures, and issues; and that staff are willing and able to interact with our various publics. Program efforts will include providing information to staff, partners, and volunteers and, through them, to members of the community and other publics. Outreach will be used as a management tool, providing support to the Service, the public, and our hatchery programs.

On Station.—On station activities include tours of the facility to predominantly local schools. Some special interest groups schedule special tours to better understand hatchery operations. On site educational efforts include an Outdoor Learning Day each May introducing Camas, WA 5th graders to various elements of the hatchery and general stewardship of the outdoors. Columbia

River Day Camp is held each August as a joint effort with various agencies introducing Vancouver children to the hatchery and outdoors. Students from both Carson Elementary and Stevenson High School raise spring Chinook salmon in their classrooms and visit the hatchery annually to release their fish and tour the facility. Annual festivals include an Open House each June and an annual Disabled Fishing Day and Kid's Fishing Day each September. Additional information and education assistance is provided at the hatchery on weekends during peak adult fish returns (May - June) to give tours, answer questions, and disseminate general information.

Off station.—Outreach efforts include an array of activities that occur throughout the Pacific Region. Examples include various festivals, classroom participation at local schools, stream adoption, participation in other National Fish Hatchery events, and county fairs (Hood River and Skamania counties and the Trout Lake Community Fair).

The hatchery maintains a 5-hole miniature golf course, Migration Golf, which depicts the life cycle of salmon. This very popular activity is requested throughout the year. The Service chooses events which will reach a broad audience. The Service rotates events we attend each year. The Service does not have adequate funding or staffing to attend all events for which the golf course is requested. The golf course is an excellent tool to tell the hatchery and wild salmon story and is a great asset to the Carson NFH.

Visitors can visit Carson NFH through the World Wide Web at http://gorgefish.fws.gov/Carson to inform cyber-visitors of Carson NFH programs. Additional biological information on spring Chinook salmon at the hatchery can be viewed at http://columbiariver.fws.gov/

Partnerships/Cooperators.—A bulleted list of particular events and partnerships follows:

- Carson Elementary School - Carson NFH provides spring Chinook salmon for Salmon-In-The- Classroom activities annually, classes then tour the hatchery and release their fish in December each year.

- Clark County Community College - partnership with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, National Park Service, and the Vancouver Water Resources Education Center to provide a Mature Learning class to discuss and explain the history and stewardship of Columbia River anadromous fish.

- Clark Public Utility - Carson NFH provides the Migration Golf Course for the annual Clark County Home and Garden Idea Fair.

- Columbia Gorge Center - Coordinate an Annual Accessible Fishing Day, participating adults are from various group homes in Hood River and The Dalles, OR.

- Columbia River Gorge Visitor's Association - the Information and Education staff attends this monthly meeting; being members of the Association, the hatchery is featured as a paying member; our name, address, website and calendar of events appear in the annual *Gorge Guide*; main fulfillment publication for the Association.

- The Discovery Center and Museum - cooperative effort with outreach activities including joint booth for Hood River and Skamania County Fairs, we provide guest speakers at special speaker series for the museum, Columbia River Day Camp, Bass Lake Field Day, assistance with Carson NFH Annual Kid's Fishing Day.

- Dorothy Fox Elementary School, Camas, WA - provide an Outdoor Learning Experience for 25 urban students to gain a better understanding and sense of stewardship at the Carson NFH.

- Friends of Northwest Hatcheries - continue to strengthen and expand the partnership with the Friends of Northwest Hatcheries. Carson NFH signed an official MOU with the Friends Group and the Regional Director in fall 2000.

- Portland Public Schools, Metropolitan Learning Center - teacher Jennifer Rasor brings classes to the hatchery for tours on a regular basis, they are working cooperatively on a forest restoration project in the Gifford Pinchot National Forest, which surrounds the hatchery.

- Port of Skamania County - cooperative effort with the adoption of Kanaka Creek, Stevenson, WA; annual trash pick up, tree planting, water quality testing, and macro-invertebrate inventory.

- Skamania County Saddle Club - hold our annual Carson NFH Open House in conjunction with the Camp Howe Cowboy Breakfast; joint publicity for our events.

- Stevenson High School - donation of spring Chinook salmon for raising Salmon-In-The-Classroom. Information/Education staff lead fish dissections to reinforce internal and external anatomy.

- Underwood Conservation District - cooperative effort with the adoption of Kanaka Creek, Stevenson, WA; annual trash pick up, tree planting, water quality testing, and macro-invertebrate inventory; cooperate in various activities and events annually.

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Bonneville Lock and Dam - cooperative effort with outreach activities including joint booth at Oregon Dept of Fish and Wildlife Free Fishing Clinic, joint county fair booth, Columbia River Day Camp, Bass Lake Field Day, assistance with Carson NFH Annual Kid's Fishing Day.

- U.S. Forest Service - cooperative effort with outreach activities including fishing day events, fishing day camp activities.

- Water Resources Education Center - Carson NFH participates in the Annual Sturgeon Festival at the Water Resources Education Center, the Migration Golf course has been utilized at this event; they are a cooperator in the Columbia River Day Camp.

- Wind River Middle School - cooperative partnership with Carson students and the Port of Skamania County in the adoption of Kanaka Creek, Stevenson, WA.

- Wind River Technical Advisory Committee.

- Wind River Watershed Council.

- NOAA Fisheries - funding agency via Mitchell Act and ESA trust responsibilities.

- Bonneville Power Administration.

- Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fisheries Commission - provides coordination and technical assistance to Columbia River treaty tribes.

- Private land owners in Wind River watershed.

- Washington Department of Ecology and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - water quality and effluent discharge permits.

- U.S. *v* Oregon parties - co-managers of Columbia River fisheries, including Yakama Nation, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Nez Perce Tribe, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Idaho Fish and Wildlife, NOAA Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- Yakama Nation and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife - co-managers of Wind River fisheries.

Special Concerns

Planning Issues.—Several federal, state and tribal entities share responsibilities for development of subbasin plans, hatchery production, harvest management, and ESA considerations. Recent actions have centered around correcting those factors contributing to the decline of Wind River's aquatic resources. The agencies involved include the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NOAA Fisheries, U.S. Geological Survey, Bonneville

Power Administration, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Underwood Conservation District, and the Yakima Nation. As previously mentioned, private land owners, the public and watershed groups play an important role in managing the Wind River watershed.

This plan will recognize and comply with all management plans and Biological Opinions affecting the Columbia River Basin in general and the Wind River in particular. Operations at Carson NFH pose a number of potential issues in the watershed. The primary issues center around marking, water use, juvenile distribution and production numbers, surplus adult distribution, impacts to listed and other aquatic resources, actions being taken to help recover listed and depressed populations, and funding for operations, maintenance and evaluation.

Marking.—To help protect wild and naturally produced fish, the states of Washington, Oregon and Idaho are implementing selective sport and commercial fisheries (non-tribal) on marked hatchery fish. This selective fisheries management strategy requires that all hatchery produced fish targeted for harvest be mass marked. Mass marking of hatchery fish is being implemented for steelhead trout and coho salmon and most recently for spring Chinook salmon. Mass marking of fall Chinook salmon has not yet been implemented because of technical, logistic, and funding limitations, except for special cases.

Tribal managers generally disagree with the management strategy for mass marking and selective fisheries.

The Service has not made any unilateral decisions on marking but has undertaken actions to comply with ESA Biological Opinions. The Service will continue to coordinate actions with the states and tribes through U.S. v Oregon and NOAA Fisheries to comply with ESA actions and coordinate with the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission mark committee. In addition, the federal agencies are beginning discussion of a comprehensive marking strategy for the Columbia River Basin as identified by Action 174-1in the Federal Columbia River Power System Biological Opinion. The federal agencies (NOAA Fisheries lead) are meeting with the states and tribes to begin this effort.

This comprehensive marking plan should:
a) improve our ability to assess and monitor the status of naturally-producing (especially ESA listed) populations
b) monitor and evaluate hatchery programs, including hatchery reforms and stray rates
c) maintain critical harvest management and stock assessment information
d) monitor mark-selective fishery regimes established by the states
e) improve regional and watershed based marking decisions
f) be consistent with recovery plan goals
g) be coordinated through U.S. v Oregon, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission and U.S. - Canada forums

Juvenile Salmon Distribution and Production Numbers.—Juvenile salmon are to be released from the hatchery in the spring as yearling smolts to promote quick downstream migration from the hatchery, through the Wind and Columbia Rivers to the estuary and ocean. This release strategy is agreed to by the WDFW, Service and NOAA Fisheries.

The Yakama Nation would like to see juvenile fish from the hatchery scatter planted throughout the watershed.

Water Use (Drought).—In summer of 2001, a drought year, we anticipated having extremely low and insufficient water supply for raising 1.42 million juveniles to full-term smolts. An interim plan by Service, NOAA Fisheries, WDFW, and YN was to have an emergency release from 10 ponds, distributing 250,000 juveniles in the lower Wind River, if the hatchery water supply dropped to critically low levels during summer. Although this plan was agreed to by the fisheries managers, some conservation groups were highly concerned about this potential action and its impact to listed steelhead and resident cutthroat trout. Fortunately water supply was adequate and an emergency early release was not necessary.

Surplus Adult Salmon Distribution.—In most years more fish return to the hatchery than are needed for brood stock. Most of these surplus fish are still in very good condition and are distributed to the Yakama Nation for ceremonial and subsistence use. Fish beyond Yakama tribal needs can be distributed to other tribes, as requested. Fish beyond tribal needs are distributed to federal prison programs. Fish not suitable for food are typically buried. Plans are underway to determine the number, if any, suitable for stream enrichment, both dead and alive.

Fish Passage and Ladder Management.—In 2001, Service, NOAA Fisheries, WDFW and YN agreed to shut the ladder to the hatchery on August 1, allowing fish to spawn and die naturally for stream enrichment and allowing potential natural production of spring Chinook salmon in the Wind River. Approximately 300 salmon are estimated to have remained in the river to spawn near the hatchery because of this action. This was a compromise agreement for one year. Future plans will be negotiated and ecological risks (and benefits) to native steelhead (ESA listed) and trout will be evaluated.

Negative Impacts to Listed and Other Aquatic Resources and What Actions are Taken to Help Recover Listed and Depressed Populations.—All hatcheries must consider their potential for adversely affecting the aquatic community and Carson NFH is no exception. Of particular concern is the potential impact to the Lower Columbia River Ecologically Significant Unit (ESU) of threatened steelhead, which the Wind River steelhead population is a part of. To meet our ESA obligations, we are proceeding with actions to comply with the March 1999 Biological Opinion on hatcheries. These actions are identified in Chapter 4. The Service is developing a Hatchery and Genetic Management Plan (HGMP) to help assess our impacts from hatchery operations. More in-stream research is also needed to assess the impacts of both hatchery releases and naturally spawning spring Chinook on listed steelhead in the Wind River.

We will work towards going beyond the assessment stage and work towards taking actions which help recover listed and depressed populations, including identification of actions the hatchery can take (hatchery reform). Implementing measures identified by the HGMP, this CHMP, and in Biological Opinions will require additional resources. The following chapter identifies these projects and funding needs.

Insufficient Operations and Maintenance Funding Through the Mitchell Act.—Mitchell Act Funding has been flat for over ten years. Increased demands on hatchery programs, as required by ESA Biological Opinions, have strained hatchery budgets. Without increases in Mitchell Act reductions in production programs will need to be made. However, reducing hatchery production may allow the hatchery may allow the Service to meet some ESA requirements, but will not uphold mitigation and tribal trust responsibility.

The Service is currently working with NOAA Fisheries and other co-managers to address current budget shortfalls.

CHAPTER 4. IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of the Carson NFH program requires input to reimbursable and Service budget processes, as well as compliance with Service policies, legal mandates, and other environmental and human resource laws. This chapter intends to outline these processes and discuss the policy and planning documents which provide guidance to Carson NFH in regards to policy, budget, safety, grounds and facilities maintenance.

Budget Overview

Carson National Fish Hatchery receives 100% of it's operations budget from reimbursable Mitchell Act funds, which are administered by the NOAA Fisheries. Operation budget needs are identified each year and negotiated with NOAA Fisheries to determine the final fiscal year allocation (see following section on Mitchell Act). However, Deferred Maintenance and most construction funding is through the Service. Some funding for special studies can also be derived from reimbursable sources other than Mitchell Act. Current budget and number of full-time personnel for the Carson NFH are provided in Attachment 18. Additional Mitchell Act funding is provided to the CRFPO, LCRFHC, and Abernathy Fish Technology Center for support services to the hatchery. In past years approximately 5% of operational funds did come from the Service. However, those funds are now directed to stations where the Service has the primary funding responsibility.

Budgetary Needs and Strategies.—Funding for unmet needs such as construction, program changes, and quarters maintenance is identified through the Maintenance Management System (MMS), the Fisheries Operational Needs System (FONS), and Regional Quarters Overhead funds and allocated through a competitive process. Access to FONS and MMS files is through the Fisheries Information System (FIS) database. The FIS database consists of five modules which address out-year budgeting (FONS), resource oriented accomplishments that occurred over a fiscal year (Accomplishments Module), Congressionally mandated reporting requirements that describe yearly production at NFH (Fish and Egg Module), activities related to endangered species (Imperiled Species Module), and deferred maintenance needs (Maintenance Management System).

Fisheries Operational Needs System (FONS).—The FONS was established in 1999 as a planning, budgeting, and communication tool to enhance identification of funding and staffing needs for the fishery program. FONS projects are used in budget requests to the Department of Interior and the Office of Management and Budget. Attachment 19 outlines the Regional and National budget formulation, and provides a time step through the process. In FY 2002, an additional project will be submitted to evaluate ecological interactions between wild steelhead and hatchery spring Chinook salmon in the Wind River (Attachment 20). Additional projects will be submitted as needs arise. Several other Service field offices support Carson NFH. Those include Columbia River Fisheries Program Office (Vancouver, Washington), Lower Columbia

River Fish Health Center, and Abernathy Fish Technology Center. Projects included in the FY 2002 FONS database by these stations that support Carson NFH resource needs are listed in Attachment 21.

Maintenance Management System (MMS).—The Maintenance Management System (MMS) is an inventory of deferred maintenance projects, which are maintenance projects that can be put off or do not occur on an annual basis. The MMS is the primary vehicle used to address maintenance requirements above $5,000. The database is updated annually then forwarded to the WO for consolidation and submission into the budgetary process. Projects submitted for consideration are too numerous to list here and can be found in Attachment 22. Recent MMS funding has been directed toward correcting Health and Safety discrepancies. New projects which will be submitted in FY 2002 are: Replace windows in hatchery duplex quarters units to bring them into compliance with fire code requirements for window size and height from the floor; radon mitigation in the nursery; and addition of a formalin injection system in the nursery which will enable placement of the formalin barrel outside the building in an approved formalin storage unit.

Five-Year Construction Plan.—Fisheries Construction projects are entered into the RMIS, the same web-based database, developed for Refuges, as is used for the RPI. Scores and Regional priorities are assigned and the information is used in the WO to develop the Five-year Construction Plan. This plan, after it has been approved by the Department and OMB, is submitted as part of the Service Budget to Congress. The out-years of this plan are subject to revision each year.

Construction funds are similar to MMS funds but are reserved for new construction and maintenance to existing buildings above $500,000. A project to relocate the Wind River intake and bring it into compliance with NOAA Fisheries screen criteria has been approved for FY 2005.

Five-Year Maintenance Plan.—The Deferred Maintenance projects entered into the database are prioritized by the WO, at least partially, based on the priority established by the Field Office and Regional Office priorities. This plan is reviewed by the Department and the approved plan is part of the basis of our MMS budget request to Congress (see previous discussion on MMS).

Mitchell Act and Other Reimbursable Funding Processes.—As stated previously, 100% of Carson NFH operations is derived through Mitchell Act, which is administered by the NMFS. Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) provides funding to mark 75,000 fish with a coded-wire tag for stock assessment as outlined in Chapter 3. This funding is negotiated yearly with the Fish and Wildlife Service submitting budget proposals to NOAA Fisheries and BPA for there consideration. A final budget agreed to which reflects the needs of the production program which is derived through other forums.

The increased demands on hatchery programs, as required by ESA Biological Opinions, are inadequately funded through the Mitchell Act. Either Mitchell Act support needs to be increased or alternative funding sources need to be identified. If additional support is not secured in the near future, hatchery programs may need to reduce production or possibly close. Reducing production may meet ESA requirements but it does not uphold our federal mitigation or tribal trust responsibility.

ESA Compliance and Needs.—The 1999 NOAA Fisheries Biological Opinion on Artificial Propagation in the Columbia River Basin lists a host of measures which either must, in the case of Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives, be complied with or, in the case of Conservation Recommendations, should be implemented (NMFS 1999b). Several actions require additional resources. Two of the Conservation Recommendations (CRs) discussed below have work proposals developed but are not currently funded.

CR 4. Evaluate NATURES type rearing strategies. A proposal to evaluate NATURES type rearing strategies on a production level has been submitted by the NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center Resource Enhancement and Utilization Technologies Division and is being considered for funding by the Northwest Power Planning Council. Should this study receive funding, nearly all raceway rearing units at Carson NFH will be involved. Variables to be looked at are: substrate, in water structure (suspended Christmas trees), shade, and possibly predator avoidance training.

CR 6. Monitor and evaluate ecological interaction. Little data describing the ecological interaction of hatchery Chinook smolts with Endangered Species Act listed Wind River summer steelhead are available. To procure funding to fill this data gap will be pursued via the FONS system will be initiated with the FY 2002 FONS submissions. This will be a shared project with the Columbia River Fisheries Program Office.

Additional Conservation Recommendations are: minimize inter-basin stock transfers, emphasize juveniles that are ready to migrate to the ocean and spend a minimum amount of time in the freshwater environment, improve homing and reduce straying, assess carrying capacity and density-dependent effects (unfunded), monitor and evaluate predation (unfunded), conduct spawning ground surveys, assess use of hatchery carcasses for nutrient input (needs development), use most appropriate brood stock for reintroduction into historic or vacant habitats, develop cost-effective externally distinguishable marks to identify hatchery origin fish, modify hatchery programs to conservation / enhancement role (to be identified in HGMP), adopt strategies to separate returning hatchery fish from listed naturally spawning fish, continue adaptive management to improve smolt quality, and continue to coordinate hatchery programs to meet ESA concerns. In addition, a host of measures are associated with an Incidental Take Statement. Reasonable and Prudent Measures are: provide projected hatchery releases to NOAA Fisheries annually, manage programs to minimize potential inbreeding of hatchery and listed fish, monitor and evaluate artificial propagation programs (partially funded), reduce potential

negative impacts to listed salmon and steelhead from hatchery operations, and NOAA Fisheries shall conduct the proposed actions in such a way as to minimize adverse genetic and demographic effects on naturally-produced listed steelhead (to be identified in HGMP). Terms and Conditions include: provide to NOAA Fisheries projected hatchery releases and annual report of releases and returns, mark a representative sample of hatchery salmon and steelhead released to allow M&E (partially funded), develop protocols for fishery augmentation/mitigation programs to reduce potential for interbreeding and genetic introgression (to be identified in HGMP), insure water intakes are properly screened and comply with NOAA Fisheries intake structure criteria (unfunded), implement PNFHPC and IHOT guidelines, monitor effluent for compliance with NPDES permits, and the NOAA Fisheries shall minimize the number of hatchery adults remaining to potentially spawn with wild fish through removal of hatchery fish at sufficiently high harvest and/or trapping.

Service and Station Guidance

Each Service hatchery operates under a variety of guidance and policies. This section is provided to describe some of the more important policy and guidance documents that are available at the hatchery.

Quarters Policy.—The Service administers a variety of field offices and National Fish Hatcheries. At many of these hatcheries, including Carson NFH, government owned residences are available to employees on a required occupancy basis. The determination of whether an employee must occupy government furnished quarters as a condition of employment is made on a station-by-station, position-by-position basis. In making a determination, supervisors will consider: the dependability of the water supply, adequacy of the alarm and call back systems, response time needed to take emergency corrective actions, and the adequacy of the security provided to protect fish, facilities, and equipment. Attachment 23 is a copy of the current quarters policy.

Required On-Station Housing.—The current Quarters Plan for Carson NFH is dated November 20, 2001 (Attachment 24). The intent of having personnel living in government quarters at Carson NFH is to provide station security and operations during non-duty hours. Mechanical systems to regulate water flows must be maintained immediately to prevent loss of valuable fish stocks. Additional security protection of government owned property is provided by occupants especially when anadromous brood stock are present. The isolated setting of Carson NFH combined with potential inaccessibility during severe snowstorms precludes adequate protection by other than required housing.

Overtime/Compensatory Time/Standby.—Regulations governing overtime, compensatory time, and standby are described in the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Administrative Manual. Premium pay is discussed in Part 225 FW of the Manual with specific discussions on overtime regulations in Chapter 7.8, callback overtime in Chapter 7.13, Compensatory time in Chapter 7.18, and standby in Chapter 7.22.

Distribution of Surplus Fish/Eggs.—Guidance was provide in a July 2001 memorandum from the Regional Director (Attachment 25). The guidance states: "Live fish entering a National Fish Hatchery (Hatchery), whole fish carcasses or their parts, are Government property and cannot be converted for personal use, even temporarily on loan. Misuse of Government property may result in disciplinary action ranging from a written reprimand to removal from the Service. The attached Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch, contained in 5 CFR 2635.704, specifically address use of Government property. Please review and be acquainted with these standards. Also, please ensure that all your employees read and understand this memorandum.

It is important that you first consider all possible uses of hatchery fish that are consistent with the Service Mission. Surplus fish must be disposed of using prescribed government contracting procedures. Furthermore, you must comply with other Service and FDA policies related to the disposition of carcasses and parts that have been treated with chemicals making them unfit for human consumption."

Drugs and Anesthetics.—Guidance on the use of anesthetics, drugs and other chemicals was provided in a November 9, 2000 memorandum from the Assistant Regional Director for Fisheries in Region 1 (Attachment 26). Hatcheries and other Fisheries offices within Region 1 may at times have legitimate and necessary reasons to use certain drugs and chemicals to achieve their goals and complete the mission and objectives of the Service. During the capture, rearing, or monitoring of fish species, several drugs and chemicals are used for anesthesia, disease treatments, or to increase the survival of the animals. Some of these compounds are already registered and labeled for fisheries use. Others may be legally used under the prescription and supervision of a veterinarian, or within the protocols of an existing Investigational New Animal Drug (INAD) exemption permit issued by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The Service has existing correspondence from the FDA concerning the use of compounds in the recovery of threatened and endangered species, but there are strict considerations and limits even in those situations. Region 1, working closely with the National INAD Office and through appropriate consultation with FDA, will fully comply with all regulations and agreements for the use of aquatic drugs and chemicals. The inappropriate use of compounds on fish or aquatic animals intended for human or animal consumption is prohibited. If you have questions regarding the use of chemicals or drugs, please contact your servicing Fish Health Center, or your supervisor.

Employee Training.—Regulations governing employee training are described in the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Administrative Manual. Career development is discussed starting in Part 230 FW of the Manual.

Service Required Planning Documents

Daily operations of Carson NFH are guided by a number of plans and reports designed to promote health and safety, station development, emergency situations, employee training, and other actions. Some of the more significant ones are described in the following section:

Safety and Health Plan.—Regulations safety are described in the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Administrative Manual. Safety program discussions start in Part 240 FW of the Manual.

Fire Management Plan.—Department and Service policy require that "every area with burnable vegetation must have an approved Fire Management Plan" and field stations cannot conduct prescribed fire operations, including trash burning, without an approved Fire Management Plan that includes such activities. All Service facilities developed plans and had them approved in FY2001, but they must be amended before any controlled burning can be conducted.

Integrated Pesticide Management Plan.—It is Service policy to eliminate unnecessary use of pesticides by implementing integrated pest management techniques and by selecting crops and other vegetation that are beneficial to fish and wildlife but do not require pesticides. The ultimate goal is to eliminate pesticide use on Service lands and facilities and to encourage pest management programs that benefit trust resources and provide long-term, environmentally sound solutions to pest management problems on sites which are off Service lands (Attachment 27).

When pesticides are used, they must be part of a pest management program that includes strategies to reduce and eventually eliminate their use. The program must be set forth in an Integrated Pest Management Plan which must include consideration of target specificity of the pesticide (insecticide, fungicide, herbicide, etc.), risk to nontarget organisms, incidental reduction of food resources for trust species, persistence, control and prevention of the spread of fish and wildlife diseases, and other environmental hazards.

Station Development Plan.—The Station Development Plan considers future growth and construction needs of the facility that are necessary to meet goals and objectives. The plan is an opportunity to work with the Service's Engineering Department to thoughtfully lay out a course of action to maintain the facility in proper operating condition. It is also a necessary precursor to get construction projects on the five-year construction list (see previous discussion).

Station Development Plans were completed for many stations in the early to mid-80s. Most are in need of revision and 1 to 3 stations will be updated each year as funds and personnel availability allow. The Carson NFH Station Development Plan was written in 1981. A new plan needs to be written to include new and much needed station improvements. For example, (1) The earthen ponds need to be lined with "Gunnite" or some similar product to prevent weed growth during the summer when the ponds are fallow. The use of herbicides to prevent weed growth is becoming increasingly more difficult if not impossible due to environmental restrictions, leaving only hand pulling to remove the weeds. Structure would be added to more closely mimic the natural environment; and (2) The recently constructed cover over the middle bank of raceways should be extended to cover the upper bank.

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.—Monitoring and evaluation of production programs are outlined in Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans (HGMPs) which can be found at the hatchery, the Columbia River Fishery Program Office, or through the Fishery Program Office in Portland. A more detailed discussion of this plan can be found in Chapter 3.

Distribution of Surplus Fish.—In this exercise the hatchery works cooperatively with the Service's Columbia River Fishery Program Office, Lower Columbia River Fish Health Center, and co-managers to plan beneficial uses of fish surplus to hatchery needs in years of large adult returns. The plan should consider all possible uses of adult carcasses and live fish in excess of hatchery needs, and should be coordinated with co-managers when necessary to achieve mutually satisfying solutions. A plan should be developed in years where surpluses are anticipated, and should be developed well in advance of spawning operations. These plans can be obtained from the hatchery, the Columbia River Fisheries Program Office (Vancouver, Washington), or through the Fishery Program Office in Portland

Small Water Systems Management Plan (Drinking Water).—The Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) is becoming an issue in Spring, 2002. The Act delegates safe drinking water control to the states and we must meet state requirements to provide drinking water to the public as well as our employees and their families. The EPA recently indicated that they believe that a significant number of the Service's systems do not fully comply with the SDWA. They have requested that we audit our compliance with state regulation. This process has already been started using the services of a contractor. Facilities in the State of Washington have been surveyed and the other states will be done in the next one to two years. Deficiencies discovered in water systems will be corrected as they are detected.

Continuity of Operation Plan.—The continuity of Operations Plan provides guidance for Carson NFH staff to ensure that essential operations and activities continue during and after an emergency situation. The plan is developed in accordance with DOI, MRPS Bulletin 98-01, Continuity of Operations Planning - Guidance and Schedules, dated March 27, 1998, and 380 DM 6, Vital Records Program. This plan is current and located at the hatchery in the administrative files.

Spill Prevention, Control and Counter Measure Plan.—A Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan (SPCC) is prepared in accordance with the provisions of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 112. An SPCC plan establishes procedures, methods, and equipment used at the Carson hatchery to comply with U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) oil spill prevention control and countermeasures standards, and inspection reporting, training and record keeping requirements. An SPCC is required at Carson NFH because it stores petroleum fuel in above ground storage tanks greater than 660 gallons. The CCC for Carson is current (April 1999) and can be located in the hatchery administrative files, or the Fisheries Program Regional Office in Portland.

Outreach Plan.—An outreach plan (see Chapter 3) describes the hatchery's strategy for telling the Service, Carson National Fish Hatchery, and the Columbia River Basin resource story to the public. Further, this plan describes outreach tools and facilities needed to implement this strategy. The plan should be cited when describing unmet outreach needs in the FONS database (see Fish and Wildlife Service Budgeting Process).

Watershed/Sub-basin Plan.—These documents are part of the Northwest Power Planning Council process to address fisheries and aquatic issues related to subbasin and recovery planning in the Columbia River basin and in facilitating implementation of recovery actions.

National attention has been focused on the Columbia River basin with listings of salmon and steelhead, bull trout and other aquatic species. Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultations and recovery planning for listed species are having a major impact on management of fishery resources, the economy and cultural values in the basin. Consultations include the operation of the Federal Columbia River Power System, hatchery operations, harvest actions, habitat planning and project specific activities. Planning processes include the development of an All H Paper which is a conceptual recovery plan for salmon, steelhead and other aquatic species in the Columbia River basin, and various state and local government recovery planning efforts in Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana. The Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act resulted in the establishment of the Northwest Power Planning Council and ultimately the development of its Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, a comprehensive program to enhance and restore the salmon and steelhead runs and other fish and wildlife resources of the Columbia River basin. The Northwest Power Planning Council is leading a major subbasin assessment and planning effort which will provide key building blocks for aquatic species restoration in the basin. At the same time the Service has initiated recovery planning for bull trout and NOAA Fisheries for salmon and steelhead. Each of these recovery plans will rely on subbasin planning as major building blocks for recovery of listed species. In addition, Implementation Plans have been developed by the Corps of Engineers, Bonneville power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation that require implementation of significant habitat actions for listed salmon.

There are over 30 different agencies, Indian tribes, councils or commissions with fisheries responsibilities or interests operating in the Columbia River basin. The effective management and restoration of Columbia River basin salmon and steelhead and other aquatic resources depends to a large extent on the ability of these agencies to communicate effectively, resolve differences, develop unified subbasin plans, and work together in a spirit of cooperation in various interagency forums to solve regional and river basin problems.

National Pollution Discharge Elimination System.—Carson NFH is currently in compliance with required National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements for discharge from the hatchery. However, an Environmental Compliance Audit conducted June 25, 2001 found that two storm drains installed as part of a repaving project in 1999 did not meet current NPDES standards. Funds are being sought through the MMS system to correct this deficiency by connecting both drains to the existing pollution abatement pond.

Hazardous Waste.—Carson NFH is currently, to the best of our knowledge, in compliance with all hazardous waste treatment and control regulations. Efforts have been made to reduce dependence on products resulting in hazardous waste to the greatest extent possible.

Investigative New Animal Drugs (INAD)—No drugs requiring an Investigative New Animal Drug use permit have been used in recent years. Prophylactic treatments with erythromycin to combat bacterial kidney disease have been discontinued pending demonstrated need such as a BKD epizootic. Should erythromycin treatment become necessary, all INAD procedures will be followed.

Monitoring and Reporting

Fisheries Information System (FIS).—The FIS is a multifaceted database system consisting of five modules which address unmet management needs (out-year budgeting), accomplishments, deferred maintenance, and other national reporting requirements. This system was previously referenced in "Budgetary Needs and Strategies section. The following paragraphs provide a more detailed description of the modules and their reporting requirements.

Fisheries Operational Needs System (FONS).—FONS was described earlier in this Chapter under "Fish and Wildlife Service Budgeting Process". This database is available through the hatchery or the Fisheries Program Regional Office in Portland.

Accomplishment Module.—The Fisheries Accomplishment Module was established as a planning, budgeting, and communication tool to enhance identification of Fisheries Program accomplishments. These data are used in budget documents presented to the Department, OMB, and Congress. The data structure is a "flip-side" of the FONS Module data structure (see previous Fish and Wildlife Service Budgeting Process). This module is used to describe all accomplishments, regardless of funding source. This database is available through the hatchery or the Fisheries Program Regional Office in Portland.

Fish and Egg Distribution.—This information is used in the Fish and Egg Distribution Report. The report describes the mission of the National Fish Hatchery System, a component of the Fisheries Program of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and it's varied accomplishments. The report contains detailed information regarding species, numbers, and pounds of fish produced. It also describes the general purpose of the production program and if it involves listed species. Copies of the report can be obtained by writing the Division of Fish Hatcheries, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 4401 N. Fairfax Drive, Room 810, Arlington, Virginia 22203.

Imperiled Species Module.—The Imperiled Species Module was designed to capture and report on imperiled species work performed by any Fisheries office. For the purpose of this database an imperiled species is any species or population that is 1) Federally listed under the ESA as threatened or endangered, 2) petition, proposed, or a candidate for Federal listing, or 3) a State-listed or species of special concern. Reporting occurs annually, generally in November.

Maintenance Management System (MMS).—MMS was described earlier in this Chapter under "Fish and Wildlife Service Budgeting Process". This database is available through the hatchery or the Fisheries Program Regional Office in Portland.

Station Guides.—The Station Guide provides an overview of the hatchery program and layout. It describes the station location, layout plan, easements or permits in place, water supply, quarters, office and other buildings. The Guide also provides a brief history of the hatchery. This summary document is useful for providing a quick snap-shot to Service employees and parties interested the hatchery program and facility layout. The Guide is kept current and generally updated annually. Copies can be obtained from the hatchery or the Fisheries Program Regional Office in Portland.

Real Property Inventory.—The Real Property Inventory (RPI) provides an annual update on Service real property (anything fixed to the ground or a building). The RPI was maintained by the Realty Branch until automated in the Spring of 1999. The update function was "pen-and ink changes to a paper file". This was changed to an automated system using FileMaker Pro software in FY1999. It was converted to a web-based data base in FY2001. This method of updating the database is expected to continue until FY2003 or FY2004 when it will probably be converted to Maximo/SAMMS, also a web-based database.

Columbia River information System (CRiS) Reports.—This database is used at Columbia River Basin hatcheries to record information related to hatchery operations, marking and tagging, juvenile releases, adult returns, etc. The CRiS also is useful in providing summary reports of this data. The utility and purpose of this database is described in greater detail in Chapter 3 under Monitoring, Evaluation and Coordination.

Energy Use Report.—This is an annual report that summarizes electricity, heating and cooling energy, and gasoline used at the hatchery.

REFERENCES

Banks, J.L. 1994. Raceway density and water flow as factors affecting spring chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) during rearing and after release. Aquaculture 119:201-217.

Bayer, R.D. 1986. Seabirds near an Oregon estuarine salmon hatchery in 1982 and during the 1983 El Nino. Fish. Bull. 84: 279-286.

Beamesderfer, R.C.P., D.L. Ward, and A.A. Nigro. 1996. Evaluation of the biological basis for a predator control program on northern squawfish (*Ptychocheilus oregonensis*) in the Columbia and Snake rivers. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 53: 2898-2908.

Beamish, R.J. (ed.). 1995. Climate Change and Northern Fish Populations. National Research Council of Canada. Ottawa, Canada.

Beamish, R.J., B.L. Thomson, and G.A. Mcfarlane. 1992. Spiny Dogfish Predation on Chinook and Coho Salmon and the Potential Effects on Hatchery-Produced Salmon. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 121: 444-455.

Becker, C.D. 1973. Food and growth parameters of juvenile chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*, in central Columbia River. Fish. Bull. 71: 387-400.

Campton, D.E. 2000 (Draft). Genetic comparisons among hatchery and wild populations of spring chinook salmon in the Methow River Basin: ESA controversies in the Columbia River Basin. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Abernathy Fish Technology Center, Longview, Washington.

Cederholm, C.J. et al. 1999. Pacific salmon carcasses: Essential contributions of nutrients and energy for aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. Fisheries 24 (10): 6-15.

Chapman, D., and K. Witty. 1993. Habitat of weak salmon stocks in the Snake River basin and feasible recovery measures. Report to the Bonneville Power Administration, DOE/BP-99654-1, Portland, Oregon.

Collis, K., Roby, D.D., Craig, D.P., Ryan, B.A., and R.D. Ledgerwood. 2001. Colonial waterbird predation on juvenile salmonids tagged with passive integrated transponders in the Columbia River estuary: Vulnerability of different salmonid species, stocks, and rearing types. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 130:385-396.

Congleton, J.L., and 10 coauthors. 1995. Evaluation procedures for collection, bypass, and downstream passage of outmigrating salmonids. Draft annual report for 1995, MPE-96-10.

Dawley, E.M., R.D. Ledgerwood, T.H. Blahm, C.W. Sims, J.T. Durkin, R.A. Kirn, A.E. Rankis, G.E. Monan, and F.J. Ossiander. 1986. Migrational characteristics, biological observations, and relative survival of juvenile salmonids entering the Columbia River estuary, 1966-1983. 1985 Final Report. Bonneville Power Administration and National Marine Fisheries Service, Portland, Oregon.

Elliott, D.G., and R. Pascho. 1994. Juvenile fish transportation: impact of bacterial kidney disease on survival of spring/summer chinook salmon stocks. 1992. Annual report of the National Biological Survey to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Walla Walla, Washington.

Elliot D.G., R.J. Pascho, L.M. Jackson, G.M. Mathews, and J.R. Harmon. 1997. *Renibacterium salmoninarum* in spring-summer chinook salmon smolts at dams on the Columbia and Snake River. Aquat. Animal Health 9: 114-126.

Emlen, J.M., R.R. Reisenbichler, A.M. McGie, and T.E. Nickelson. 1990. Density-dependence at sea for coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*). Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 47: 1765-1772.

Enhancement Planning Team. 1986. Salmon and steelhead enhancement plan for the Washington and Columbia River conservation area. Vol. 1. Preliminary review draft.

Goede, R. 1986. Management considerations in stocking of diseased or carrier fish. Pages 349-356 *in* R.H. Stroud, editor. Fish Culture in fisheries management. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland.

Groot, C. and L. Margolis. 1991. Pacific salmon life histories. UBC Press, University of British Columbia, Vancouver B.C.

IHOT (Integrated Hatchery Operations Team). 1995. Policy and procedures for Columbia Basin anadromous salmonid hatcheries. Annual report 1994 to the Bonneville Power Administration, Portland Oregon. Project # 92-043.

IHOT (Integrated Hatchery Operations Team). 1996. Operation plans for anadromous fish production facilities in the Columbia River Basin, Volume III-Washington. Annual report 1995 to the Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, Oregon. Project 92-043.

Isaak, D.J., and T.C. Bjornn. 1996. Movement of northern squawfish in the tailrace of a lower Snake River dam relative to the migration of juvenile anadromous salmonids. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 125: 780-793.

Mantua, N.J., S.R. Hare, Y. Zhang, J.M. Wallace, and R.C. Francis. 1997. A Pacific interdecadal climate oscillation with impacts on salmon production. Bull. Am. Meterol. Soc. 78: 1069- 1079.

McNeil, W.J. and D.C. Himsworth. 1980. Salmonid ecosystems of the North Pacific. Oregon State University Press and Oregon State University Sea Grant College Program, Corvallis, Oregon.

Muir, W.D., and R.L. Emmett. 1988. Food habits of migrating salmonid smolts passing Bonneville Dam in the Columbia River, 1984. Regulated River 2: 1-10.
Muir, W.D., A.E. Giorgi, and T.C. Coley. 1994. Behavioral and Physiological Changes in Yearling Chinook Salmon During Hatchery Residence and Downstream Migration. Aquaculture 127: 69-82.

Myers, J.M., R.G. Kope, G.J. Bryant, D. Teel, L.J. Lierheimer, T.C. Wainwright, W.S. Grant, F.W. Waknitz, K. Neely, S.T. Lindley, and R.S. Waples. 1998. Status review of chinook salmon from Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. U.S. Dept. Commer., NOAA Technical Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-35, 443p.

NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 1999a. Biological Assessment for Mitchell Act Hatchery Operations. Hatcheries and Inland Fisheries Branch, Portland, Oregon.

NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 1999b. Biological Opinion on Artificial Propagation in the Columbia River Basin, Endangered Species Act - Section 7 Consultation.

NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 1999c. Biological Opinion on Harvest in the Columbia River Basin, Endangered Species Act - Section 7 Consultation.

NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 1997. Investigation of Scientific Information on the Impacts of California Sea Lions and Pacific Harbor Seals on Salmonids and on the Coastal Ecosystems of Washington, Oregon, and California. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-28, 172 p.

Olla, B.L., M.W. Davis and C.H. Ryer. 1993. Behavioral deficits of hatchery-reared Pacific salmon: potential effects on survival following release, p. 19. *In* D.S. Danielssen and E. Moksness [ed.] Proc. Int. Symp. on Sea Ranching of Cod and Other Marine Animals, held in Bergen, Norway, June 15-18, 1993. Institute of Marine Research, Bergen, Norway.

Park, D.L. 1993. Effects of marine mammals on Columbia River salmon listed under the Endangered Species Act, DOE/BP-99654-3. Bonneville Power Administration. Portland, Oregon.

Pastor, S.M. 1999. Annual coded wire program. Annual report 1998 to the Bonneville Power Administration, project 89-065, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Vancouver, Washington.

Pettit, R. 1999a. Escapement database for spring chinook in Washington tributaries between Bonneville and McNary Dams, 1970-1998. Columbia River Progress Report 99-2. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Vancouver, Washington

Pettit, R. 1999b. Escapement estimates for adult spring chinook in Washington tributaries between Bonneville and McNary Dams, 1998. Columbia River Progress Report 99-3. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Vancouver, Washington

Piggins, D.J., and C.P.R. Mills. 1985. Comparative aspects of the biology of naturally-produced and hatchery-reared Atlantic salmon smolts *Salmo salar*. Aquaculture 45: 321-334.
Ruggerone, G.T. 1986. Consumption of migrating juvenile salmonids by gull foraging below a Columbia River dam. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 115: 736-742.

Sager, P.M., and G.J. Glova. 1988. Diet feeding periodicity, daily ration and prey selection of a riverine population of juvenile chinook salmon, *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*. J. Fish Biol. 33: 643-653.

Salonius, K., and G.K. Iwama. 1993. Effects of Early Rearing Environment on Stress Response, Immune Function, and Disease Resistance in Juvenile Coho (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) and Chinook Salmon (*O. tshawytscha*). Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 50: 759-766.

Schreck, C.B., A.G. Maule and S.L. Kaattari. 1993. Stress and disease resistance, p. 170-175. *In* J.F. Muir and R.J. Roberts [ed.] Recent Advances in Aquaculture, Vol. 4. Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford, UK.

Simenstad, C., K. Fresh, and E. Salo. 1982. The role of Puget Sound and Washington coastal estuaries in the life history of Pacific Salmon: an unappreciated function. Pages 343-364 *in* V. Kennedy, editor. Estuarine comparisons. Academic Press, New York.

Slatick, E., L.G. Gilbreath, J.R. Harmon, T.C. Bjornn, R.R. Ringe, K.A. Walch, A.J. Novotny, and W.S. Zaugg. 1988. Imprinting hatchery reared salmon and steelhead trout for homing, 1978 - 1983. Final report of research by NOAA Fisheries, Seattle, Washington. Bonneville Power Administration Project No. 78-1, Portland, Oregon.

Smith. S.D. 1995. Wind River summer run steelhead: An evaluation to determine the feasibility of rearing steelhead to enhance natural production. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Biological Service, Columbia River Research Laboratory, Cook, Washington.

Steward, R., and T. Bjornn. 1990. Supplementation of salmon and steelhead stocks with hatchery fish: a synthesis of published literature. Tech. Report 90-1. Part 2 *in* W.H. Miller,

editor. Analysis of Salmon and Steelhead Supplementation. Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, Oregon. U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Dworshak Fisheries Assistance Office, Idaho.

Trotter, P.C. 1997. Sea-run cutthroat trout: life history profile. Pages 7-15 *in* J.D. Hall, P.A. Bisson, and R.E. Gresswell, editors. Sea-run cutthroat trout: biology, management, and future conservation. Oregon Chapter, American Fisheries Society, Corvallis, Oregon.

USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 1993. Hatchery Evaluation Vision Action Plan. Draft planning report, May 14, 1993 by Region 1 Fisheries, Portland, Oregon.

USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 1994. Biological Assessments for operation of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service operated or funded hatcheries in the Columbia River Basin in 1995-1998. Submitted to National Marine Fisheries Service under cover letter, dated August 2, 1994, from Bill Shake Acting USFWS Regional Director to Brian Brown, NMFS.

USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 1999. Hatchery and Genetic Management Plan, spring chinook salmon, Carson National Fish Hatchery, December 14, 1999 Draft. Columbia River Fisheries Program Office, Vancouver, Washington.

Washington Conservation Commission. 1999. Salmon and steelhead habitat limiting factors in Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 29.

WDFW (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife) 2000. Wind River Subbasin Summary (Draft). Prepared for the Northwest Power Planning Council, Portland, Oregon.

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1.—Map of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Pacific Region including Location of Carson National Fish Hatchery and associated field offices.

Attachment 2.—Historical Background of National Fish Hatcheries in the Pacific Region.

Attachment 3.—Statutory Mandates and Authorities.

Attachment 4.—Map of Wind River Watershed in Southwest Washington and Location Map of Carson National Fish Hatchery.

Attachment 5.— Hatchery Buildings, Primary Use, and Improvements.

Attachment 6.— Carson NFH Physical Description of Holding, Incubation, and Rearing Units.

Attachment 7.—Layout Diagram of Carson National Fish Hatchery.

Attachment 8.—Aerial Photographs of Carson National Fish Hatchery.

Attachment 9.—Listed and Candidate Species under the Endangered Species Act.

Attachment 10.—Spawning Ground Survey Data for Spring Chinook Salmon in the Wind River, 1970 - 2001.

Attachment 11.—Special Use Permit from the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Circa 1937.

Attachment 12.—Historical Releases from Carson National Fish Hatchery, 1938-1980.

Attachment 13.—Releases of Juvenile Spring Chinook Salmon from Carson National Fish Hatchery into the Wind River since 1990.

Attachment 14.—Carson National Fish Hatchery Spring Chinook Return Data, 1980-2001.

Attachment 15.—Age at Return of Carson National Fish Hatchery Spring Chinook Salmon.

Attachment 16.—Smolt to Adult Survival of Carson National Fish Hatchery Spring Chinook Salmon, 1980-1996 Broods.

Attachment 17.—Fisheries Contribution of Spring Chinook Salmon from Carson National Fish Hatchery.

Attachment 18.—Budget by Funding Source and Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Personnel for Fiscal Years (FY) 2000 through 2002.

Attachment 19.—Regional and National Calender for the Budget Formulation Process.

Attachment 20.—Projects Submitted as of Fiscal Year 2001 which are Linked to Carson NFH Goals and Objectives.

Attachment 21.—Projects Submitted to FONS in 2001 by the Service's Columbia River Fisheries Program Office (Vancouver, Washington), Lower Columbia River Fish Health Center and Abernathy Fish Technology Center to Support Carson NFH which are Linked to Carson NFH Goals and Objectives.

Attachment 22.—MMS.

Attachment 23.—Quarters Policy.

Attachment 24.—Quarters Plan.

Attachment 25.—Surplus Fish as Government Property.

Attachment 26.—Drugs and Anesthetics.

Attachment 27.—Fisheries Pest Management Policy.

Attachment 1.—Map of Pacific Region including location of Carson National Fish Hatchery.

Pacific Region and Location of Carson NFH



The Pacific Region of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and location of Carson National Fish Hatchery, Abernathy Fish Technology Center, Lower Columbia River Fish Health Center, Columbia River Gorge Information and Education Office, and Columbia River Fisheries Program Office.

Attachment 2.—Historical Background of National Fish Hatcheries in Region 1.

Station	Year Established	Final Year	Disposition
McCloud River, CA	1872	1882	Closed
Crooks Creek,CA	1879	1887	Moved to McCloud River, CA
Baird (formerly McCloud River), CA	1888	1937	Transferred to Bureau Of Reclamation
Clackamas, OR	1888	1943	Transferred to State of Oregon
Fort Gaston, CA	1889	1898	Replaced by Willamette Falls, OR
Korbel, CA	1893	1896	Closed
Redwood Lake, CA	1893	1898	Closed
Sandy River, OR	1895	1925	Closed
Battle Creek, CA	1896	1946	Closed
Olema (Bear Valley), CA	1897	1898	Closed
Salmon River, OR	1897	1900	Transferred to State of Oregon
Upper Clackamas, OR	1897	1931	Transferred to State of Oregon
Roque River, OR	1897	1932	Closed
Mill Creek, CA	1898	1948	Transferred to FWS Division of Research
Little White Salmon, WA	1898	----------	Operating
Willamette Falls, OR	1899	1942	Closed
Baker Lake, WA	1899	1942	Transferred to US Forest Service
Spring Creek, WA	1901	----------	Operating
Grants Pass, OR	1904	1906	Moved to Applegate Creek, OR
Phinney Creek, WA	1907	1918	Closed
Applegate, OR	1907	1959	Transferred to FWS Division of Research
Cazadero, OR	1908	1913	Closed
Illabot Creek, WA	1909	1927	Closed
Duckabush, WA	1911	1943	Transferred to US Forest Service
Quilcene, WA	1911	----------	Operating
Darrington, WA	1912	1919	Closed

Brinnon, WA	1913	1923	Closed - egg collection
Sultan, WA	1913	1933	Closed
Birdsview, WA	1913	1947	Transferred to State of Washington
Day Creek, WA	1914	1919	Closed
Quinault (Old), WA	1914	1947	Transferred to US Forest Service
St. Helens, OR	1917	1919	Closed
Paris, ID	1918	1921	Closed
Washougal River, WA	1919	1923	Closed
Salmon, ID	1921	1946	Transferred to Bureau of Land Management
Phalon, WA	1922	*	Authorized, but never operated
Snake River, OR	1924	1925	Moved to Salmon, ID
Ozette, WA	1926	1927	Closed
Wind River, WA	1926	1936	Transferred to State of Washington
Mt. Rainer, WA	1931	1942	Transferred to National Park Service
Hagerman, ID	1931	---------	Operating
Butte Falls, OR	1932	1943	Transferred ½ to State of Oregon; ½ to Bureau of Reclamation
Deschutes, OR	1932	*	Authorized, but never operated
Spokane, WA	1935	1942	Transferred to State of Washington
Yakima Fish Screen, WA	1935	1986	Closed
Delph Creek (Estacada), OR	1936	1954	Transferred to State of Oregon
Carson, WA	1937	----------	Operating
Leavenworth, WA	1938	----------	Operating
Clark Fork, ID	1939	1942	Transferred to State of Idaho
Sun Valley, ID	1940	1941	Closed
Warm River, ID	1940	1951	Transferred to State of Idaho
Entiat, WA	1940	----------	Operating
Winthrop, WA	1940	----------	Operating

Coleman, CA	1942	----------	Operating
Willard, WA	1951	----------	Operating
Eagle Creek, OR	1953	----------	Operating
Abernathy, WA	1957	----------	Operating
Lahontan, NV	1964	----------	Operating
Tehama-Colusa Spawning Channels, CA	1967	1989	Caretaker status
Quinault, WA	1969	----------	Operating
Dworshak, ID	1969	----------	Operating
Kooskia, ID	1970	----------	Operating
Marble Bluff Fishway, NV	1974	----------	Operating
Warm Springs, OR	1974	----------	Operating
Makah, WA	1981	----------	Operating
Nisqually, WA	1991	----------	Operating
Livingston Stone, CA	1992	----------	Operating

Attachment 3.—Statutory Mandates and Authorities.

General Authorizations

- Anadromous Fish Conservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 757a-757f).
- Department of Transportation Act (16 U.S.C. 1653f).
- Estuary Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1221-1226).
- Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act of August 9, 1950, as amended (16 U.S.C. 777k).
- Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments, as amended (33 U.S.C. 1251-1365, 1281-1292, 1311-1328, 1341-1345, 1361-1376).
- Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended (16 U.S.C. 742a-742j).
- Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act of 1980 (16 U.S.C. 2901-2911).
- Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1976 (25 U.S.C. 450-450n).
- Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1801-1882).
- National Aquaculture Act of 1980, as amended (16 U.S.C. 2801-2810).
- Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1970 (5 U.S.C. Appendix).
- Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, as amended (33 U.S.C. 401 et seq.).
- Recreation Use of Conservation Areas Act (16 U.S.C. 460k-460k-4).
- Sikes Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 670a-670o).
- Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001-1009).
- Code of Federal Regulation, Wildlife and Fisheries, Title 50, Parts 1 to 199.
- Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531-1544, 87 stat. 884) as amended.
- Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 791-828c; Chapter 285, June 10, 1920; 41 Stat. 1063) as amended.
- Federal Water Project Recreation Act (16 U.S.C. 460 (L) (12) - 460 (L) (21); P.L. 89-72.
- Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661-667e; 48 Stat. 401) as amended.
- Fish and Wildlife Improvement Act (16 U.S.C. 7421; 92 Stat. 3110)
- Lacy Act Amendments of 1981 (P.L. 97-79; 95 Stat. 1073, 16 U.S.C. 3371-3378)
- Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 [Title I of P.L. 101-646 (104 Stat. 4761].
- Oil Pollution Act of 1990 [Public Law 101-380 33 U.S.C. 2701 et seq; 104 Stat. 484].
- Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (Superfund) (26 U.S.C. 4611-4682; P.L. 96-510, December 11, 1980; 94 Stat. 2797).
- National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91-190, 42 U.S.C. 4321-4347, January1, 1970, 83 Stat. 852) as amended by P.L. 94-52.
- National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd-668ee) as amended.
- Emergency Relief Appropriations Act (49 Stat. 115).
- Reclamation Laws (54 Stat. 1198, 1199).
- Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1193).
- White Act (46 Stat. 371).
- Flood Control Act of 1944, as amended 1950 (58 Stat. 887).

Area-Specific Authorizations

- U. S. v. Oregon, "Belloni Decision" [302 F. Supp. 899 (1969); affirmed, 529 F. 2d 570 (1976)].
- U. S. v. Washington, "Boldt Decision" [384 F. Supp. 312 (1974); affirmed, 520 F. 2d 676 (1975); cert. denied, 423 U.S. 1086 (1976)].
- Water Resources Development Act of 1976 [Lower Snake River Compensation Plan (90 Stat. 2921)].
- Pacific Salmon Treaty Act of 1985, "U.S./Canada Pacific Salmon Treaty" (P.L. 99-5, 16 U.S.C. 3631, 03/15/1985).
- Salmon and Steelhead Conservation and Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 3301-3325).
- Yakima Fishery Enhancement Project (P.L. 98-360, P.L. 98-381, P.L. 98-386).
- Grand Coulee Dam Project (49 Stat. 1028).
- Grand Coulee Fish Management Project [Columbia Basin (Grand Coulee Dam) Act] - April 3, 1937.
- Chief Joseph Dam Project - [Oroville-Tonasket Unit, Washington (76 stat. 761) Section 3 of the Act of October 9, 1962] [Whitestone Coulee Unit, Washington (43 U.S.C. 616uu, 616vv-1-6163; 78 Stat. 704], as amended.
- Columbia Basin Project Act (16 U.S.C. 835 et seq., 57 Stat. 140) as amended.
- Chehalis River Fishery Resources Study and Restoration Act [Public Law 101-454 (104 Stat. 1054].
- Mitchell Act (16 U.S.C. 755-757; 52 Stat. 345).
- Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation (16 U.S.C. 839, P.L. 96-501, 94 Stat. 2697) as amended.
- First Deficiency Appropriation Act, "Central Valley Project" (49 Stat. 1622).
- Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992, "Central Valley Project Improvement Act (106 Stat. 4714-4731).
- Pyramid Lake/Truckee-Carson Water Rights Settlement (P.L. 101-618, 104 Stat. 3289).
- Washoe Project Act (70 Stat. 775-777).

Attachment 4.—Map of Wind River Watershed in Southwest Washington and Location Map of Carson National Fish Hatchery.

White Salmon and Wind Rivers Subbasins





LOCATION MAP

0 10 20 30

SCALE IN MILES

Attachment 5.— Hatchery Buildings, Primary Use, and Improvements.

Building	Construction type
Nursery Building 4141 sq. ft.	Wood frame, constructed 1937. Used to incubate eggs and fry.
Shop 2118 sq.ft	Wood frame, constructed 1937. Expanded 1994.
Residences Residence-1, 192 ft^2 Residence-2 1,500 ft^2 Residence-3 1,500 ft^2 Duplex-37 2,600 ft^2 Duplex-39 2,600 ft^2	Residences at Carson NFH consist of three wood frame houses constructed circa 1937 and two concrete block three bedroom duplex units constructed in 1955. A third duplex unit was declared excess to hatchery needs and razed in FY 1996.
Service/Administration 3,537 ft^2	Brick/ceramic block, constructed 1955. Includes office space for Project Leader, Assistant Manager and Administrative Assistant plus storage for three vehicles, fish food storage freezer, feed prep room and production crew office.
Oil and Paint Storage 339 ft^2	Brick, constructed 1955. Used to store gas powered equipment, oil, and paint.
Pond Cover 17,170 ft^2	Galvanized steel cover constructed over the middle bank of raceways in 2000 to replace a cover which had collapsed during heavy snow. This structure is made of very heavy steel posts and trusses designed to carry up to 1,000,000 pounds of snow.
Hazardous Material Storage 69 ft^2	Prefabricated 9' x 12' metal hazardous material storage building purchased in 2001 to store formalin.

Attachment 6.— Carson NFH Physical Description of Holding, Incubation, and Rearing Units.

Unit type	Length (ft)	Width (ft)	Depth (ft)	Volume (ft^3)	No.	Material	Age	Condition
Brood pond	146	40	4	23,360	2	concrete	42	fair
Lower earth pond	270	78	3	63,180	1	dirt	42	good
Upper earth pond	170.0	45.0	2.3	17,212	1	dirt	42	good
Raceways	80	8	2	1,280	46	concrete	42	good
Incubator troughs	20.0	1.5	1.5	45	8	fiberglass	20	good
Vertical stack incubators				7	21	fiberglass	5	good
Starter tanks	15.0	3.5	2.0	105	24	fiberglass	20	good

Raceways were lined with polyurethane in 2002.

Attachment 7.—Layout Diagram of Carson National Fish Hatchery.



Existing Facilities



CARSON NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY

Attachment 8.—Aerial Photographs of Carson National Fish Hatchery.

Attachment 9.—Listed and Candidate Species under the Endangered Species Act.

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Western Washington Fish and Wildlife Office
510 Desmond Drive SE, Suite 102
Lacey,Washington 98503
Phone: (360) 753-9440 Fax: (360) 534-9331

Dear Species List Requester:

We are providing the information you requested to assist your determination of possible impacts of a proposed project to species of Federal concern. Attachment A includes the listed threatened and endangered species, species proposed for listing, candidate species, and/or species of concern that may be within the area of your proposed project.

Any Federal agency, currently or in the future, that provides funding, permitting, licensing, or other authorization for this project must assure that its responsibilities section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act), are met. Attachment B outlines the responsibilities of Federal agencies for consulting or conferencing with us (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).

If both listed and proposed species occur in the vicinity of a project that meets the requirements of a major Federal action (i.e., "major construction activity"), impacts to both listed and proposed species must be considered in a biological assessment (BA) (section 7(c); see Attachment B). Although the Federal agency is not required, under section 7(c), to address impacts to proposed species if listed species are not known to occur in the project area, it may be in the Federal agency's best interest to address impacts to proposed species. The listing process may be completed within a year, and information gathered on a proposed species could be used to address consultation needs should the species be listed. However, if the proposed action is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a proposed species, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of proposed critical habitat, a formal conference with us is required by the Act (section 7(a)(4)). The results of the BA will determine if conferencing is required.

The Federal agency is responsible for making a determination of the effects of the project on listed species and/or critical habitat. For a Federal agency determination that a listed species or critical habitat is likely to be affected (adversely or beneficially) by the project, you should request section 7 consultation through this office. For a "not likely to adversely affect" determination, you should request our concurrence through the informal consultation process.

Candidate species and species of concern are those species whose conservation status is of concern to us, but for which additional information is needed. Candidate species are included as an advance notice to Federal agencies of species that may be proposed and listed in the future. Conservation measures for candidate species and species of concern are voluntary but recommended. Protection provided to these species now may preclude possible listing in the future.

For other federally listed species that may occur in the vicinity of your project, contact the National Marine Fisheries Service at (360) 753-9530 to request a list of species under their jurisdiction. For wetland permit requirements, contact the Seattle District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for Federal permit requirements and the Washington State Department of Ecology for State permit requirements.

Thank you for your assistance in protecting listed threatened and endangered species and other species of Federal concern. If you have additional questions, please contact Yvonne Dettlaff (360) 753-9582.

Sincerely,

Ken S. Berg, Manager
Western Washington Fish and Wildlife Office

Enclosure(s)

ATTACHMENT A **July 2, 2002**

LISTED AND PROPOSED ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES, CRITICAL HABITAT, CANDIDATE SPECIES, AND SPECIES OF CONCERN THAT MAY OCCUR IN THE VICINITY OF THE CARSON NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY IN SKAMANIA COUNTY, WASHINGTON

(T5N R7E S32)

FWS REF: 1-3-02-SP-1530

LISTED

Wintering bald eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) may occur in the vicinity of the project. Wintering activities occur from October 31 through March 31.

Bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) may occur in the vicinity of the project.

Northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*) occur in the vicinity of the project. Nesting activities occur from March 1 through September 30.

Major concerns that should be addressed in your biological assessment of the project impacts to listed species include:

1. Level of use of the project area by listed species,

2. Effect of the project on listed species' primary food stocks, prey species, and foraging areas in all areas influenced by the project, and

3. Impacts from project construction (i.e., habitat loss, increased noise levels, increased human activity) that may result in disturbance to listed species and/or their avoidance of the project area.

PROPOSED

None

CANDIDATE

None

CRITICAL HABITAT

Critical habitat for the northern spotted owl has been designated in the vicinity of the project.

SPECIES OF CONCERN

The following species of concern have been documented in the county where the project is located. These species or their habitat could be located on or near the project site. Species in **bold** were specific occurrences located on the database within a 1 mile radius of the project site.

California wolverine (*Gulo gulo luteus*)
Cascades frog (*Rana cascadae*)
Larch Mountain salamander (*Plethodon larselli*)
Long-eared myotis (*Myotis evotis*)
Long-legged myotis (*Myotis volans*)
Northern goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*)
Northwestern pond turtle (*Clemmys marmorata marmorata*)
Olive-sided flycatcher (*Contopus cooperi*)
Pacific Townsend's big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii townsendii*)
Pacific lamprey (*Lampetra tridentata*)
Peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*)
River lamprey (*Lampetra ayresi*)
Tailed frog (*Ascaphus truei*)
Western toad (*Bufo boreas*)
Penstemon barrettiae (Barrett's beardtongue)
Rorippa columbiae (Columbia yellow-cress)
Sisyrinchium sarmentosum (pale blue-eyed grass)

ATTACHMENT B

FEDERAL AGENCIES' RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER SECTIONS 7(a) AND 7(c) OF THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973, AS AMENDED

SECTION 7(a) - Consultation/Conference

Requires:

1. Federal agencies to utilize their authorities to carry out programs to conserve endangered and threatened species;

2. Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) when a Federal action may affect a listed endangered or threatened species to ensure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by a Federal agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. The process is initiated by the Federal agency after it has determined if its action may affect (adversely or beneficially) a listed species; and

3. Conference with the FWS when a Federal action is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a proposed species or result in destruction or an adverse modification of proposed critical habitat.

SECTION 7(c) - Biological Assessment for Construction Projects *

Requires Federal agencies or their designees to prepare a Biological Assessment (BA) for construction projects only. The purpose of the BA is to identify any proposed and/or listed species that is/are likely to be affected by a construction project. The process is initiated by a Federal agency in requesting a list of proposed and listed threatened and endangered species (list attached). The BA should be completed within 180 days after its initiation (or within such a time period as is mutually agreeable). If the BA is not initiated within 90 days of receipt of the species list, please verify the accuracy of the list with the Service. No irreversible commitment of resources is to be made during the BA process which would result in violation of the requirements under Section 7(a) of the Act. Planning, design, and administrative actions may be taken; however, no construction may begin.

To complete the BA, your agency or its designee should (1) conduct an onsite inspection of the area to be affected by the proposal, which may include a detailed survey of the area to determine if the species is present and whether suitable habitat exists for either expanding the existing population or potential reintroduction of the species; (2) review literature and scientific data to determine species distribution, habitat needs, and other biological requirements; (3) interview experts including those within the FWS, National Marine Fisheries Service, state conservation department, universities, and others who may have data not yet published in scientific literature; (4) review and analyze the effects of the proposal on the species in terms of individuals and populations, including consideration of cumulative effects of the proposal on the species and its habitat; (5) analyze alternative actions that may provide conservation measures; and (6) prepare a report documenting the results, including a discussion of study methods used, any problems encountered, and other relevant information. Upon completion, the report should be forwarded to our Endangered Species Division, 510 Desmond Drive SE, Suite 102, Lacey, WA 98503-1273.

---

* "Construction project" means any major Federal action which significantly affects the quality of the human environment (requiring an EIS), designed primarily to result in the building or erection of human-made structures such as dams, buildings, roads, pipelines, channels, and the like. This includes Federal action such as permits, grants, licenses, or other forms of Federal authorization or approval which may result in construction.

Attachment 10.—Spawning Ground Survey Data for Spring Chinook Salmon in the Wind River, 1970 - 2001. Data from Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Vancouver Washington.

Return Year	Adult	Jack	Total
1970	241	11	252
1971	1,936	416	2,352
1972	1,094	19	1,113
1973	182	7	189
1974	76	8	84
1975	84	0	84
1976	80	4	84
1977	126	0	126
1978	243	2	245
1979	154	0	154
1980	91	1	92
1981	155	0	155
1982	79	1	80
1983	266	0	266
1984	213	7	220
1985	191	1	192
1986	111	0	111
1987	87	11	98
1988	164	9	173
1989	148	9	157
1990	172	1	173
1991	140	1	141
1992	248	0	248
1993	657	0	657
1994	50	0	50
1995	26	6	32
1996	423	2	425
1997	227	0	227
1998	59	1	60
1999	79	20	99
2000	216	8	224
2001	412	16	428

Attachment 11.—Special Use Permit from the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Circa 1937.

Form 832
(Revised Nov. 1933)

SPECIAL USE PERMIT

L-Uses
Columbia
U. S. Bureau of Fisheries
Fish Hatchery

(Case designation)

Permission is hereby granted to Regional Director

of the U. S. Bureau of Fisheries

to use the following-described lands: A tract of not over ten acres, located near
(Describe the lands to be occupied, if unsurveyed, by metes and bounds, with reference to a road or stream or well-known landmark; right of way by terminal points, direction, and lands occupied)
the junction of Tyee Creek and Wind River, approximately at what, if surveyed, would be the Quarter Corner of the North line of Section 5, Township 4 North, Range 7 East, W.M., as shown on site plan which is hereby made a part of this permit,

for the purpose of building, maintaining and operating a Government Fish Hatchery
(Briefly but clearly describe the use, giving area of inclosures, length and width of right of way, etc.)

subject to the following conditions:

1. The permittee shall pay to the Regional Fiscal Agent designated by the Forest officer for deposit to the credit of the Treasurer of the United States, in consideration for this use, the sum of No charge - Reg. L-2-B dollars ($_____) for the period from _____, 19____, to December 31, 19____, and thereafter annually, on January 1, _____ dollars ($_____).

2. The permittee shall comply with the regulations of the Department of Agriculture governing the National Forest, shall observe all sanitary laws and regulations applicable to the premises, and shall keep the premises in a neat and orderly condition and dispose of all refuse and locate outhouses and cesspools as required by the Forest officers.

3. This permit is subject to all valid claims.

4. The permittee shall take all reasonable precaution to prevent and suppress forest fires.

8—713

5. The permittee, if engaged in business, shall conduct same in an orderly manner and in accordance with all requirements of the applicable laws of the State of Washington, as well as the laws of the United States.

6. The permittee shall pay the United States for any damage to its property resulting from this use.

7. The permittee shall fully repair all damage, other than ordinary wear and tear, to roads and trails in the National Forests caused by the permittee in the exercise of the privilege granted by this permit.

8. Construction work (or occupancy and use) under this permit shall begin within two (2) months, be completed within five (5) years from the date of the permit, and this use shall be actually exercised at least ninety (90) days each year, unless the time is extended or shortened.

9. In case of change of address, permittee shall immediately notify the Forest Supervisor.

10. ~~The charges for this use may be readjusted whenever necessary to place this permit on a basis consistent with the charge to other permittees for like privileges. A general readjustment will be made at the end of five years from the date of issuance of permit and at the end of each five year period thereafter.~~

11. No National Forest timber may be cut or destroyed without first obtaining a permit from the Forest Supervisor.

12. Upon the abandonment, termination, or revocation of this permit, and in the absence of an agreement to the contrary, the permittee, if all the rental charges due the Government have been paid, may, within a reasonable period to be determined by the issuing officer, remove all structures which have been placed on the premises by him, except where the material was furnished by the Forest Service, but upon failure to remove the structures within that period they shall become the property of the United States.

13. This permit may be transferred with the approval of the officer by whom it was given or his successor, subject to such conditions as may be imposed at the time of transfer. It shall terminate upon breach of any of the conditions herein or at the discretion of the Regional Forester or the Forester.

14. The permittee shall provide, whenever requested by the Forest officers, a way across the land covered by this permit for the free ingress or egress of Forest officers and for users of National Forest land and purchasers of National Forest products.

15. The permittee will obtain approval of the District Ranger before burning brush piles or any debris resulting from the clearing of the grounds.
(Special stipulations necessary)

16. No building of any sort shall be constructed until plans for each structure have been submitted to and approved by the Forest Supervisor of the Columbia National Forest.

17. The permittee shall not permit dead fish to be returned to the stream, but shall dispose of them in some manner approved by the Forest Supervisor.

18. If no commercial telephone is available the permittee will be allowed to attach one telephone to the Forest Service line, without cost, and there will be no charge for calls over the Forest Service line. Calls extending to commercial lines will be paid for by the permittee.

May 27, 1937
(Date)

(Signature of officer issuing permit)

(Title)

8—713 U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Attachment 12.—Historical Releases from Carson National Fish Hatchery, 1938-1980.

Date	BY	Species	Size	Number	Water
FY1938		FCS	fry	2,750,000	Tyee Spring Creek
FY1938		FCS	fingerling	226,044	Tyee Spring Creek
FY1938		RBT	fingerling	228,000	Tyee Spring Creek
FY1938		BST	fingerling	294,750	Tyee Spring Creek
05/15/38		SCS	fingerling	91,675	Tyee Spring Creek
FY1939		FCS	fry	1,998,714	Tyee Spring Creek
FY1939		FCS	fingerling	649,044	Tyee Spring Creek
FY1939		RBT	fingerling	228,000	Tyee Spring Creek++
FY1939		BKT	fingerling	294,750	Tyee Spring Creek++
FY1939		BST	fingerling	254,000	Tyee Spring Creek++
FY1940		FCS	fry	932,700	Wind River
FY1940		FCS	fingerling	328,723	Tyee Spring Creek
FY1940		SCS	fingerling	96,480	Tyee Spring Creek
FY1940		RBT	fingerling	379,900	Dist. to applicants
FY1940		BKT	fingerling	292,700	Columbia Nat'l Forest
FY1940		BST	fingerling	282,000	Dist. to applicants
CY1941		FCS	fry	1,784,600	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1941		FCS	fingerling	136,070	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1941		BKT	fingerling	411,950	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1941		BST	fingerling	380,535	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1941		RBT	fingerling	232,500	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1942		CS	fry	2,333,000	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1942		CS	fingerling	592,467	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1942		BKT	fingerling	245,511	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1942		RBT	fingerling	91,525	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1942		BST	fingerling	166,378	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1943		FCS	fingerling	528,037	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1943		BKT	fingerling	8,280	Dist. to applicants
CY1943		BKT	fingerling	283,487	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1943		RBT	fingerling	20,000	Dist. to applicants
CY1943		RBT	fingerling	218,500	Columbia Nat'l Forest
10/31/43		SCS	EE	28,152	Leavenworth, WA
11/10/43		SCS	EE	33,930	Leavenworth, WA
12/07/43		BBS	EE	323,100	Leavenworth, WA
CY1944		BBS	fingerling	121,000	Dist. to Fed. Hatcheries
CY1944		FCS	fingerling	235,536	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1944		RBT	fingerling	12,350	Columbia Nat'l Forest
01/03/44		BBS	EE	358,992	Leavenworth, WA
10/24/44		SCS	EE	32,868	Entiat, WA

Date	BY	Species	Size	Number	Water
11/22/44		BBS	EE	79,650	Winthrop, WA
12/27/44		BBS	EE	304,650	Leavenworth, WA
CY1945		FCS	fingerling	238,516	Columbia Natl. Forest
CY1945		SCS	fry	26,813	Dist. to Fed. Hatcheries
CY1945		BBS	fingerling	81,750	Dist. to Fed. Hatcheries
1/11/45		SIS	EE	19,840	Winthrop, WA
1/21/45		SIS	EE	38,579	Winthrop, WA
06/08/45		SHT	EE	18,360	Cook, WA
06/18/45		SHT	EE	18,609	Cook, WA
06/27/45		SHT	EE	32,588	Winthrop, WA
07/10/45		SHT	EE	46,626	Winthrop, WA
07/23/45		SHT	EE	53,037	Winthrop, WA
07/31/45		SHT	EE	11,526	Winthrop, WA
10/21/45		BBS	EE	45,495	Leavenworth, WA
12/04/45		BBS	EE	126,247	Leavenworth, WA
12/10/45		FCS	EE	1,550	Oregon City High School
12/26/45		BBS	EE	145,698	Leavenworth, WA
CY1946		FCS	fry	100,000	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1946		FCS	fingerling	620,446	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1946		SCS	fingerling	20,522	Columbia Nat'l Forest
CY1947		FCS	fry	4,233,000	Wind River
CY1947		FCS	fingerling	870,048	Wind River
CY1948		FCS	fry	6,709,240	Wind River
CY1948		FCS	fingerling	556,024	Wind River
CY1949		FCS	fry	8,353,307	Wind River
CY1949		FCS	fingerling	718,325	Wind River
CY1949		BKT	fingerling	128,466	Wind River
July1949		SES	fingerling	415,772	Wind River
12/13/49		FCS	EE	632,810	Washington State Marblemount, WA
12/21/49		FCS	EE	50,000	Quilcene, WA
CY1950		FCS	unknown	1,289,816	Wind River
CY1950		FCS	unknown	2,127,685	Wind River
CY1950		BKT	unknown	219,432	Wind River
11/21/50		FCS	EE	2,000,000	Klickitat, WA
CY1951	1950	FCS	fry	2,698,845	Wind River
CY1951	1950	FCS	fingerling	1,778,923	Wind River
CY1951	1950	FCS	fry	8,202,966	Wind River
CY1951		BKT*	unknown	199,681	G. Pinchot Nat'l Forest
11/29/51	1951	FCS	EE	4,001,864	Seattle, WA
CY1952	1951	FKT	fry	2,130,045	Wind River

Date	BY	Species	Size	Number	Water
CY1952	1951	FKT	fry	6,775,685	Wind River
CY1952	1951	FKT	fry	1,433,749	Wind River
CY1952		BKT*	unknown	66,131	G. Pinchot Natl. Forest
CY1953	1951	SCS	5	7,603	Wind River
CY1953	1952	FCS	fry	11,646,619	Wind River
CY1954	1953	FCS+	fry	147,242	Wind River
CY1954	1953	FCS+	3	3,911,687	Wind River
CY1954	1953	FCS+	1	41,387	Little W. Salmon River
CY1954	1953	FCS+	2	16,360	Little W. Salmon River
CY1954	1953	FCS+	3	31,844	Bonneville Dam
CY1954	1953	FCS+	3	1,020	Leavenworth, WA
CY1954		BKT*	unknown	191,724	G. Pinchot Nat'l Forest
CY1954		RBT*	unknown	57,822	unknown
12/02/54		SES*	EE	13,000	Salmon Nutritional Lab Cook, WA
12/17-30/54		RBT*	EE	401,805	Washington Game Dept. Vancouver
CY1955	1954	FCS+	2	2,265,266	Wind River
CY1955	1954	FCS+	3	1,769,987	Wind River
CY1955		RBT*	unknown	62,846	unknown
CY1955		BKT*	unknown	177,947	unknown
Jan.-Mar.	1955	RBT*	EE	2,242,748	Washington Game Dept. Vancouver
03/01/55		BKT*	EE	102,075	Washington Game Dept. Vancouver
April1955	1954	SHT*	unknown	4,695	Wind River
Oct.1955	1954	SES+	2	102,432	Spirit Lake
Oct.1955	1955	SES+	3	85,680	Spirit Lake
Dec.1955	1955	SES+	3	1,985	West. Fish Nutrition Lab
CY1956	1954	FCS+	2	494,558	Wind River
CY1956	1954	FCS+	3	402,571	Wind River
CY1956	1954	FCS+	4	387,015	Wind River
CY1956	1955	FCS+	4	1,094,757	Wind River
CY1956	1954	SHT*	unknown	74,282	Washougal Hatchery
CY1956		BKT*	unknown	86,534	unknown
CY1956	1955	SCS+	4	911,686	Wind River
01/25/56		RBT*	EE	111,936	Hagerman, ID
02/14/56		RBT*	EE	40,704	Hagerman, ID
Mar1956	1955	FCS+	fry	496,760	Wind River
April1956	1954	SHT*	unknown	24,718	Wind River
April1956	1954	SCS+	4	26,451	Wind River

Date	BY	Species	Size	Number	Water
Sept.1956	1955	FCS+	3	1,082,475	Wind River
10/10/56	1956	SCS+	EE	195,360	Willard Station Cook, WA
10/17/56	1956	SCS+	EE	217,195	White Salmon Station
11/14/56	1956	FCS+	EE	523,260	Washington Game Dept. Klickitat, WA
CY1957		BKT*	unknown	243,577	unknown
01/29/57		RBT	EE	250,638	Hagerman, ID
Feb.1957	1956	FCS+	fry	706,320	Wind River
Mar1957	1955	SIS*	4	45,000	Little Washougal R
Mar1957	1955	SIS*	4	45,000	Greenleaf Creek
Mar1957	1955	SIS*	4	98,770	Upper Washougal R
03/07/57		RBT	EE	223,554	Quilcene, WA
April1957	1955	SHT	unknown	2,376	Wind River
04/21/57		RBT	EE	28,268	Quilcene, WA
May1957	1956	FCS+	1	2,742,128	Wind River
Oct.1957	1956	FCS+	3	424,555	Wind River
10/22/57	1957	SCS+	EE	190,608	Willard, WA
10/22/57	1957	SCS+	EE	131,389	Little White Salmon
11/07/57	1957	SCS+	EE	33,281	Little White Salmon
CY1958		BKT*	unknown	116,834	unknown
CY1958	1957	FCS+	2	1,391,419	Wind River
CY1958	1957	SIS*	4	200,000	Spring Creek
01/29/58		RBT	EE	461,472	Boseman, MT
02/10/58		RBT	EE	79,952	Creston, MT
Feb.1958	1957	FCS+	fry	486,635	Wind River
Feb.1958	1956	SIS*	4	260,100	Washington State Washougal, WA
03/10/58		RBT	EE	106,552	Creston, MT
10/24/58	1958	SCS+	EE	50,000	Fishery Research Warm Springs, OR
Nov.1958	1957	SIS*	4	259,228	Abernathy Creek
Dec.1958	1957	SIS*	4	490,634	Columbia River
CY1959		RBT	unknown	31,423	unknown
CY1959		BKT*	unknown	211,524	unknown
CY1959		KMT	unknown	30,084	unknown
CY1959	1958	FCS+	7	3,953,000	Wind River
CY1959	1958	FCS+	7	3,742,900	Wind River
CY1959	1958	FCS+	2	7,897,255	Wind River
01/06-12/59		RBT	EE	300,200	Hagerman, ID

Date	BY		Species	Size	Number	Water
Feb.1959	1958	SIS		7	11,060	Wind River
11/30/59			FCS+	EE	4,000,000	Kalama Falls Hatchery Kalama, WA
12/02/59			FCS+	EE	3,211,000	Washougal, WA
CY1960			RBT	unknown	62,465	unknown
CY1960			BKT*	unknown	168,820	unknown
CY1960			KMT	unknown	93,163	unknown
CY1960	1959		FCS+	3	49,986	Wind River
Feb.1960	1958		SHT	6	3,616	Wind River
April1960	1958		SCS+	4	1,016,469	Wind River
May1960	1959		FCS+	2	9,324,000	Wind River
May1960	1959		KOK	7	192,000	Lake Simtustus, Pelton Dam
Oct.1960	1959		FCS+	4	194,398	Wind River
10/13/60			SCS+	EE	35,000	Washington State Klickitat, WA
CY1961			RBT	unknown	108,091	unknown
CY1961			BKT*	unknown	41,496	unknown
CY1961			KMT	unknown	764,840	unknown
CY1961	1959		SCS+	4	260,720	Wind River
CY1961	1960		SCS+	7	75,313	Happy Valley Reservoir Warm Springs Indian Reservation
CY1961	1960		SIS+	1	12,383	Willard Hatchery
April1961	1959		SIS+	5	55,387	Wind River
April1961	1959		SIS+	5	927,932	Columbia River
April1961	1959		SHT	5	13,200	Wind River
May1961	1960		KOK	1	104,310	Lake Simtustus, Pelton Dam
June1961	1960		FCS+	2	1,855,640	Wind River
July1961	1960		KOK	1	45,217	Norwich Lake, Mt. Rainier Natl. Park
09/21/61	1961		SCS+	EE	372,000	Idaho Fish & Game Dept.
10/11/61	1961		SCS+	EE	333,711	Idaho Fish & Game Dept.
11/06/61	1961		SCS+	EE	100,000	Washington State Klickitat, WA
CY1962			BKT*	unknown	245,230	unknown
CY1962			RBT	unknown	184,677	unknown
CY1962			KMT	unknown	959,479	unknown
CY1962	1960		SCS+	5	605,871	Wind River
CY1962	1960		SCS+	5	56,882	Research- Bonneville Dam

Date	BY	Species	Size	Number	Water
CY1962	1960	SCS+	5	872,763	Wind River
Feb.1962	1961	SHT+	4	50,040	Lake Branch Hood River
Feb.1962	1961	SHT+	4	56,385	West Fork of Hood River
Feb.1962	1961	SHT+	4	56,340	Tony Creek
Feb.1962	1961	SHT+	4	50,040	Bowman Creek
Feb1962	1961	SHT+	4	50,040	Cable Creek
Feb.1962	1961	SHT+	4	117,450	Middle Fork Hood River
Feb.1962	1961	SHT+	4	100,080	Camas Creek
Feb.1962	1961	SHT+	4	120,150	East Fork Hood River
April1962	1961	SHT+	5	109	Research- Bonn. Dam
May1962	1962	KOK	1	197,800	Lake Simtustus, Pelton Dam
June1962	1961	SHT+	4	52,429	Middle Fork Hood River
10/02/62	1962	SCS+	EE	959,000	Idaho Fish &Game Dept.
10/30/62	1962	SCS+	EE	487,800	Klickitat Hatchery
11/09/62	1962	SCS+	EE	411,539	Klickitat Hatchery
CY1963		RBT	unknown	113,261	unknown
CY1963		BKT*	unknown	79,920	Skamania County
CY1963		KMT	unknown	1,177,425	unknown
Mar1963	1961	COS	26/ lb.	713,254	Columbia River
April1963	1961	COS	25/ lb.	524,535	Wind River
April1963	1961	SCS+	32/ lb.	1,264,969	Wind River
May1963	1961	SCS+	29/ lb.	83,244	Research- Bonneville Dam
May1963	1961	COS	24/ lb.	73,930	Research- Bonneville Dam
Oct.1963	1963	SCS+	EE	1,000,000	Idaho Fish & Game Dept.
Nov.1963	1962	SCS+	55/ lb.	5,985	Fish Passage Research
Dec.1963	1963	COS	EE	30,000	West. Fish Nutrition Lab
FY1964		RBT	unknown	46,666	unknown
FY1964		BKT*	unknown	69,920	Skamania County
FY1964		KMT	unknown	52,425	unknown
Jan-Feb.1964	1963	COS	EE	1,024,150	Leavenworth, WA
Feb.1964	1963	SCS+	1,061/ lb	16,976	Wind River
May1964	1962	SCS+	34/ lb.	1,020	West. Fish Disease Lab
June1964	1962	SCS+	30/lb.	1,500	Research- Bonneville Dam
June1964	1962	SCS+	29/ lb.	5,046	Fish Passage Research
June1964	1962	SCS+	29/ lb.	67,396	Wind River
Sept.1964	1964	FCS	EE	500,000	Idaho Fish &Game Dept.
Oct.1964	1964	FCS	EE	500,000	Idaho Fish & Game Dept.
Dec.1964	1963	SCS	57/ lb.	39,045	Wind River
Dec1964	1964	COS	EE	500,250	Idaho Fish & Game Dept
FY1965		RBT	unknown	23,963	unknown
FY1965		BKT*	unknown	39,000	Skamania County

Date	BY	Species	Size	Number	Water
FY1965	1964	SCS	EE	121,500	Klickitat Hatchery
Feb.1965	1964	FCS	fry	2,498,670	Wind River
Feb.1965	1963	COS	30/ lb.	13,260	Wind River
Feb.1965	1964	COS	fry	191,105	Wind River
April1965	1963	SCS	38/ lb.	1,076,416	Wind River
April1965	1963	COS	26/ lb.	1,449,214	Wind River
April1965	1963	COS	25/ lb.	112,575	Warm Springs River
April1965	1963	COS	24/ lb.	68,800	Badger Creek
May1965	1963	COS	25/ lb.	67,346	Wind River
May1965	1963	COS	25/ lb.	68,625	Warm Springs River
May1965	1963	COS	25/ lb.	2,100	West. Fish Disease Lab
June1965	1963	SCS	32/ lb.	77,105	Wind River
Oct.1965	1965	SCS	EE	634,942	Idaho Fish & Game Dept.
Oct.1965	1965	SCS	EE	19,341	Willard Hatchery
FY1966		RBT	unknown	101,170	unknown
FY1966		BKT*	unknown	43,600	Skamania County
April1966	1964	SCS	48/ lb.	1,909,466	Wind River
May1966	1965	SCS	615/ lb.	76,875	Wind River
Oct.1966	1966	SCS	EE	1,018,200	Idaho Fish & Game Dept.
FY1967		RBT	unknown	48,397	unknown
FY1967		BKT	unknown	95,312	Indian Reservations
Feb.1967	1966	COS	fry	262,500	Deschutes River
Mar1967	1965	COS	32/ lb.	1,904,590	Wind River
Mar1967	1966	COS	fry	261,500	Deschutes River
April1967	1965	SCS	32/ lb.	2,411,552	Wind River
Oct.1967	1967	SCS	EE	1,016,300	Idaho Fish & Game Dept.
Nov.1967	1966	SCS	50/ lb.	2,500	Research- Seattle, WA
Dec.1967	1966	SCS	73/ lb.	7,322	Research- Seattle, WA
FY1968		RBT	2 yr. old	36,783	unknown
FY1968		BKT*	unknown	14,935	Indian Heaven Lakes
FY1968		CUT	unknown	26,600	unknown
Jan.1968	1966	SCS	unknown	10,880	Research- Weyerhauser Co.
March1968	1968	SHT	EE	150,000	Umatilla Indian Reservation
March1968	1968	SHT	EE	200,000	Oregon State Fish Comm.
March1968	1968	SHT	EE	160,000	Warm Springs Indian Res.
April1968	1966	SCS	21/ lb.	1,613,395	Wind River
April1968	1967	COS	527/ lb.	803,272	Wind River
Oct.1968	1968	SCS	EE	951,970	Idaho Fish & Game Dept.
Oct.1968	1968	SCS	EE	101,000	Little White NFH
FY1969		RBT	unknown	76,751	Military Installations
FY1969		BKT	unknown	3,507	unknown

Date	BY		Species		Size	Number	Water
Mar1969	1967		COS		unknown	476,520	Wind River
Mar1969	1967		COS		unknown	200,040	Umatilla Indian Reservation
April1969	1967		SCS		21/ lb.	1,534,530	Wind River
April1969	1967		SCS		20/ lb.	600	Abernathy Salmon Cult. Lab
May1969	1968		SHT		12.5/ lb.	35,740	Wind River
Oct.1969	1969		SCS		EE	255,300	Kooskia NFH
Oct.1969	1969		SCS		EE	990,117	Idaho Fish & Game Dept.
Oct.1969	1969		SCS		EE	300,017	Warm Springs Indian Res.
FY1970			RBT		unknown	21,265	Federal Waters
FY1970			CUT		unknown	18,300	unknown
Mar1970	1969		SHT	1	65.7/ lb.	44,747	Wind River
April1970	1968		SHT		7.3/ lb	23,710	Wind River
April1970	1968		SHT		9.0/ lb	23,400	Umatilla Indian Reservation
May1970	1968		SHT		7.9/ lb	44,747	Umatilla Indian Reservation
May1970	1968		SCS		16/ lb.	757,000	Wind River
July1970	1969		SCS		unknown	200	Bureau Comm. Fisheries
Sept.1970	1970		SCS		EE	1,123,190	Little White NFH
Oct.1970	1970		SCS		EE	307,810	Leavenworth NFH
Oct.1970	1970		SCS		EE	2,999,130	Oregon State Fish Comm.
FY1971			RBT		unknown	77,229	unknown
FY1971	1970		SCS		462/ lb.	359,280	Oregon State Fish Comm.
Jan.1971	1970		SCS		fry	692,410	Wind River
Mar1971	1970		SCS		unknown	424,660	Wind River
April1971	1969		SCS		18/ lb.	1,177,710	Wind River
09/29/71	1971		SCS		EE	828,330	Kooskia NFH
10/20/71	1971		SCS		EE	857,440	State of Idaho
10/21/71	1971		SCS		EE	600,000	Leavenworth NFH
10/26/71	1971		SCS		EE	765,640	State of Idaho
10/27/71	1971		SCS		EE	500,000	State of Alaska
10/28/71	1971		SCS		EE	800,000	State of Idaho
Nov.1971	1970		SCS		28/ lb.	3,017	N.M.F.S.
11/07/71	1971		SCS		EE	703,690	Kooskia NFH
FY1972			RBT		unknown	60,895	Quilcene NFH
Mar1972	1970		SCS		22/ lb.	5,125	N.M.F.S.
April1972	1970		SCS		20/ lb.	300	N.M.F.S.
April1972	1970		SCS		17.7/ lb.	1,409,370	Wind River
10/10/72	1972		SCS		EE	1,510,000	Alaska Fish & Game
10/11/72	1972		SCS		EE	600,860	Leavenworth NFH
10/11-25/72	1972	SCS	EE		5,495,160	Oregon Fish Commission	
10/19/72	1972		SCS		EE	1,730,760	Washington Fisheries
10/25/72	1972		SCS		EE	1,070,610	Little White NFH

Date	BY	Species	Size	Number	Water
10/25/72	1972	SCS	EE	5,100	N.M.F.S.
Nov.1972	1971	SCS	33/ lb.	100	N.M.F.S.
Nov.1972	1972	SCS	fry	22,000	N.M.F.S.
11/01/72	1972	SCS	EE	801,890	Kooskia NFH
Dec.1972	1972	SCS	1,333/ lb.	12,000	N.M.F.S.
FY1973		RBT	unknown	50,695	unknown
Jan.1973	1971	SCS	32/ lb.	420	Willard Lab
Feb.1973	1971	SCS	33/ lb.	100	N.M.F.S.
April1973	1971	SCS	22/ lb.	1,010	N.M.F.S.
April1973	1971	SCS	20/ lb.	1,540,600	Wind River
April1973	1972	SCS	343/ lb.	1,030	N.M.F.S.
April1973	1972	SCS	424/ lb.	255,030	Washington State
09/24/73	1973	SCS	EE	443,370	Little White NFH
09/27/73	1973	SCS	EE	403,270	Little White NFH
10/11/73	1973	SCS	EE	354,780	Eagle Creek NFH
10/12/73	1973	SCS	EE	747,560	Leavenworth NFH
Nov.1973	1972	SCS	36/ lb.	400	Corps of Engineers
FY1974		RBT	unknown	71,292	unknown
Feb.1974	1973	SCS	594/ lb.	228,800	Kooskia NFH
April1974	1973	SCS	297/ lb.	300,520	Washington Dept. of Fish.
April1974	1972	SCS	23/ lb.	350	Corps of Engineers
April1974	1972	SCS	23/ lb.	7,000	N.M.F.S.
April1974	1972	SCS	21/ lb.	2,001,088	Wind River
Oct.1974	1973	SCS	34/ lb.	505	N.M.F.S.
10/09/74	1974	SCS	EE	113,751	Abernathy SCDC
10/11/74	1974	SCS	EE	300,000	Little White NFH
FY1975		RBT	unknown	47,264	some went to Indian lands
Mar1975	1973	SCS	23/ lb.	934,450	Wind River
April1975	1973	SCS	19/ lb.	1,065,062	Wind River
Aug.1975		SCS	EE	1,576,700	Marion Forks Salmon Hatchery, OR
Sept.1975	1975	SCS	EE	1,000,000	Entiat NFH
Oct.1975	1975	SCS	EE	2,300,000	Leavenworth NFH
Oct.1975	1975	SCS	EE	300,000	Kooskia NFH
Oct.1975	1975	SCS	EE	431,370	Washington Dept. of Fish.
Oct.1975	1974	SCS	37/ lb.	2,000	Marrowstone Lab
Oct.1975	1974	SCS	37/ lb.	196,562	Wind River
FY1976		RBT	unknown	95,102	some went to Indian lands
FY1976		BKT	unknown	15,000	Umatilla Indian Reservation
FY1976		BKT	unknown	24,265	unknown
FY1976	1975	FCS	480/ lb.	882,720	Abernathy SCDC

Date	BY	Species	Size	Number	Water
Jan.1976	1974	SCS	30/ lb.	5,000	Marrowstone Lab
Jan.1976	1975	SCS	fry	20,000	Marrowstone Lab
Mar1976	1975	SCS	unknown	251,450	Kooskia NFH
Mar1976	1974	SCS	23/ lb.	1,149,261	Wind River
April1976	1974	SCS	19/ lb.	1,142,150	Wind River
May1976	1975	FCS	208/ lb.	668,692	Wind River
Sept.1976	1975	SCS	45/ lb.	253,067	Wind River
Oct.1976	1976	SCS	EE	1,000,000	Kooskia NFH
Oct.1976	1976	SCS	EE	721,170	Entiat NFH
Oct.1976	1976	SCS	EE	2,443,094	Leavenworth NFH
Oct.1976	1976	SCS	EE	473,469	Winthrop NFH
Oct.1976	1976	SCS	EE	743,550	Marion Forks Salmon Hatchery, OR
FY1977		RBT	unknown	87,990	unknown
FY1977		BKT	unknown	12,989	unknown
Mar1977	1975	SCS	22/ lb.	1,398,705	Wind River
April1977	1975	SCS	19/ lb.	1,414,148	Wind River
April1977	1975	COS	17/ lb.	1,446,240	Columbia River
Aug.1977	1976	COS	fry	300,000	Little W. Salmon River
Sept.1977	1976	COS	54/ lb.	145,800	Little W. Salmon River
FY1978		SCS	unknown	557,600	unknown
FY1978		SCS	EE	~2,300,000	Leavenworth NFH
FY1978		RBT	unknown	37,400	Yakima Indian Res. and youth camps in Portland area
FY1978		COS	unknown	521,000	N.M.F.S.
FY1978		COS	unknown	121,000	Pasco Homing Site
FY1978		COS	unknown	400,432	Bonneville Dam
FY1978		BKT	unknown	7,300	unknown
FY1978		BKT	unknown	71,400	unknown
FY1979	1977	SCS	19/ lb.	1,550,000	Wind River
FY1979	1977	SCS	19/ lb.	50,000	Yakima Indian Reservation
FY1979	1977	SCS	19/ lb.	300,000	Columbia River
FY1979		COS	unknown	271,000	Northwestern Lake
FY1979		COS	unknown	47,200	unknown
FY1979		SCS	unknown	622,000	Leavenworth NFH
FY1979		SCS	EE	2,500,000	Leavenworth NFH
FY1979		SCS	EE	200,000	Dworshak Complex
FY1979		FCS	unknown	2,350,000	Columbia River
FY1980	1978	SCS	fry	467,000	Wind River
FY1980	1978	COS	17/ lb.	606,000	B. White Salmon River
FY1980	1978	COS	unknown	78,000	Yakima River

Date	BY	Species	Size	Number	Water
FY1980		RBT	unknown	15,000	Warm Spring NFH
FY1980		RBT	unknown	18,000	unknown
April1980	1978	SCS	unknown	2,545,000	Wind River
May1980	1978	SCS	unknown	120,000	Hammond, OR
May1980	1978	SCS	fry	78,000	Entiat NFH
June1980	1979	COS	fry	102,000	Columbia River

++Planted by Forest Service.
*Reared cooperatively with the Washington Dept. of Game
+Reared as part of the Lower Columbia River Salmon Development Program

BBS= Blueback Salmon
BKT= Brook Trout
BST= Black-spotted Trout
CH= Chinook Salmon
COS= Coho Salmon
SIS= Silver Salmon
CUT= Cutthroat Trout
FCS= Fall Chinook Salmon
FKS= Fall King Salmon
KMT= Kamloops Trout
KOK= Kokanes
RBT= Rainbow Trout
SCS= Spring Chinook Salmon
SES= Sockeye Salmon
SHT= Steelhead Trout

Fry = up to time yolk sac absorbed & feeding begins
Advanced fry = end of fry to 1 inch
Fingerlings = between 1" and yearling, No.1 were 1", up to 2", No. 2 were up to 3", etc.
Yearling = one year old, but less than 2 from date of hatching, could call them No. 1, etc, as well.

Attachment 13.—Releases of Juvenile Spring Chinook Salmon from Carson National Fish Hatchery into the Wind River since 1980.

Carson NFH Spring Chinook releases
in Wind River, 1980 - 2002.

Release Date	Brood Year	Number	Size #/lb.	Stage
04/02/1980	78	245,854	29.00	yearling
04/28/1980	78	2,295,207	23.00	yearling
05/12/1980	78	44,550	24.00	yearling
03/24/1981	79	442,835	25.00	yearling
04/15/1981	79	2,156,077	19.00	yearling
04/07/1982	80	656,976	20.00	yearling
04/15/1982	80	1,921,674	18.00	yearling
04/15/1983	81	1,722,080	20.00	yearling
04/12/1984	82	2,017,670	16.00	yearling
04/13/1984	82	868,890	18.00	yearling
02/13/1985	83	664,740	27.00	yearling
02/15/1985	83	182,300	27.00	yearling
04/11/1985	83	18,494	17.00	yearling
04/15/1985	83	1,525,437	18.00	yearling
03/06/1986	84	443,000	25.00	yearling
04/15/1986	84	1,949,468	19.00	yearling
06/23/1986	85	140,000	102.00	fingerling
11/26/1986	85	185,000	35.00	fall
04/10/1987	85	47,496	19.00	yearling
04/15/1987	85	1,808,694	19.00	yearling
04/16/1987	85	482,974	18.00	yearling
01/21/1988	87	206,610	1,282.00	fry
04/14/1988	86	833,420	19.00	yearling
04/15/1988	86	1,122,800	19.00	yearling
07/12/1988	87	237,995	66.00	fingerling
07/13/1988	87	173,197	75.00	fingerling
01/13/1989	88	307,000	1,258.00	fry
01/13/1989	88	307,000	*,***.**	FRY
04/19/1989	87	437,998	18.00	yearling
04/20/1989	87	1,445,641	18.00	yearling
04/27/1989	87	100,000	18.00	yearling
04/12/1990	88	1,052,641	19.00	yearling
04/13/1990	88	1,052,640	19.00	yearling
04/15/1991	89	2,336,788	18.00	yearling
04/15/1992	90	2,315,382	18.00	yearling
04/14/1993	91	2,321,285	20.00	yearling
04/14/1994	92	2,040,568	19.00	yearling
06/08/1994	93	320,000	98.00	fingerling
04/10/1995	93	127,113	19.00	yearling
04/13/1995	93	666,073	18.00	yearling
04/14/1995	93	1,402,006	18.00	yearling
02/08/1996	94	600,000	24.00	yearling
04/08/1996	94	44,034	18.00	yearling
04/18/1996	94	1,046,363	18.00	yearling
04/19/1996	94	32,224	18.00	yearling
04/17/1997	95	907,708	16.00	yearling
04/20/1998	96	1,734,188	17.00	yearling
04/20/1999	97	1,415,744	13.00	yearling
04/20/2000	98	1,430,022	16.00	yearling
04/19/2001	99	1,608,684	15.00	yearling
04/17/2002	00	1,449,361	16.00	yearling

Attachment 14.—Carson National Fish Hatchery Spring Chinook Return Data, 1980-2001.

Carson NFH Spring Chinook Returns

Year	Males	Females	Jacks	Unknown	Total	Males Spawned	Females Spawned
80	1,405	1,931	32	0	3,368	1,448	1,920
81	1,120	1,425	3	0	2,548	1,123	1,425
82	609	1,027	20	0	1,656	629	1,027
83	955	1,515	4	20	2,494	959	1,515
84	945	1,163	45	0	2,153	719	1,068
85	2,026	2,646	62	0	4,734	1,433	2,324
86	1,303	1,811	67	2,475	5,656	1,056	1,687
87	1,577	2,797	4	0	4,378	1,247	1,714
88	774	1,280	56	0	2,110	727	1,161
89	925	1,209	162	0	2,296	861	1,098
90	1,019	1,693	34	7,910	10,656	794	1,059
91	1,322	1,942	40	1,029	4,333	1,144	1,661
92	1,206	1,643	17	1,322	4,188	1,043	1,362
93	1,220	1,855	2	1,362	4,439	1,125	1,657
94	397	525	0	0	922	365	474
95	245	239	81	0	565	225	233
96	793	1,600	22	1,902	4,317	691	933
97	511	648	3	2,242	3,404	501	630
98	409	517	12	0	938	391	503
99	458	912	85	2,273	3,728	426	511
00	606	1,060	162	9,030	10,858	505	525
01	449	929	205	10,491	12,074	381	525

CRiS\ReturnPr

Attachment 15.—Age at Return of Carson National Fish Hatchery Spring Chinook Salmon.

Carson NFH Spring Chinook Age of Returns

Year	Age-2	Age-3	Age-4	Age-5	Age-6	Total
80		32	606	2,730		3,368
81		3	901	1,609		2,548
82		22	1,085	549		1,656
83		9	1,072	1,413		2,494
84		79	1,274	789	11	2,153
85		53	3,591	1,090		4,734
86		48	3,557	2,051		5,656
87		7	2,464	1,907		4,378
88		72	252	1,786		2,110
89		118	1,883	287	8	2,296
90		26	9,324	1,306		10,656
91		37	1,178	3,105	13	4,333
92		7	3,094	1,080	7	4,188
93		12	1,455	2,972		4,439
94		7	542	371	2	922
95		104	361	100		565
96		14	4,230	73		4,317
97		5	2,911	488		3,404
98		14	406	518		938
99		95	3,524	109		3,728
00		316	9,875	667		10,858
01		92	11,010	972		12,074

CRiS\AgePr

Attachment 16.—Smolt to Adult Survival of Carson National Fish Hatchery Spring Chinook Salmon, includes all Reported Recoveries (hatchery plus harvest), 1980-1996 Broods.



Attachment 17.—Fisheries Contribution of Spring Chinook Salmon from Carson National Fish Hatchery.



Attachment 18.—Budget by Funding Source and Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Personnel for Fiscal Years (FY) 2000 through 2002.

	FY 2000 Actual ($1,000)	FY 2001 Actual ($1,000)	FY 2002 Estimated ($1,000)
NOAA Fisheries	424.1	470.5	564.7
USFWS	23.6	23.7	0.0
Operations	447.7	494.2	564.7
Cyclical	5.2	5.2	0.0
Quarters	10.5	8.9	8.9
Flood	474.5	0.0	0.0
Spill control	8.3	4.0	0.0
MMS project list	0.0	115.0	328.0
Maintenance	498.5	133.1	336.9
Cost recoverables	424.1	470.5	564.7

	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002
FTE	6.75	7	7

Attachment 19.—Regional and National Calender for the Budget Formulation Process.

Regional Formulation Process	
November	Project Leaders complete FONS submissions, emphasizing projects related to ecoregion priorities, and forward to the Regional FONS Coordinator. Submissions are reviewed for completeness and clarity. Projects are then submitted to the relevant supervisors for ranking. ARD, Fisheries incorporate supervisor rankings and input, plus regional and national priorities to develop regional ranking recommendations. Regional Director reviews and approves/modifies regional ranking recommendations.
National Formulation Process	
February	Regional FONS submission to Service's Washington Office.
Mar/Apr	Assistant Director, Fisheries and Habitat Conservation and ARD, Fisheries review regional submissions and identify themes. Themes communicated to ARD, Fisheries, Regional Directors, and Director.
May/June	Regions use themes in the development of regional budget requests. Using FONS, project lists will be developed for each theme to be forwarded in the Regional Request.
June	The Service Budget Committee considers the Regional Requests in setting priorities for the Service's Budget Request to the Department.
June º Jan	As the Service's Budget Request moves through the approval process (Department of Interior and OMB review), ARD, Fisheries will be consulted to ensure that FONS lists still represent the highest priorities of the regions.
February	Presidents budget submitted to Congress including FONS projects for Fisheries Program increases.

Attachment 20.—Projects Submitted as of Fiscal Year 2001 which are Linked to Carson NFH Goals and Objectives.

Goal	Objective	Intended accomplishment	FONS project #	Cost ($1,000)
1	2	Most efficient use of fish rearing facilities to enhance unique spring Chinook in-river fishing opportunities.	1999-001	35
4	1 & 2	Increase public use of hatchery facilities while informing visiting publics of Fish and Wildlife Service activities.	1999-002	110
3	1	Enhanced survival and abundance of listed salmon in Washington.	1999-003	21
3	1	Restoration of ESA listed steelhead (threatened) in the Wind River.	2000-001	10
1 2	1 2 & 3	Development of a Station Development Plan which will make Carson NFH more effective in addressing the needs of fishers reaching conservation hatchery goals.	2001-02	25
1	2	Evaluate the energetic costs of passage and migrational delay, resulting from hydropower projects, on Columbia river adult spring Chinook salmon.	2002-001	4
1	1 & 2	Determine the effects of electrical anesthesia used during spawning activities on adult spawners, eggs, and juveniles	2002-002	4
1 (All)	1 (All)	Maximizing efforts of fisheries managers and biologists on resource issues by minimizing computer down time which is estimated at 2000 hours (50 weeks) per year for 6 stations	2002-003	18
3	1	Provide information to assist with the recovery of wild and listed fish in the Wind River.	2002-004	15
			Total:	242

Attachment 21.—Projects Submitted to FONS in 2001 by the Service's Columbia River Fisheries Program Office (Vancouver, Washington), Lower Columbia River Fish Health Center and Abernathy Fish Technology Center to Support Carson NFH which are Linked to Carson NFH Goals and Objectives.

Goal	Objective	Intended accomplishment	FONS project #	Cost ($1,000)
Columbia River Fisheries Program Office (Vancouver, Washington)				
3	1	Evaluate four National Fish Hatcheries to Improve Efficiency and Reduce Impacts to Wild Fish	1999-005	110
3	1	Ecological Interactions Between Hatchery and Wild fish in the Wind River, Washington	2002-001	150
3	1	Comprehensive Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans for National Fish Hatcheries	1999-006	20
			Total:	280
Lower Columbia River Fish Health Center				
3	1	Restoration of Endangered Steelhead in the Wind River, Washington	2000-002	51
1	1	Fisheries Resources Computer Management	2000-006	18
3	1	Ecological Interactions Between Hatchery and Wild fish in the Wind River, Washington	2002-002	18
			Total:	87
Abernathy Fish Technology Center				
1	1&2	Evaluate Electro Anesthesia Used in Sorting Fish During Spawning Activities	2001-009	66
3	1	Ecological Interactions Between Hatchery and Wild fish in the Wind River, Washington	2002-002	40
1	2	Energetic Costs of Spawning Migration and Reproductive Maturation in Columbia River Chinook salmon	2001-006	184
			Total:	290

Attachment 22.—MMS.

13215 **<File Missing>** FundSrc

SR: 5	CostEst: $107,000	**1993001**	DOMESTIC WATER LINES	R
RR: 888	CumOblig: $70,000	*<File Missing>*	%Cplt: 65%
NR: 1052	Backlog: $37,000	*<File Missing>*	
Fix type: Repair/Rehab			

Project approximately 70% completed - Need to complete a Small Water System Mgmt Plan. Rehab water supply - only available water source for domestic consumption. Coliform counts routinely exceed standards. Failure to improve system will result in giardia or other pathogen infection of hatchery employees, residents, and visitors.

13215 **<File Missing>** FundSrc

SR:	CostEst: $335,000	**1999002**	RACEWAYS	R
RR: 888	CumOblig: $293,000	*<File Missing> 46*	%Cplt: 87%
NR: 2068	Backlog: $42,000	*<File Missing>*	
Fix type: Repair/Rehab			

Project 60% complete - Will be completed in fall when remaining raceways empty. Reline 46 aging 40+year old 80' raceways. New lining will extend raceway life, promote fish health, and make cleaning easier, less costly, and more effective. Significant Pacific salmon restoration program affected by current state of disrepair.

13215 **<File Missing>** FundSrc

SR:	CostEst:	$60,000	
RR: 888	CumOblig:	$5,000	
NR: 2009	Backlog:	$0	
Fix type:	Repair/Rehab		

1999004 RESIDENCES R

<File Missing> 3 %Cplt: 100%

<File Missing>

Completed with FY2002 funds - Install hard wired smoke alarms and rewire three residences to assure safety of residents and comply with OSHA and fire codes.

13215 **<File Missing>** FundSrc

SR:	CostEst:	$46,000	
RR: 888	CumOblig:	$27,000	
NR: 1127	Backlog:	$0	
Fix type:	Repair/Rehab		

2000001 Chemical storage building R

<File Missing> 1 %Cplt: 100%

<File Missing>

Completed - Enlarge 15'X20' chemical storage building to provide a safe workplace for employees and to comply with OSHA Formalin storage standards. Current building does not meet code for this use; insufficient enclosed containers for combustibles, inadequate ventilation, etc. Chemical storage important to accomplishing mission of restoring Pacific salmon.

13215 <File Missing> FundSrc

SR:	CostEst:	$45,000	
RR: 888	CumOblig:	$42,000	
NR: 1004	Backlog:	$3,000	
Fix type:	Repair/Rehab		

2000003 Surplus adult pond R

<File Missing> 1 %Cplt: 93%

<File Missing>

Completed - Rehab adult salmon holding pond to facilitate surplus fish disposal. Modify fish crowder to include side crowder and fish lift. Potential for back injury due to current hand lifting very high with repetitive motion and heavy loads. Failure to remove surplus fish will imperil hatchery brood stock through consumption of limited water supply.

13215 <File Missing> FundSrc

SR: 6	CostEst:	$39,000	
RR: 888	CumOblig:	$0	
NR: 3030	Backlog:	$39,000	
Fix type:	Repair/Rehab		

2001001 Residences R

<File Missing> 3 %Cplt: 0%

<File Missing>

Rehab deteriorated plumbing in three residences. Plumbing is 60+ years old and is corroded such that leakages and blockages are becoming increasingly frequent. Iron supply lines are becoming occluded, shed rust and negatively impact taste and present chronic health concern.

13215 <File Missing> FundSrc

SR: 2	CostEst: $39,000	**2002001**	Service/Admin building drainlines	R
RR: 82	CumOblig: $0		*<File Missing> 1*	%Cplt: 0%
NR: 999	Backlog: $39,000		*<File Missing>*	
Fix type: Repair/Rehab				

Rehab drain lines (sink, compresor coolant, floor) to include oil/water separator. Drain lines empty directly into the Wind River in violation of WAC 90.48.080. Violation was noted in an Environmental Compliance Audit conducted 6/25/01. Potential for introducing oil from spills very high. The Wind River is home to threatened Steelhead.

13215 <File Missing> FundSrc

SR: 3	CostEst: $162,000	**2002003**	Storm drains	R
RR: 85	CumOblig: $0		*<File Missing> 1*	%Cplt: 0%
NR: 999	Backlog: $162,000		*<File Missing> 0.5*	
Fix type: Repair/Rehab				

Install oil/water separators in two storm water drains. Storm water from 50,000 square feet of asphalt public parking lot and hatchery access road drains directly into the Wind River in violation of WAC 90.48.080. The Wind River is home to listed steel head trout. Violation was noted in an Environmental Compliance Audit conducted 6/25/01.

13215 <File Missing> FundSrc

SR: 9	CostEst: $101,000	**2002004**	Rearing ponds, earthen	R
RR: 117	CumOblig: $0	*<File Missing> 2*	%Cplt: 0%
NR: 999	Backlog: $101,000	*<File Missing>*	
Fix type: Repair/Rehab			

Line two earthen ponds with gunite. Lining the ponds will prevent weed growth and fouling of the ponds without using herbicides. Also, recent outbreaks of botulism in fish in reared elswhere in earthen ponds underscores the potential for botulism outbreaks here. Botulism is extremly toxic to fish and other vertebrates including humans.

13215 <File Missing> FundSrc

SR: 1	CostEst: $24,000	**2002002**	Facility asphalt paving	R
RR: 137	CumOblig: $0	*<File Missing> 1*	%Cplt: 0%
NR: 999	Backlog: $24,000	*<File Missing> 0.5*	
Fix type: Repair/Rehab			

Seal 100,000 sq ft of asphalt paving throughout the facility to prevent deterioration and asphalt loss. The asphalt was placed in 1999 at a cost of $167,000 and is beginning to show signs of weather related deterioration. Sealing will protect the asphalt surface and extend the life of the asphalt many years.

13215 **<File Missing>** FundSrc

SR:	CostEst:	$25,000	
RR: 888	CumOblig:	$20,000	
NR: 9999	Backlog:	$0	
Fix type:	Replace		

1999009 1990 Ford pickup R

<File Missing> 1 %Cplt: 100%

<File Missing>

Done with FY 02 funds. - Replace aging '90 pickup w/ 4WD - has only 24K mi, but needs repeated repairs, very fuel inefficient02 funds. Style requested would better meet the station needs as it could also be used for snow removal. Pacific salmon restoration program will benefit from proper equipment. 10-yr old vehicle used extensively on station - low mi but worn.

13215 **<File Missing>** FundSrc

SR: 8	CostEst:	$10,000	
RR: 30	CumOblig:	$0	
NR: 5045	Backlog:	$10,000	
Fix type:	Replace		

1999006 INCUBATORS R

<File Missing> 5 %Cplt: 0%

<File Missing>

Replace trough incubation system w/vertical incubators to improve larval salmon incubation, reduce potential for employee back injuries related to trough incubation methodology. Eggs incubated in troughs held in stacks of 15 trays. Stacks are heavy, can only be lifted by bending over trough in awkward position in violation of all back injury protection guidlines.

13215 <File Missing> FundSrc

SR: 7	CostEst: $305,000	**1999001**	RACEWAYS R
RR: 37	CumOblig: $0		*<File Missing> 10* %Cplt: 0%
NR: 5077	Backlog: $305,000		*<File Missing>*
Fix type: Repair/Rehab			

Rehab predator exclosure over 10 raceways to provide cover for and prevent predation of important anadromous salmon; fish loss & bird borne diseases resulting from current conditions affect significant salmon restoration.

13215 <File Missing> FundSrc

SR: 4	CostEst: $108,000	**1992003**	FISH PROD/ADMIN BUILDING R
RR: 53	CumOblig: $31,000		*<File Missing> 2* %Cplt: 29%
NR: 6100	Backlog: $77,000		*<File Missing>*
Fix type: Repair/Rehab			

Rehab production/administration building to provide disabled access.. Remodel restrooms to include accessible stalls and sinks. Provide ramp access to incubation room. Remodel visitor center for access to administrative personnel. Current facilities not usable by mobility impaired persons.

13215 <File Missing> FundSrc

SR:	CostEst:	$19,000	
RR: 888	CumOblig:	$15,000	
NR: 4088	Backlog:	$0	
Fix type:	Repair/Rehab		

1999007 RESIDENCES Q

<File Missing> 1 %Cplt: 100%

<File Missing>

Completed with FY02 funds - Replace usafe energy inefficient windows in 1 duplex unit. Windows are single pane swing out type and do not meet fire codes for emergency egress. It is unlikely that a small child could escape through the exisitng windows. Employees are required to live on station to protect irreplaceable salmon stocks.

13215 <File Missing> FundSrc

SR:	CostEst:	$80,000	
RR: 888	CumOblig:	$24,000	
NR: 6026	Backlog:	$0	
Fix type:	Replace		

1999005 RESIDENCES Q

<File Missing> 3 %Cplt: 100%

<File Missing>

Done with 2002 funds - Replace 3 1940 era asbestos-sided garages. Garages are usable only for compact vehicles, rotting, large cracks in the foundations permit free acccess to rodents, and are unlighted creating safety issues. Asbestos is chipped, loose and cracked. Employees are required to live on station to protect irreplaceable salmon stocks.

Attachment 23.—Quarters Policy.

REGION 1
POLICY ON REQUIRED OCCUPANCY IN GOVERNMENT FURNISHED QUARTERS ON NATIONAL FISH HATCHERIES

INTRODUCTION

In order to carry out its mandated responsibilities, the Fish and Wildlife Service administers a variety of field offices and National Fish Hatcheries. At many of these National Fish Hatcheries, government owned residences are available to employees on a required occupancy basis. The determination of whether an employee must occupy Government Furnished Quarters as a condition of employment is made on a station-by-station, position-by-position, and residence-by-residence basis. In making the determination, supervisors will consider:

1. the dependability of the water supply systems;
2. adequacy of the alarm and call back systems;
3. response time needed to take emergency corrective actions; and
4. the adequacy of the security provided to protect fish, facilities, and equipment (See attached Optimum Protection Standards for National Fish Hatcheries in Region 1).

AUTHORITY

This policy is promulgated under authority of Public Law 88-459, Section 5 (5 USC 5911); Office of Management and Budget Circular A-18; Department of the Interior Property Management Regulation 114-51.302; Departmental Quarters Handbook, 400 DM; and the Fish and Wildlife Administrative Manual 23 AM 11.3.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to provide uniform guidance in the identification of required occupancy in government owned residences on National Fish Hatcheries, and to ensure consistency in those requirements throughout the Region. The Region will require occupancy of employees at specified hatcheries only when necessary services cannot be rendered or government property cannot be protected effectively and efficiently through means other than the presence of employees on the station. The policy provides for implementation of other methods of protection and security on hatcheries.

SCOPE

This policy is applicable to all National Fish Hatcheries in Region 1 where government owned residences exist on the effective date of this policy and where such residences are subsequently acquired or constructed.

POLICY

Required Occupancy -

It is the policy of the Region to require occupancy of key employees at specified National Fish Hatcheries where necessary services cannot be rendered or government property cannot be protected effectively and efficiently through means other than the presence of employees residing at the hatchery. Positions and residences assigned required occupancy status will be justified on the basis that the employee filling the position will be familiar enough with station operations to effectively handle emergencies.

The preferred staffing of required occupancy positions will be Project Leader, Assistant Project Leader, and Maintenanceman. However, these positions may vary from hatchery to hatchery based on the availability and capability of individual employees. In any case, the Project Leader will be ultimately responsible for ensuring the adequacy of protection for fish, facilities, and equipment.

Employees who perform work outside their tour of duty are entitled to appropriate compensation. Required occupancy will not be used in a manner which places restriction on the employee's freedom of movement regarding scheduled leave, non-work days, off duty hours, and similar benefits.

IMPLEMENTATION

In implementing and administering this policy, the following will apply:

Project Leaders

- Will initiate a review and determine the following:

  1. the dependability of the water supply;

  2. adequacy of existing alarm and call back systems;

  3. response time needed to take emergency corrective actions;

  4. the adequacy of security provided to protect fish, facilities, and equipment; and

  5. the availability of local housing for rent/purchase.

- Will initiate improvements in alarm systems, security, fencing, water supplies, etc., as soon as funding permits. If existing systems are inadequate to provide the required security and protection, make recommendations to the Associate Manager on the level of required occupancy needed on a station-by-station, position-by-position, and residence-by-residence basis.

- Will identify quarters to be made available for occupancy by other government agencies, or for rental to the general public (upon approval from the appropriate Assistant Secretary).

Associate Manager/Assistant Regional Director, Fisheries and Federal Aid

- Will review Project Leader recommendations on required occupancy.

- Will modify or approve Project Leader recommendations.

- Will require Project Leaders to annually review required occupancy status and to initiate actions to improve the adequacy of existing security systems (as funding permits).

Other

- Required occupancy status will be reviewed on an annual basis to address changes in station programs/missions, personnel, and available protection. Where it is determined that occupancy of Government Furnished Quarters is not required, the Project Leader must annually certify in writing to the Associate Manager/Assistant Regional Director, Fisheries and Federal Aid, that necessary services can be rendered and government property can be protected effectively and efficiently through means other than the presence of employees residing at the hatchery. This review and certification will be completed by November 1 of each calendar year.

- Where occupancy is required, it will be made a condition of employment and will be contained in the employee's position description and SF-50. In addition, a Form DI 1872, "Certification of Required Occupancy", will be completed. After concurrence by the Regional Director, the form will be forwarded to the Washington Office for final approval by the Director.

- By December 1 of each calendar year, a listing of those residences and positions which have been reapproved for required occupancy will be provided to the Director.

  Any new determinations for required occupancy or deletions from required occupancy will follow the procedures outlined in the "U.S. Fish and Wildlife Policy On Required Occupancy In Government Furnished Quarters".

This policy becomes effective when approved.

APPROVED:

_____ Date: _____

Regional Director

Attachment

Optimum Protection Standards
for
National Fish Hatcheries
in
Region 1

1. Maximum response time between the occurrence of a problem and initiation of corrective action - 20 minutes.

2. Perimeter fencing, fencing around, or gates to isolate critical and sensitive areas.

3. Lockable fuel dispensing stations with separate, isolated shut-off switch.

4. Outside lighting around office buildings, shop buildings, equipment/vehicle storage buildings, and other sensitive areas.

5. Centralized alarm system panel with individualized water and intrusion system status lights.

6. Alarm system capabilities must include: a pager system, minimum 30 mile radius range, with at least 3 active belt/pocket receivers (two additional receivers are to be available as replacement equipment). Also, at least one of the following should be included:

   - alarm sirens/bells (on station),
   - alarm indicator light/beacon (on station), and
   - telephone warning system, with roll-over feature.

7. Individualized water supply alarms (on each system and/or area used for incubation/rearing) which include:

   - flow or pressure alarms,
   - pond or headbox water high/low level alarms, and
   - equipment failure alarms (pumps on wells or reuse systems, pre-treatment, and post-treatment systems).

8. Power failure alarms.

9. Standby generator(s) with automatic start and transfer feature.

10. Building burglar alarms and broodstock pond intrusion alarms.

11. Smoke and/or heat sensing alarms in buildings and residences.

Attachment 24.—Quarters Plan.

Quarters Plan
Carson National Fish Hatchery
November 20, 2001

General Information

The housing at Carson NFH consists of three circa 1937 wood frame, three bedroom houses designated as Q 1, 2, &3 and two circa 1955 block construction, three bedroom duplex units designated as Q 37-1 & 2 and Q 39-1 & 2. Quarters 1, 2, and 39-1 & 2 are generally reserved for station personnel. Quarters 2 and 37-1 & 2 are currently excess to station needs. However, Quarters 2 has been designated as historically significant by Cultural Resources and an attempt to have it removed was thwarted. It is currently rented to a US Geological Survey Willard Laboratory employee. Quarters 37-1 has been used in recent years to provide housing for student and other volunteers. This program has been very successful providing much needed volunteer help in the busy summer months and, most recently, during the winter months. The savings to the government have more than offset the costs of maintaining the unit.

The intent of having personnel living in government quarters at Carson NFH is to provide station security and operations during non-duty hours. Mechanical systems to regulate water flows must be maintained immediately to prevent loss of valuable fish stocks. Additional security protection of government owned property is provided by occupants especially when anadromous broodstock are present. The isolated setting of Carson NFH combined with potential inaccessibility during sever snowstorms precludes adequate protection by other than required housing.

Required housing at present is limited to the station manager, the assistant station manager, and a fish culturist. The job descriptions of the required tenants are less critical to the safety of fish stocks than is the number of tenants required to live on station. Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, employees cannot be required to be at home in government owned quarters without compensation. Since there is no viable mechanism for compensating the employees, the presence of someone at home in government owned quarters and available to respond immediately to a water alarm or other emergency is left to chance. Increasing the number of people living on station increases the probability that someone will be available for emergency response. Therefore, the minimum number required to provide a reasonable prospect of protection is three. Whether the person is management, maintenance, or production personnel is not critical. Most alarm situations at Carson NFH can be managed with a leaf rake. In the event the problem cannot be solved by the responder, maintenance or other staff can be called in for assistance.

Assignment of Quarters

The assignment of quarters shall be done in accordance with Chapter 8, Department of the Interior Departmental Quarters Handbook (DQM)(400 DM Addition to IPMR 06/02/94).

Assignment Priorities: Assignment of quarters shall follow the priorities in the order listed below.

88. Required Occupants.

89. Other Station Personnel, including contractors and essential cooperators.

90. Volunteers. Must meet requirements of paragraph 8.1C DQH 400 DM.

91. Other Bureaus. Employees of other Interior bureaus.

92. Other Agencies. Employees of other Federal Agencies.

93. Non-Federal Tenants. See paragraph 5.2 DQH.

Maintenance

The station manager has final approval authority over all quarters maintenance. Quarters maintenance needs are reported to the station manger for inclusion into the prioritization process. Quarters deficiencies affecting safety or health are given top priority, followed by weatherization and structural needs. The station manager meets with the assistant manager and maintenance personnel at the beginning of the fiscal year to determine major deficiencies and prioritize repairs.

Attachment 25.—Surplus Fish as Government Property.

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
911 NE. 11th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232-4181

IN REPLY REFER TO:
AFR

JUL 10 2001

Memorandum

To: Fishery Project Leaders

From: Regional Director, Region 1
Portland, Oregon

Anne Badgley

Subject: Surplus Fish as Government Property

The Hatchery system in Region 1 is currently enjoying success with increasing returns of adult fish. This success is due in no small part to the dedication of Service Fisheries employees who have worked tirelessly to ensure the Hatchery system produces quality fish. However, it is important that all Service employees honor the public trust placed in them as stewards of the Nation's resources and administrators of public property.

With this memorandum I want to emphasize that live fish entering a National Fish Hatchery (Hatchery), whole fish carcasses or their parts, are Government property and cannot be converted for personal use, even temporarily on loan. Misuse of Government property may result in disciplinary action ranging from a written reprimand to removal from the Service. The attached Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch, contained in 5 CFR 2635.704, specifically address use of Government property. Please review and be acquainted with these standards. Also, please ensure that all your employees read and understand this memorandum.

It is important that you first consider all possible uses of hatchery fish that are consistent with the Service Mission. Surplus fish must be disposed of using prescribed government contracting procedures. Furthermore, you must comply with other Service and FDA policies related to the disposition of carcasses and parts that have been treated with chemicals making them unfit for human consumption. Should you have any questions regarding this policy, please contact the Assistant Regional Director, Fishery Resources, through your supervisor.

Attachment

performance of his official duties does not give rise to an appearance of use of public office for private gain or of giving preferential treatment, an employee whose duties would affect the financial interests of a friend, relative or person with whom he is affiliated in a nongovernmental capacity shall comply with any applicable requirements of § 2635.502.

(e) *Use of terms of address and ranks.* Nothing in this section prohibits an employee who is ordinarily addressed using a general term of address, such as "The Honorable", or a rank, such as a military or ambassadorial rank, from using that term of address or rank in connection with a personal activity.

§ 2635.703 Use of nonpublic information.

(a) *Prohibition.* An employee shall not engage in a financial transaction using nonpublic information, nor allow the improper use of nonpublic information to further his own private interest or that of another, whether through advice or recommendation, or by knowing unauthorized disclosure.

(b) *Definition of nonpublic information.* For purposes of this section, *nonpublic information* is information that the employee gains by reason of Federal employment and that he knows or reasonably should know has not been made available to the general public. It includes information that he knows or reasonably should know:

(1) Is routinely exempt from disclosure under 5 U.S.C. 552 or otherwise protected from disclosure by statute, Executive order or regulation;

(2) Is designated as confidential by an agency; or

(3) Has not actually been disseminated to the general public and is not authorized to be made available to the public on request.

Example 1: A Navy employee learns in the course of her duties that a small corporation will be awarded a Navy contract for electrical test equipment. She may not take any action to purchase stock in the corporation or its suppliers and she may not advise friends or relatives to do so until after public announcement of the award. Such actions could violate Federal securities statutes as well as this section.

Example 2: A General Services Administration employee involved in evaluating proposals for a construction contract cannot disclose the terms of a competing proposal to a friend employed by a company bidding on the work. Prior to award of the contract, bid or proposal information is nonpublic information specifically protected by 41 U.S.C. 423.

Example 3: An employee is a member of a source selection team assigned to review the proposals submitted by several companies in response to an Army solicitation for spare parts. As a member of the evaluation team, the employee has access to proprietary information regarding the production methods of Alpha Corporation, one of the competitors. He may not use that information to assist Beta Company in drafting a proposal to compete for a Navy spare parts contract. The Federal Acquisition Regulation in 48 CFR parts 3, 14 and 15 restricts the release of information related to procurements and other contractor information that must be protected under 18 U.S.C. 1905 and 41 U.S.C. 423.

Example 4: An employee of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission inadvertently includes a document that is exempt from disclosure with a group of documents released in response to a Freedom of Information Act request. Regardless of whether the document is used improperly, the employee's disclosure does not violate this section because it was not a knowing unauthorized disclosure made for the purpose of furthering a private interest.

Example 5: An employee of the Army Corps of Engineers is actively involved in the activities of an organization whose goals relate to protection of the environment. The employee may not, other than as permitted by agency procedures, give the organization or a newspaper reporter nonpublic information about long-range plans to build a particular dam.

§ 2635.704 Use of Government property.

(a) *Standard.* An employee has a duty to protect and conserve Government property and shall not use such property, or allow its use, for other than authorized purposes.

(b) *Definitions.* For purposes of this section:

(1) *Government property* includes any form of real or personal property in which the Government has an ownership, leasehold, or other property interest as well as any right or other intangible interest that is purchased with Government funds, including the services of contractor personnel. The term includes office supplies, telephone and other telecommunications equipment and services, the Government mails, automated data processing capabilities, printing and reproduction facilities, Government records, and Government vehicles.

(2) *Authorized purposes* are those purposes for which Government property is made available to members of the public or those purposes authorized in accordance with law or regulation.

Example 1: Under regulations of the General Services Administration at 41 CFR 101-35.201, an employee may make a personal long distance call charged to her personal calling card.

Example 2: An employee of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission whose office computer gives him access to a commercial service providing information for investors may not use that service for personal investment research.

Example 3: In accordance with Office of Personnel Management regulations at part 251 of this title, an attorney employed by the Department of Justice may be permitted to use her office word processor and agency photocopy equipment to prepare a paper to be presented at a conference sponsored by a professional association of which she is a member.

[57 FR 35042, Aug. 7, 1992, as amended at 62 FR 48748, Sept. 17, 1997]

§ 2635.705 Use of official time.

(a) *Use of an employee's own time.* Unless authorized in accordance with law or regulations to use such time for other purposes, an employee shall use official time in an honest effort to perform official duties. An employee not under a leave system, including a Presidential appointee exempted under 5 U.S.C. 6301(2), has an obligation to expend an honest effort and a reasonable proportion of his time in the performance of official duties.

Example 1: An employee of the Social Security Administration may use official time to engage in certain representational activities on behalf of the employee union of which she is a member. Under 5 U.S.C. 7131, this is a proper use of her official time even though it does not involve performance of her assigned duties as a disability claims examiner.

Example 2: A pharmacist employed by the Department of Veterans Affairs has been granted excused absence to participate as a speaker in a conference on drug abuse sponsored by the professional association to which he belongs. Although excused absence granted by an agency in accordance with guidance in chapter 630 of the Federal Personnel Manual allows an employee to be absent from his official duties without charge to his annual leave account, such absence is not on official time.

(b) *Use of a subordinate's time.* An employee shall not encourage, direct, coerce, or request a subordinate to use official time to perform activities other than those required in the performance of official duties or authorized in accordance with law or regulation.

Example 1: An employee of the Department of Housing and Urban Development may not ask his secretary to type his personal correspondence during duty hours. Further, directing or coercing a subordinate to perform such activities during nonduty hours constitutes an improper use of public office for private gain in violation of § 2635.702(a). Where the arrangement is entirely voluntary and appropriate compensation is paid, the secretary may type the correspondence at home on her own time. Where the compensation is not adequate, however, the arrangement would involve a gift to the superior in violation of the standards in subpart C of this part.

Subpart H—Outside Activities

§ 2635.801 Overview.

(a) This subpart contains provisions relating to outside employment, outside activities and personal financial obligations of employees that are in addition to the principles and standards set forth in other subparts of this part. Several of these provisions apply to uncompensated as well as to compensated outside activities.

(b) An employee who wishes to engage in outside employment or other outside activities must comply with all relevant provisions of this subpart, including, when applicable:

(1) The prohibition on outside employment or any other outside activity that conflicts with the employee's official duties;

(2) Any agency-specific requirement for prior approval of outside employment or activities;

(3) The limitations on receipt of outside earned income by certain Presidential appointees and other noncareer employees;

(4) The limitations on paid and unpaid service as an expert witness;

(5) The limitations on participation in professional organizations;

(6) The limitations on paid and unpaid teaching, speaking, and writing; and

Attachment 26.—Drugs and Anesthetics.

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
911 NE. 11th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232-4181

IN REPLY REFER TO:
AFR

NOV - 9 2000

Memorandum

To: Region 1 Fisheries Project Leaders

From: Assistant Regional Director, Fishery Resources

Subject: Guidance on Clove Oil and Other Fisheries Use Drugs and Chemicals

Hatcheries and other Fisheries offices within Region 1 may at times have legitimate and necessary reasons to use certain drugs and chemicals to achieve their goals and complete the mission and objectives of the Service. During the capture, rearing, or monitoring of fish species, several drugs and chemicals are used for anesthesia, disease treatments, or to increase the survival of the animals. Some of these compounds are already registered and labeled for fisheries use. Others may be legally used under the prescription and supervision of a veterinarian, or within the protocols of an existing Investigational New Animal Drug (INAD) exemption permit issued by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The Service has existing correspondence (see attached copy) from the FDA concerning the use of compounds in the recovery of threatened and endangered species, but there are certain restrictions even in those situations.

This document is intended to review the use of aquatic animal drugs for Fisheries Projects and provide guidance on their proper use in food animals. Attached are summaries of drugs and chemicals that are approved for aquatic animal use, considered Low Regulatory Priority for use in aquiculture, on the deferred regulatory list for aquiculture, and INAD permitted chemicals. Also attached are the FDA criteria for veterinary extra label use of approved human and animal drugs and a glossary of terms commonly used by FDA and others involved with the use of drugs and chemicals.

Region 1, working closely with the National INAD Office (NIO) and through appropriate consultation with FDA, will fully comply with all regulations and agreements for the use of aquatic drugs and chemicals. The inappropriate use of compounds on fish or aquatic animals intended for human or animal consumption is prohibited.

The use of clove oil as an anesthetic in food fish has been declared illegal by the Center for Veterinary Medicine (CVM) of the FDA. Until notified otherwise by the CVM, a fish is a food fish if it is reasonably likely that it will be consumed directly or indirectly by humans for food. Non-food fish salmon, steelhead, or trout are those to be rendered, buried, or released to the wild where they are not subject to harvest in legal fisheries. If a fish to be treated is not a food fish, then clove oil can be used as an anesthetic. However, juvenile fish cannot be anesthetized using

clove oil because of possible residual effects[1] (this excludes listed fish which are not harvested in legal fisheries as adults). If fish anesthetized with clove oil are rendered, the rendering plant operator who receives the fish must be notified in writing of this treatment; the same is true for MS-222 if its established 21-day withdrawal period is not observed. If the fish is outplanted, the Service must be assured that it will not be harvested in a legal fishery. These situations will be treated on a case-by-case basis and will need written approval from the Assistant Regional Director, Fishery Resources. Please notify your supervisor if you feel you have a non-food fish that would be appropriate for clove oil treatment.

The Service believes that its mission and goals can be achieved within the existing framework of allowable drug and chemical use, but recognizes the pressing needs for additional safe and effective drugs to facilitate recovery and restoration efforts. The Service continues to support the efforts of the National INAD Office, fisheries professionals, and the FDA by supplying data and working towards the registration and labeling of new chemotherapeutic compounds.

Attachment 1: Letter from FDA on the use of drugs in Threatened and Endangered Species
Attachment 2: Form TE-1, "Guide for Reporting Shipment/Receipt of Unapproved Drugs for Use on Threatened and Endangered Fish Species," and Form TE-2, "Chemical Use Log for the Use of Unapproved Drugs on Threatened and Endangered Fish Species."
Attachment 3: List of FDA Approved Compounds for Use in Aquatic Animals
Attachment 4: FDA Compliance Policy Guide 1240.4200: Drug use in Aquiculture Enforcement Priorities. Includes the lists of compounds FDA considers to be of Low Regulatory Priority, Deferred Regulatory Priority, and High Regulatory Priority for enforcement
Attachment 5: List of FDA INAD Permitted compounds and their sponsors
Attachment 6: FDA Compliance Policy Guide 1240.4210 Extralabel Use of Approved Drugs in Aquiculture
Attachment 7: Glossary of terms frequently encountered in chemotherapeutic compound registration and use.
Attachment 8: Clove oil fact sheet
Attachment 9: FDA Compliance Policy Guide 1240-4260: Classification of Aquaculture Species/Population as Food or Nonfood Animal
Attachment 10: Use of Unapproved Drugs in Culturing Endangered and Threatened Fish Species (02/06/96)
Attachment 11: Use of Unapproved Drugs in Culturing Endangered and Threatened Fish Species (03/04/96)

---

[1]If a drug is not covered by an INAD exemption permit it has no established withdrawal period, or more precisely, the drug must be considered to be present in a residual form into adulthood when it is subject to harvest in a legal fishery. On the other hand, juvenile fish exposed to MS-222 or drugs under an INAD exemption permit that have an FDA-specified withdrawal time could be stocked immediately following treatment, as this period of time would elapse before the fish could be legally harvested.

cc:
Fisheries Line Supervisors (Dunn, Johnson, Hillwig, Zylstra)
Ed Forner, Chief, Hatcheries
Dave Erdahl, USFWS, Bozeman, Montana
Joy Evered, USFWS, Olympia FHC

Attachment 27.—Fisheries Pest Management Policy.

AFR

JAN - 3 2001

Memorandum

To: Fishery Project Leaders

From: Assistant Regional Director, Fishery Resources SIGNED BY DANIEL H. DIGGS

Subject: Fisheries Pest Management Policy

It is Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) policy to eliminate unnecessary use of pesticides by implementing integrated pest management techniques and by selecting crops and other vegetation that are beneficial to fish and wildlife but do not require pesticides. The ultimate goal is to eliminate pesticide use on Service lands and facilities and to encourage pest management programs that benefit trust resources and provide long-term, environmentally sound solutions to pest management problems on sites which are off Service lands.

When pesticides are used, they must be part of a pest management program that includes strategies to reduce and eventually eliminate their use. The program must be set forth in an Integrated Pest Management Plan which will be a part of the Comprehensive Hatchery Management Plan and must include consideration of target specificity of the pesticide (insecticide, fungicide, herbicide, etc.), risk to nontarget organisms, incidental reduction of food resources for trust species, persistence, control and prevention of the spread of fish and wildlife diseases, and other environmental hazards.

Land management practices must have high value for fish and wildlife resources, not encourage the exposure to pathogens or development of disease vectors that affect fish or wildlife resources, and they must utilize minimal or no hazardous chemicals. Internal endangered species review, including Section 7 consultation, must be completed for all pest management activities that may affect threatened or endangered species.

Endangered Species Act

Service personnel must be trained in integrated pest management. Those personnel who apply pesticides on Service lands must comply with the provisions of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act and the Endangered Species Act, Department and Service policy, and other applicable laws and regulations. All pesticides must be registered and may only be used in accordance with the pesticide label. Leftover pesticides, rinse water, and empty containers must be disposed of properly. All personnel involved with integrated pest and weed management on and off Service lands must participate in medical surveillance on an annual basis. This program is paid for by the Service from the Field Station budget. Instructions on medical surveillance will be issued in a separate memorandum. All pesticides labeled as

James 1/3/01
J. Slate 1-3-01
D. Stuffelbeam 1/3/01
1/2/01
12/22/00
Tom Brown
12/21/00
12-21-00
J. Anderson

"Restricted Use" and "Non-restricted Use" must be applied under the supervision of a certified Pesticide Applicator who holds a current and applicable State certification.

All proposed uses of pesticides and biological control agents, in quantities greater than general household use, on Service lands, facilities or in Service-funded projects will undergo review at the Regional and, if required, at the Departmental level. The exception is projects involving uses of disinfection agents for control of fish and wildlife pathogens and a few other minor exceptions. The Administrative Manual, 30 AM 12, attached, is the latest regulation on this topic and is to be used until new Service regulations are issued. The mechanism used to submit your plan (pesticide, biological controls, and other integrated, sustainable practices, such as herbicide use) for approval is called the PUP, or Pesticide Use Proposal. This request must be submitted at least 30 days prior to use to the Regional Office for review by the Regional Integrated Pest Management Coordinator in Refuges and Wildlife, with a copy to the Assistant Regional Director, Fishery Resources, and will be forwarded to the Washington Office if necessary. A blank PUP form is attached for your use.

If you have any questions, please call Chuck Eggleston at (503) 872-2763, or Scott Stenquist, the Regional Integrated Pest Management Coordinator in National Wildlife Refuges-Operations, at (503) 231-6172.

Attachments

CEggleston:jpa December 21, 2000
D:\MyFiles\WPDOCS\A-Contaminants\Pest Management\Pest Mgt Policy Memo to PL-partial for print only.wpd

AFR

Memorandum

To: Fishery Project Leaders

From: Assistant Regional Director, Fishery Resources

Subject: Fisheries Pest Management Policy

It is Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) policy to eliminate unnecessary use of pesticides by implementing integrated pest management techniques and by selecting crops and other vegetation that are beneficial to fish and wildlife but do not require pesticides. The ultimate goal is to eliminate pesticide use on Service lands and facilities and to encourage pest management programs that benefit trust resources and provide long-term, environmentally sound solutions to pest management problems on sites which are off Service lands.

When pesticides are used, they must be part of a pest management program that includes strategies to reduce and eventually eliminate their use. The program must be set forth in an Integrated Pest Management Plan which will be a part of the Comprehensive Hatchery Management Plan and must include consideration of target specificity of the pesticide (insecticide, fungicide, herbicide, etc.), risk to nontarget organisms, incidental reduction of food resources for trust species, persistence, control and prevention of the spread of fish and wildlife diseases, and other environmental hazards.

Land management practices must have high value for fish and wildlife resources, not encourage the exposure to pathogens or development of disease vectors that affect fish or wildlife resources, and they must utilize minimal or no hazardous chemicals. Internal endangered species review, including Section 7 consultation, must be completed for all pest management activities that may affect threatened or endangered species.

Service personnel must be trained in integrated pest management. Those personnel who apply pesticides on Service lands must comply with the provisions of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act and the Endangered Species Act, Department and Service policy, and other applicable laws and regulations. All pesticides must be registered and may only be used in accordance with the pesticide label. Leftover pesticides, rinse water, and empty containers must be disposed of properly. All personnel involved with integrated pest and weed management on and off Service lands must participate in medical surveillance on an annual basis. This program is paid for by the Service from the Field Station budget. Instructions on medical surveillance will be issued in a separate memorandum. All pesticides labeled as

MEM 12/22/00
12/22/0
Jon O'Brien
C A Egglston for
12/21
12-21-00
J. Anderson

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

BOR . . . . . Bureau of Reclamation
BPA . . . . . Bonneville Power Administration
CHMP . . . . . Comprehensive Hatchery Management Plan
COE . . . . . Corps of Engineers
CRIS . . . . . Columbia River information System
CRITFC . . . . . Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
CRFPO . . . . . Columbia River Fisheries Program Office
CWT . . . . . Coded-Wire Tag
DNR . . . . . Department of Natural Resources
ESA . . . . . Endangered Species Act
ESU . . . . . Ecologically Significant Unit
FIS . . . . . Fisheries Information System
FONS . . . . . Fisheries Operations Needs System
FTE . . . . . Full Time Equivalent
HGMP . . . . . Hatchery and Genetic Management Plan
IHOT . . . . . Integrated Hatchery Operations Team
MMS . . . . . Maintenance Management System
NFH . . . . . National Fish Hatchery
NMFS . . . . . National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA Fisheries . . . . . also known as NMFS or National Marine Fisheries Service
. . . . . National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce
ODFW . . . . . Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
PAC . . . . . Production Advisory Committee
PIT . . . . . Passive Integrated Transponder
PNFHPC . . . . . Pacific Northwest Fish Health Protection Committee
Service . . . . . United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
TAC . . . . . Technical Advisory Committee
USFWS . . . . . United States Fish and Wildlife Service (Service)
WDFW . . . . . Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
YN . . . . . Yakama Nation