

**Snake River Salmon Draft Recovery Plan  
Public Comment Summary -- “Content comments”**

#	Source	Comment	Reference	Plan
1	Clarkston workshop	Cost for Whitman County to implement, specifically related to roads	Implementation	Public Summary
2	Clarkston workshop	Who determines what needs to be done to address threats	Implementation	Public Summary
3	Clarkston workshop	Will counties be required to update land use plans	Implementation	Public Summary
4	Clarkston workshop	Concerned about EDT analysis: it is in contradiction to what local knowledge says about Asotin Creek – habitat is in good enough shape to achieve viability	Recovery goals and targets/ Asotin Creek	Public Summary
5	Clarkston workshop	Concerned about EDT analysis: NOAA will want supplementation in Asotin Creek. Not in favor of supplementation	Recovery goals and targets / Asotin Creek	Public Summary
6	Clarkston workshop	Concerned that proposed projects in Asotin Creek will be lower ranked because analysis says that habitat improvements won't meet targets	Recovery goals and targets / Asotin Creek	Public Summary
7	Clarkston workshop	How extensive will monitoring be and who is responsible for it?	Implementation	Public Summary
8	Clarkston workshop	The recovery plan should communicate what successful recovery efforts have accomplished and show what salmon recovery looks like (model watersheds, projects, etc.)	Description Actions	Public Summary
9	Walla Walla Workshop	The plan did not cover Bull Trout in detail	General	Public Summary
10	Walla Walla Workshop	How to the target numbers compare to the number of returning fish 50 years ago?	Recovery goals and targets	Public Summary
11	Walla Walla Workshop	What is the connection back to fish populations in Table 14?	Actions	Public Summary
12	Walla Walla Workshop	Recovery treatments need to be tied to individual watershed to ensure recovery actions are done in the right place	Actions	Public Summary
13	Walla Walla Workshop	How should the plan be interpreted? Are the numbers for treatments (acres direct seeded, amount of woody debris, etc.) exact or “ball park?”	Actions	Public Summary
14	Walla Walla Workshop	Don't do more CRP: it is twice as expensive as direct seed, and direct seeding keeps land in production	Actions	Public Summary

15	Walla Walla Workshop	The plan needs to set priorities for actions	Actions	Public Summary
16	Walla Walla Workshop	What is the difference between integrated hatcheries and segregated hatcheries?	General	Public Summary
17	Walla Walla Workshop	Protecting banks from erosion on the Lower Touchet, Dry Creek , and Lower Walla Walla should have higher priority than tree planting (trees will be washed out unless bank is protected first)	Strategies/ Walla Walla watershed	Public Summary
18	Walla Walla Workshop	Why are reservoirs behind dams described as shallow? (p. 7)	Description	Public Summary
19	Walla Walla Workshop	Maps in chapter 3 need to be improved	Assessment	Public Summary
20	Walla Walla Workshop	Will the plan include Oregon?	General	Public Summary
21	Walla Walla Workshop	In Table 14, why do some items have no costs?	Implementation	Public Summary
22	Walla Walla Workshop	Will there be a cost figure for the Mill Creek MSA through Walla Walla (Table 14)?	Implementation	Public Summary
23	Walla Walla Workshop	What about converting annual/perennial crops?	Actions	Public Summary
24	Walla Walla Workshop	Why isn't Touchet Steelhead achieving viability?	Goals and planning targets/Touchet River MSA	Public Summary
25	Walla Walla Workshop	Which portion of the Touchet River has the greatest habitat problems (upper or middle)?	Factor affecting viability/Touchet River MSA	Public Summary
26	Walla Walla Workshop	Can you request that the EDT analysis be rerun?	Goals and planning targets	Public Summary
27	Walla Walla Workshop	The unit costs for irrigation conversion seem high	Implementation	Public Summary
28	Walla Walla Workshop	On Table 14, do you account for total costs, or is it a subsidized portion?	Implementation	Public Summary
29	Walla Walla Workshop	The leasing and purchasing costs in Table 14 don't make sense if it is on an annual basis	Implementation	Public Summary
30	Walla Walla Workshop	Costs need to be apples to apples	Implementation	Public Summary

31	Walla Walla Workshop	In Table 14 recharge numbers for Walla Walla and Mill Creek should not be the same	Implementation	Public Summary
32	Walla Walla Workshop	Water rights: if any were purchased in Mill Creek they would have to be from the City of Walla Walla, as Mill Creek only has 4cfs.	Implementation	Public Summary
33	Walla Walla Workshop	To what extent will local governments be obligated to implement these strategies	Planning strategies/implementation	Public Summary
34	Walla Walla Workshop	Aquifer recharge: is there an explanation for how the shallow aquifer was considered in developing actions	Actions	Public Summary
35	Walla Walla Workshop	The plan needs to better define actions	Actions	Public Summary
36	Walla Walla Workshop	The local control of the regions' salmon recovery plan provides a good checks and balances with the federal agencies. Local knowledge comes through in thee plan	General	Public Summary
37	Walla Walla Workshop	Caution about putting too much emphasis on numbers as they can be manipulated to suit just about any need	General	Public Summary
38	Walla Walla Workshop	Unsure about what Table 15 says. Does it suggest that minor priority areas need not apply for project funding?	Implementation	Public Summary
39	Walla Walla Workshop	From a local perspective Yellowhawk Creek is a priority area, but the plan seems to indicate it is not important. It should not be left out just because of unknowns	Planning Strategies	Public Summary
40	Walla Walla Workshop	Dry Creek is a contributor of sediments	Factors affecting viability	Public Summary
41	Walla Walla Workshop	Effectiveness monitoring: lacking in definition; we need to know if what we are doing is effective	Implementation	Public Summary
42	Walla Walla Workshop	Monitoring can go too far and can consume too many resources and dollars	Implementation	Public Summary
43	Walla Walla Workshop	Reforestation timberlands: aren't there already laws that require reforestation timberlands?	Planning strategies	Public Summary
44	Walla Walla Workshop	Implementation structure: how do all the planning entities work together to implement the plan	Implementation	Public Summary
45	Walla Walla Workshop	To what degree is Walla Walla Watershed obligated to implement recovery on its own?	Implementation/ Walla Walla Watershed	Public Summary
46	Walla Walla Workshop	Concern that this level of planning is getting further from "on the ground" actions	General	Public Summary

47	Walla Walla Workshop	Would like to see more geographic specificity at a smaller scale	General	Public Summary
48	Walla Walla Workshop			Public Summary
49	Written comment (1)	Clarify the location and purpose of the two non-Snake River dams (p. 7)	Description	Public Summary
50	Written comment (1)	On figure 8 Deadman Creek should be "colored"	Salmonid Assessment	Public Summary
51	Written comment (1)	On Figure 10 are George, Couse, and Ten Mile Creeks marked correctly for steelhead distribution	Salmonid Assessment	Public Summary
52	Written comment (1)	How is Meadow Creek meshed with Deadman Creek when Meadow Creek has never been eligible for salmon recovery funding because it has no steelhead?	Salmonid Assessment	Public Summary
53	Written comment (1)	Figure 21: why is Pataha and Deadman/Meadow listed as an MSA when Tucannon only has enough habitat to support about 1500 fish?	Recovery targets and goals	Public Summary
54	Written comment (1)	Why is the Pataha listed for and MSA for Spring Chinook and the Tucannon not listed for Fall Chinook?	Salmonid Assessment	Public Summary
55	Written comment (1)	Should the Pataha be highlighted for restoration and protection?	Salmonid Assessment	Public Summary
56	Written comment (1)	Shouldn't the primary and secondary factors (p. 34) be the basis for the imminent threats listed on p. 57?	Factors affecting viability	Public Summary
57	Written comment (1)	How come secondary factors on page 35 are not listed as primary? Deadman needs a lot of work. Where is Alpowa Creek on this list?	Factors affecting viability	Public Summary
58	Written comment (1)	On page 49, last sentence of paragraph two: I don't like the definition of protection	Planning strategies	Public Summary
59	Written comment (1)	Pataha Creek should be listed for protection and restoration	Planning strategies	Public Summary
60	Written comment (1)	Why aren't Pataha or Alpowa on the list in table 10 and why is Deadman in the protection only category?	Planning strategies	Public Summary
61	Written comment (1)	In table 11, why don't the critical uncertainties related back to the primary and secondary factors listed in Table 7?	Action	Public Summary
62	Written comment (1)	How can there be no costs associated with a number of the identified upland action in Table 14 for the Deadman/Penewawa MSA?	Actions	Public Summary

63	Written comment (1)	Table 14: Why is there such a difference between the Deadman/Penewawa MSA and other MSAs' for cost/acre for direct seed?	Actions	Public Summary
64	Written comment (1)	Table 14: Under riparian actions, why is the unit for CREP-like program in cfs in Deadman/Penewawa MSA instead of acres like other MSAs'	Actions	Public Summary
65	Written comment (1)	Table 14: In Deadman/Penewawa MSA, why is there only 5 acres listed for controlling noxious weeds in riparian areas?	Actions	Public Summary
66	Written comment (1)	Table 14: It seems like there is too much emphasis for no till work and not enough emphasis on riparian work in the Deadman/Penewawa MSA.	Actions	Public Summary
67	Written comment (1)	The budget needs further input from your technical committee to ensure more money is spent in riparian areas (in Pomeroy District).	Actions	Public Summary
68	Written comment (1)	The Northfork of Deadman Creek could be productive due to spring generated flows and wetlands, and so should be tagged for restoration actions	Actions	Public Summary
69	Written comment (2)	Should the Columbia River be added to the list of rivers in the first paragraph on page 6?	Description	Public Summary
70	Written comment (2)	In the first sentence of the second paragraph of page 28, it is not safe to assume that native tribes did not impact the "natural state." The same goes for the last sentence of 4 on page 28	Factors affecting availability	Public Summary
71	Written comment (2)	In the first full paragraph of page 36, terns should be mentioned as impacting fish survival	Factors affecting availability	Public Summary
72	Written comment (2)	Actions will deal with habitat only	Planning strategies	Public Summary
73	Written comment (2)	How is the hatchery strategy in section 6.3 part of this plan?	Planning strategies	Public Summary
74	Written comment (2)	Related to section 8.3, changes that show significant smolt to adult ratio are needed to validate habitat successes	Actions	Public Summary
75	Written comment (3)	Page 7, paragraphs 3 and 4: Are there other streams within the region that are substantially affected by irrigation and is irrigation the primary use of water?	Description	Public Summary
76	Written comment (3)	Section 5.1, Figure 18, page 40, the following sentences should be removed from this location and added at the end of the very last paragraph in Section 5.1, page 45,  "Figures 18 and 19 show general viability curves for steelhead in the Snake and Mid-Columbia ESUs and spring/summer Chinook in the Snake River ESU. Figures 20 through 26 present the viability curves for each of the steelhead and spring/summer Chinook populations considered for recovery actions within the recovery region. No viability curves have been developed by ICTRT for fall Chinook to date."	Recovery Goals and Planning Targets	Public Summary
77	Written comment	Section 7.1, Table 13, page 55 - "should there be Asotin MSAs?"	Actions	Public Summary

	(3)			
78	Written comment (3)	Section 7.1, Table 15, page 62 - "should Couse Creek in Asotin County be added to table?"	Actions	Public Summary
79	Written comment (4)	Section 5.1, Table 9, page 45, in reference to the note "a" – "Isn't the Wenaha the Lower Grande Ronde Population?"	Recovery Goals and Planning Targets	Public Summary
80	Written comment (4)	Table 2.2 should include information on WDFW lands*	Description	Public Summary
81	Written comment (4)	Is the quoted amount of privately owned land (1,268 acres) in Walla Walla County correct?*	Description	Full document
82	Written comment (4)	Need to add the Schlee, Bickford, and other land purchases to the list of land owned by the WDFW on page 16. There is about 43,000 acre of WDFW land in Asotin County.*	Description	Full document
83	Written comment (4)	Delete "elk" from the first paragraph of section 2.3.2 on page 23. There were no elk before they were introduced. Add "Rocky Mountain Big Horn Sheep" on the same section and page.*	Description	Full document
84	Written comment (4)	The last two sentences of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph of section 2.3.2 on page 23 should read "Lower Asotin Creek has been straightened, diked, or channelized (Stovall et al. 2001). The <i>Asotin Creek Model Watershed Plan</i> was the 1 <sup>st</sup> plan of its kind completed in the State of Washington that dealt with habitat enhancement for ESA listed salmonids and was funded by Bonneville Power Administration and implemented by the Asotin County Conservation District."*	Description	Full document
85	Written comment (4)	In the first sentence of the third paragraph under the heading "Water Availability" on page 29, replace the word "Forks" with "mouth".*	Description	Full document
86	Written comment (4)	On figure 3.1 add Hells Canyon Snake – starts at confluence with Clearwater and Snake and goes upstream into Idaho and Oregon.*	Salmonid Assessment	Full document
87	Written comment (4)	Add "Tenmile" and "Couse" to the list of creeks in the first and second sentences of the first paragraph on page 108.*	Salmonid Assessment	Full document
88	Written comment (4)	Figure 3-14 (Steelhead presence in the Asotin Basin): distribution for Couse and Tenmile is not highlighted on the maps.*	Salmonid Assessment	Full document
89	Written comment (4)	Delete "and from Headgate Dam to the confluence of the north and south forks (RM 9.1 to 15.2)" from the fourth sentence of the second paragraph under the "Asotin Creek heading" on page 113. *	Salmonid Assessment	Full document
90	Written comment (5)	The Board should present policy recommendations with respect to harvest of salmon and steelhead produced in the Snake River Region but harvested in lower river fisheries. The Board should not advise harvest managers on harvest levels or seasons but rather force a policy decision by NOAA and the agencies with respect to harvest allocations making them equitable across the Columbia basin.	General	Full document
91	Written comment (5)	All of the maps except that of the State of Washington need to be standardized in format and scale. The detail is not sufficient to "see" specific areas. Perhaps maps specific to each MSA would be beneficial so the	General	Public Summary

		implementers and policy makers can see specifically where the areas are.		
92	Written comment (5)	The Actions table (Table 14) needs to be validated against actual implementation costs within each MSA and then annualized or standardized somehow so we can see cost per unit per year. The values need to be standardized for total project (A&E, implementation costs plus donated) or just reported as the cost to the “tax payer” for the public’s investment in the action.	Actions	Public Summary
93	Written comment (5)	The Action table (Table 14) would be more useful if parsed out into each MSA so the reader can see a map of the geographic area, the priority in that area and the actions that the Plan suggests. This would provide greater specificity for the implementation phase.	Actions	Public Summary
94	Written comment (5)	The range of goals in the viability curves need to be described in the public summary document.	Recovery goals and planning targets	Public Summary
95	Written comment (5)	A description of how the public was involved is provided on page 4 but is too general to illustrate the magnitude of efforts to engage the public.	Introduction	Public Summary
96	Written comment (5)	Pataha Creek could never have supported 500 salmon and likely not even 500 steelhead. The Board should make a policy decision to remove the Pataha as an MSA. If so, Figure 14 needs adjusted to remove Pataha Creek	Assessment	Public Summary
97	Written comment (5)	The characterization of historic vegetation on Page 29 is too generous as it is unlikely that cottonwood groves were as dense as reported otherwise Lewis and Clark would have been able to find fire wood on their journey down the Snake (the trees would have annually washed into the Snake and deposited on point bars between Tri-Cities and the Gorge).	Factors affecting viability	Public Summary
98	Written comment (5)	The plan needs to include an inventory of accomplishments because it feels like nothing has been done yet but we all know that we are nearly done in some areas (screens, passage barriers) in some areas.	General	Public Summary
99	Written comment (5)	Table 8 shows flow as a primary limiting factor for the Tucannon and this should be a secondary factor based on the prioritized strategies for this MSA.	Factors affecting viability	Public Summary
100	Written comment (5)	Page 36 – the FCRSP dams do, not may, affect the region’s fish.	Factors affecting viability	Public Summary
101	Written comment (5)	The mortality for the hydro system is reported at 50% and this is incorrect based on the USACOE web site which reports it from 2-5% per dam. This mortality should be reported for each population because the WW	Factors affecting viability	Public Summary

		only goes through 4 dams while the Tucannon goes through 6 and the Asotin goes through		
102	Written comment (5)	Page 36 needs to include tribal harvest and commercial harvest as additional forms of harvest mortality.	Factors affecting viability	Public Summary
103	Written comment (5)	The viability curves should include the adult to smolt productivity for each population and not just the adult to adult productivity.	Recovery goals and planning targets	Public Summary
104	Written comment (5)	Page 37 first paragraph should include Protected marine mammals in addition to Caspian terns.	Factors affecting viability	Public Summary
105	Written comment (5)	Page 38 – it says the only listed population significantly impacted by ocean fisheries is fall Chinook. Can you quantify this for fall Chinook and the other species?	Factors affecting viability	Public Summary
106	Written comment (5)	The vision statement in Section 5 is OK but the next paragraph implies the vision is to meet recovery goals. While this may be an outcome of the vision statement, it is not explicitly stated in the vision. As I read the vision, the Board wants to restore habitat conditions to support fish populations and one outcome will hopefully be recovery. The paragraph that follows the vision statement should include: restoring and protecting habitat to improve fish populations	Recovery goals and planning targets	Public Summary
107	Written comment (5)	The Asotin MSA prioritized habitat factors are not reported in Table 13	Actions	Public Summary
108	Written comment (5)	There is no viability curve in Section 5.1 for Asotin Steelhead	Recovery goals and planning targets	Public Summary
109	Written comment (6)	The plan should distinguish between deep and shallow aquifer recharge.	Actions	Public Summary
110	Written comment (6)	There is 4 cfs shown coming from Mill Creek. Comment was made that this must mean a lease from the City. There is no lease. The 4 cfs is actually less than the 5 cfs we are planning on under our proposal to enhance stream flows; however, our 5 cfs is only for a single month.	Actions	Public Summary
111	Written comment (6)	There is no obligation to implement the plan. Walla Walla County will be supporting submittal of the plan, but will not “adopt” the plan.	Implementation	Public Summary
112	Written comment (6)	The plan needs a description of aquifer recharge activities.	Actions	Public Summary
113	Written comment (6)	How will funding flow to Yellowhawk Creek?	Implementation	Public Summary
114	Written comment (6)	Uncertainties associated with Mill Creek mean it probably won’t be funded.	Implementation	Public Summary
115	Written comment (6)	It seems as if this plan is related only to obtaining SRF Board funding.	Implementation	Public Summary

116	Written comment (6)	Can you clarify why the “transboundary recovery plan” that was originally requested was apparently not approved?	General	Public Summary
117	Written comment (6)	The valley needs a master plan that encompasses all of the plans being prepared either by identifying an existing planning effort or stepping back and creating a separate coordinating/policy direction document. This is the Master Plan document and we should officially identify it as such in all related planning documents, including this one. In general the City of Walla Walla supports the Salmon Recovery Plan to the extent that its elements are informed by and are not counter to the objectives and elements of the Watershed Plan once finalized and approved by the City.	General	Public Summary
118	Written comment (7)	Page 7, 5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph: development pressure has also impaired the riparian zone	Description	Public Summary
119	Written comment (7)	Page 7, bottom of the page: the hatcheries also produce resident trout for catch and release	Description	Public Summary
120	Written comment (7)	Page 8: The Captain John acclimation facility is operated by the Nez Perce Tribe	Description	Public Summary
121	Written comment (7)	Table 8: the Tucanon from Pataha to Marengo must have more than just key habitat quantity as a primary limiting factor for steelhead (seems like there are more)	Factors affecting viability	Public Summary
122	Written comment (7)	Table 8 page 35: it identifies fish passage as a primary factor for bull trout but we can't think of any barriers in the mainstem Tucannon River	Factors Affecting Viability	Public Summary
123	Written comment (7)	Page 43 viability curves: it seems odd that Touchet Steelhead are not viable	Recovery goals and planning targets	Public Summary
124	Written comment (7)	Page 66, Section 8.1: the conservation districts do not provide money for implementation but the Conservation Commission does	Implementation	Public Summary
125	Written comment (8)	The total units column that seem high are over the horizon of the plan (15 Years). If the title of the Table 14 is going to be Annual Costs for Actions, it is my opinion we have to have the yearly costs in all the columns. I was totally confused and the dollar amounts don't reflect the annual costs, but our estimated costs over the lifespan (15 Years) of the plan.	Actions	Public Summary
126	Written comment (9)	The Walla Walla River from the Mill Creek Confluence to the Dry Creek Confluence was considered in the Walla Walla Subbasin Plan as a protection priority. This is stated in the text on page 62 of the May version of the Walla Walla subbasin plan. However, there was an oversight and it did not show up on the map. Will this been corrected in the Southeast Washington Salmon Plan? I do not see that reach listed on page 51 of the plan.	Planning strategies	Public Summary
127	Written comment (9)	It is not clear to me whether you are, or are not, including hatchery steelhead in the Walla Walla summer Steelhead viability analysis.	Recovery goals and planning targets	Public Summary
128	Written comment (10)	Section 1, page 3: We discussed that the Plan will be a working document when presented to the State. I realize that you discuss the adaptive nature after the final plan delivery statement, but should we state the final	Introduction	Public Summary

		<b>draft</b> will be delivered to the State since we have a fix-it loop?		
129	Written comment (10)	Section 3, figure 11: As a member of the Bull Trout Recovery Plan Team I know that there are sightings of bull trout as far down the Walla Walla as McDonald Road east of Lowden, but I do not remember there being statements regarding bull trout to the mouth of the Touchet.	Salmonid Assessment	Public Summary

\*= comment from “full” version of the draft plan