

MITCHELL ACT HATCHERY DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (DEIS)

Council Staff has developed a draft list of potential questions, the answers to which may be useful to the ad hoc Mitchell Act Committee in developing recommendations for Council consideration at the November Council meeting. Recognizing that many agencies represented at the Council may be conducting concurrent reviews of the DEIS, candidates to answer questions are shown with the goal of not assigning questions to Council advisory bodies or Council staff that might be duplicative of that already planned by other entities. The Council should confirm questions and assignment expectations as a guidance and direction under Agenda Item C.3.d.

1. Has the science used in the analysis of impacts been peer reviewed, and is there agreement with the States and Tribes that it represents the best available science? (WA, OR, Tribes, AK)
2. Are the mitigation requirements and responsibilities under the Mitchell Act adequately described in the DEIS? (WA, OR, Tribes, AK)
3. What are the other alternatives that meet the purpose and need of the proposed action that were not included in the DEIS? (USFWS)
4. Can hatchery reform concepts other than proportion hatchery origin spawners (pHOS) and proportion natural origin broodstock (pNOB), such as natural rearing strategies, be used to develop alternatives that meet the purpose and need of the DEIS but maintain more production than Alternatives 3-5? (Tribes, AK, OR, WA)
5. What fisheries are assumed in the analysis to be mark-selective, and at what point in time? (OR, WA, Tribes, AK)
6. Were Native American tribes engaged in government to government consultations in development of the DEIS, including the four Washington coastal treaty tribes and the four Columbia River treaty tribes? (Tribes)
7. Are the impacts to all ocean fisheries in areas under management authority of the Pacific Council, the Pacific Salmon Commission, and the State of Alaska included in the analysis of each alternative in DEIS (harvest impacts to individual fishery strata, socioeconomic impacts, and the environmental justice analyses)? (STT)
 - If not, what is the list of fisheries not included and what is the relationship of Mitchell Act hatchery production with those fisheries? (STT)
8. Are impacts in all Columbia River basin fisheries included in the DEIS, including tributary C&S and recreational fisheries? (Tribes, OR, WA)
9. Is production from all Columbia Basin hatcheries included in the analysis? (USFWS)

10. Is the methodology describing economic impacts complete and proper, including consistent metrics? For example, are there more appropriate indices of fishery value that should be used rather than ex-vessel value? (SSC)
11. Were expected benefits to fisheries from increased wild production included in the economic analyses? (WA, OR, Tribes, AK)
12. Were current fishery and hatchery management agreements used to estimate impacts (e.g., *US v Oregon*, PST Chinook Annex, *US v Washington*, *Hoh v Baldrige*, etc.)? (WA, OR, Tribes, AK)
13. Were impacts to commitments in the PST, *US v Oregon*, *US v Washington*, *Hoh v Baldrige* properly described in the DEIS? (WA, OR, Tribes, AK)
14. Are there relevant sources of information omitted from socioeconomic analysis? (SSC)
15. Is the temporal scale of the impact assessment adequate? (WA, OR, Tribes, AK)
16. Are the natural salmon populations targeted for restoration appropriately identified? (Council Staff)
17. Recognizing recent changes in the hatchery practices that have already occurred, what is the period used to decide the status quo alternative? (OR)
18. Are the DEIS alternatives consistent with adopted state recovery plans? (OR, WA, ID)

PFMC
09/14/10