


D. ELOCHOMAN & SKAMOKAWA SUBBASINS



D. ELOCHOMAN & SKAMOKAWA SUBBASINS

D.1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
D.1.1. Key Priorities	5
D.2. BACKGROUND	8
D.3. ASSESSMENT	9
D.3.1. Subbasin Description	9
D.3.2. Focal and Other Species of Interest.....	13
D.3.3. Watershed Habitat Conditions	28
D.3.4. Stream Habitat Limitations	32
D.3.5. Watershed Process Limitations	53
D.3.6. Other Factors and Limitations	59
D.3.7. Summary of Human Impacts on Salmon and Steelhead	68
D.4. KEY PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS	70
D.4.1. Federal Programs	70
D.4.2. State Programs.....	71
D.4.3. Local Government Programs	72
D.4.4. Non-governmental Programs	72
D.4.5. Tribal Programs.....	73
D.4.6. NPCC Fish & Wildlife Program Projects	73
D.4.7. Washington Salmon Recovery Funding Board Projects	73
D.5. MANAGEMENT PLAN	74
D.5.1. Vision.....	74
D.5.2. Biological Objectives	75
D.5.3. Integrated Strategy	75
D.5.4. Tributary Habitat.....	76
D.5.5. Priority Areas, Limiting Factors and Threats.....	77
D.5.6. Hatcheries	98
D.5.7. Harvest	106
D.5.8. Hydropower	109
D.5.9. Mainstem and Estuary Habitat	109
D.5.10. Ecological Interactions	109
D.6. REFERENCES	110

Tables

Table D-1.	Status of focal salmonid and steelhead populations in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed.....	13
Table D-2.	Elochoman Population productivity, abundance, and diversity (of both smolts and adults) based on EDT analysis of current (P or patient) and historical (T or template) ¹ habitat conditions.....	34
Table D-3.	Skamokawa Creek— Population productivity, abundance, and diversity (of both smolts and adults) based on EDT analysis of current (P or patient) and historical (T or template) habitat conditions.	34
Table D-4.	Summary of the primary limiting factors affecting life stages of focal salmonid species. Results are summarized from Elochoman River EDT Analysis.	44
Table D-5.	Summary of the primary limiting factors affecting life stages of focal salmonid species. Results are summarized from Skamokawa Creek EDT Analysis.	45
Table D-6.	IWA results for the Skamokawa-Elochoman Watershed	55
Table D-7.	Current Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed hatchery production.	60
Table D-8.	Preliminary BRAP for hatchery programs affecting populations in the Elochoman/Skamokawa River Watershed.	61
Table D-9.	Preliminary strategies proposed to address risks identified in the BRAP for Elochoman/Skamokawa River populations.	61
Table D-10.	Approximate annual exploitation rates (% harvested) for naturally-spawning lower Columbia salmon and steelhead under current management controls (represents 2001-2003 fishing period).	65
Table D-11.	Productivity improvements consistent with biological objectives for the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed.....	76
Table D-12.	Salmonid habitat limiting factors and threats in priority areas. Priority areas include the upper Skamokawa and tributaries (US), Wilson Creek (WC), lower Elochoman and tributaries (LE), and the upper Elochoman and tributaries (UE). Linkages between each threat and limiting factor are not displayed – each threat directly and indirectly affects a variety of habitat factors.	79
Table D-13.	Rules for designating reach tier and subwatershed group priorities. See Biological Objectives section for information on population designations.	80
Table D-14.	Reach Tiers in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed.....	81
Table D-15.	Prioritized measures for the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed.	84
Table D-16.	Habitat actions for the Elochoman/Skamokawa Basin.	94
Table D-17.	Summary of potential natural production and fishery enhancement strategies to be implemented in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed.....	98
Table D-18.	A summary of conservation and harvest strategies with potential implementation through Elochoman River Hatchery programs.	100
Table D-19.	Potential hatchery implementation actions in the Elochoman Subbasin.	102
Table D-20.	Summary of regulatory and protective fishery actions in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watersheds	107
Table D-21.	Regional harvest actions with significant application to the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed populations.	108

Figures

Figure D- 1. Map of the Elochoman and Skamokawa subbasins..... 4

Figure D-2. Landownership within the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed. Data is WDNR data that was obtained from the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP). 11

Figure D-3. Land cover within the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed. Vegetation cover (pie chart) derived from Landsat data based on methods in Lunetta et al. 1997. Mapped data was obtained from the USGS National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD)..... 12

Figure D-4. Elochoman River hydrograph (1962-1971)..... 28

Figure D-5. Adult abundance of Elochoman fall Chinook, winter steelhead, chum and coho based on EDT analysis of current (P or patient) and historical (T or template) habitat conditions. .. 35

Figure D-6. Adult abundance of Skamokawa fall Chinook, chum, winter steelhead and coho based on EDT analysis of current (P or patient) and historical (T or template) habitat conditions. .. 35

Figure D-7. Elochoman / Skamokawa Watershed with EDT reaches identified. For readability, not all reaches are labeled. 37

Figure D-8. Elochoman fall Chinook ladder diagram..... 38

Figure D-9. Elochoman chum ladder diagram..... 38

Figure D-10. Elochoman coho ladder diagram..... 39

Figure D-11. Elochoman River Watershed winter steelhead ladder diagram..... 40

Figure D-12. Skamokawa fall Chinook ladder diagram..... 41

Figure D-13. Skamokawa chum ladder diagram..... 41

Figure D-14. Skamokawa coho ladder diagram..... 42

Figure D-15. Skamokawa Watershed winter steelhead ladder diagram. 43

Figure D-16. Elochoman subbasin fall Chinook habitat factor analysis diagram. 46

Figure D-17. Elochoman coho habitat factor analysis..... 47

Figure D-18. Elochoman River Watershed winter steelhead habitat factor analysis diagram. 48

Figure D-19. Elochoman subbasin chum habitat factor analysis diagram. 49

Figure D-20. Skamokawa subbasin fall Chinook habitat factor analysis diagram..... 50

Figure D-21. Skamokawa subbasin chum habitat factor analysis diagram..... 50

Figure D-22. Skamokawa coho habitat factor analysis. 51

Figure D-23. Skamokawa winter steelhead habitat factor analysis. 52

Figure D-24. Map of the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed showing the location of the IWA subwatersheds. 56

Figure D-25. IWA subwatershed impairment ratings by category for the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed..... 56

Figure D-26. Magnitude and timing of hatchery releases in the Deep River, Grays River, and Elochoman basins by species, based on 2003 brood production goals. 59

Figure D-27. Recent average hatchery returns and estimates of natural spawning escapement in the Deep, Grays, and Elochoman River basins by species..... 60

Figure D-28. Relative contribution of potentially manageable impacts on Elochoman/Skamokawa salmonid populations..... 69

Figure D-29. Flow chart illustrating the development of subbasin measures and actions..... 77

Figure D-30. Reach tiers and subwatershed groups in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed. 82

D.1. Executive Summary




Figure D- 1. Map of the Elochoman and Skamokawa subbasins.

This Plan describes a vision, strategy, and actions for recovery of listed salmon, steelhead, and trout species to healthy and harvestable levels, and mitigation of the effects of the Columbia River hydropower system in Washington lower Columbia River subbasins. Recovery of listed species and hydropower mitigation is accomplished at a regional scale. This plan for the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed describes implementation of the regional approach within these stream systems, as well as assessments of local fish populations, limiting factors, and ongoing activities that underlie local recovery or mitigation actions. The plan was developed in a partnership between the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB), Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NPCC), federal agencies, state agencies, tribal nations, local governments, and others.

The Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed consists of the Elochoman River, Skamokawa Creek, and nearby smaller tributaries to the Columbia River. The watershed is located within the Elochoman Subbasin as defined by the Northwest Power and Conservation Council. The Elochoman Subbasin is one of twelve NPCC subbasins in the Washington portion of the Lower Columbia Region. The Elochoman River and Skamokawa Creek historically supported thousands of fall Chinook, chum, coho and winter steelhead. Today, numbers of naturally spawning salmon and steelhead have plummeted to levels far below historical numbers. Chinook, coho, and chum have been listed as Threatened under the Endangered Species Act. The decline has occurred over decades and the reasons are many. Freshwater and estuary habitat quality has been reduced by agricultural and forestry practices. Key habitats have been isolated or eliminated by dredging and channel modifications and diking, filling, or draining floodplains and wetlands. Altered habitat conditions have increased predation. Competition and interbreeding with domesticated or non-local hatchery fish has reduced productivity. Hydropower operation on the

Columbia has altered flows, habitat, and migration conditions. Fish are harvested in fresh and saltwater fisheries.

The Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed is particularly important to regional recovery of salmon and steelhead because it is one of two major basins in the coastal portion of the ESU.

Elochoman/Skamokawa salmon and steelhead will need to be restored to a high level of viability to meet regional recovery objectives. This means that the populations are productive, abundant, exhibit multiple life history strategies, and utilize significant portions of the basin.

In recent years, agencies, local governments, and other entities have actively addressed the various threats to salmon and steelhead, but much remains to be done. One thing is clear: no single threat is responsible for the decline in these populations. All threats and limiting factors must be reduced if recovery is to be achieved. An effective recovery plan must also reflect a realistic balance within physical, technical, social, cultural and economic constraints. The decisions that govern how this balance is attained will shape the region's future in terms of watershed health, economic vitality, and quality of life.

This plan represents the current best estimation of necessary actions for recovery and mitigation based on thorough research and analysis of the various threats and limiting factors that impact Elochoman/Skamokawa fish populations. Specific strategies, measures, actions and priorities have been developed to address these threats and limiting factors. The specified strategies identify the best long term and short term avenues for achieving fish restoration and mitigation goals. While it is understood that data, models, and theories have their limitations and growing knowledge will certainly spawn new strategies, the LCFRB is confident that by implementation of the recommended actions in this plan, the population goals in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed can be achieved. Success will depend on implementation of these strategies at the program and project level. It remains uncertain what level of effort will need to be invested in each area of impact to ensure the desired result. The answer to the question of precisely how much is enough is currently beyond our understanding of the species and ecosystems and can only be answered through ongoing monitoring and adaptive management against the backdrop of what is socially possible.

D.1.1. Key Priorities

Many actions, programs, and projects will make necessary contributions to recovery and mitigation in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed. The following list identifies the most immediate priorities.

1. Manage Forest Lands to Protect and Restore Watershed Processes

The majority of the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed is managed for commercial timber production and has experienced intensive past forest practices activities. Proper forest management is critical to fish recovery. Past forest practices have reduced fish habitat quantity and quality by altering stream flow, increasing fine sediment, and degrading riparian zones. Effects have been magnified due to high rainfall and erodible soils. In addition, forest road culverts have blocked fish passage in small tributary streams. Effective implementation of new forest practices through the Department of Natural Resources' Habitat Conservation Plan (state lands) and Forest Practices Rules (private lands) are expected to substantially improve conditions by restoring passage, protecting riparian conditions, reducing fine sediment inputs, lowering water temperatures, improving flows, and restoring habitat diversity. Improvements will benefit all species, particularly winter steelhead and coho.

2. Restore Lowland Floodplain Function, Riparian Function, and Stream Habitat Diversity

The lower and middle mainstem Elochoman River, middle mainstem Skamokawa Creek, and Wilson Creek (Skamokawa tributary) are used for agriculture or rural residences. Levee construction and bank

stabilization have heavily impacted fish habitat in these areas. Removing or modifying channel control and containment structures to reconnect the stream and its floodplain will restore normal habitat-forming processes to reestablish habitat complexity, off-channel habitats, and conditions favorable to fish spawning and rearing. These improvements will be particularly beneficial to chum, fall Chinook, and coho. Normal floodplain functions will also help control downstream flooding and provide wetland and riparian habitats critical to other fish, wildlife, and plant species. Existing floodplain function and habitats will be protected through local land use ordinances, partnerships with landowners, and the acquisition of land, where appropriate. Restoration will be achieved by working with willing landowners, non-governmental organizations, conservation districts, and state and federal agencies.

3. Manage Growth and Development to Protect Watershed Processes and Habitat Conditions

The human population in the watershed is relatively low, but it is projected to grow by at least one third in the next twenty years. The local economy is also in transition with reduced reliance on forest products, fisheries, and farming. Population growth will primarily occur in lower river valleys and along the major stream corridors. This growth will result in the conversion of forestry and agricultural land uses to residential uses, with potential impacts to habitat conditions. Land-use changes will provide a variety of risks to terrestrial and aquatic habitats. Careful land-use planning will be necessary to protect and restore natural fish populations and habitats and will also present opportunities to preserve the rural character and local economic base of the watershed.

4. Restore Passage at Culverts and Other Artificial Barriers

As many as 10 miles of potentially accessible habitat are blocked by culverts or other barriers (approximately 8 barriers total). The water intake dam for the hatchery on Beaver Creek may limit access and passage issues and opportunities there should be further investigated. Passage restoration projects should focus on cases where it can be demonstrated that there is good potential benefit and reasonable project costs. Further assessment and prioritization of passage barriers is needed throughout the watershed.

5. Address Immediate Risks with Short-term Habitat Fixes

Restoration of normal watershed processes that allow a basin to restore itself over time has proven to be the most effective strategy for long term habitat improvements. However, restoration of some critical habitats may take decades to occur. In the near term, it is important to initiate short-term fixes to address current critical low numbers of some species. Examples in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed include building chum salmon spawning channels and constructing coho overwintering habitat such as alcoves, side channels, and log jams. Benefits of structural enhancements are often temporary but will help bridge the period until normal habitat-forming processes are reestablished.

6. Align Hatchery Priorities with Conservation Objectives

Hatcheries throughout the Columbia Basin historically focused on producing fish for fisheries as mitigation for hydropower development and widespread habitat degradation. Emphasis of hatchery production without regard for natural populations can pose risks to natural population viability. Hatchery priorities must be aligned to conserve natural populations, enhance natural fish recovery, and avoid impeding progress toward recovery while continuing to provide some fishing benefits. The Elochoman River hatchery program will produce and/or acclimate fall Chinook, winter steelhead, and coho for use in the Elochoman Subbasin. Chum and coho will be used to supplement natural production in appropriate areas of the basin and adjacent tributary streams, develop a local broodstock to reestablish historical diversity and life history characteristics, and also to provide fishing enhancement in a manner that does not pose significant risk to natural population rebuilding efforts. The hatchery

also acclimates and releases a temporally-segregated hatchery winter steelhead run to mitigate for reduced fishing opportunities on the wild population in the interim until natural productivity is restored.

7. Manage Fishery Impacts so they do not Impede Progress toward Recovery

This near-term strategy involves limiting fishery impacts on natural populations to ameliorate extinction risks until a combination of measures can restore fishable natural populations. There is no directed Columbia River or tributary harvest of ESA-listed Elochoman/Skamokawa salmon and steelhead. This practice will continue until the populations are sufficiently recovered to withstand such pressure and remain self-sustaining. Some Elochoman/Skamokawa salmon and steelhead are incidentally taken in mainstem Columbia River and ocean mixed stock fisheries for strong wild and hatchery runs of fall Chinook and coho. These fisheries will be managed with strict limits to ensure this incidental take does not threaten the recovery of wild populations including those from the Elochoman and Skamokawa. Steelhead and chum will continue to be protected from significant fishery impacts in the Columbia River and are not subject to ocean fisheries. Selective fisheries for marked hatchery steelhead and coho (and fall Chinook after mass marking occurs) will be a critical tool for limiting wild fish impacts. State and federal legislative bodies will be encouraged to develop funding necessary to implement mass-marking of fall Chinook, thus enabling a selective fishery with lower impacts on wild fish. State and federal fisheries managers will better incorporate Lower Columbia indicator populations into fisheries impact models.

8. Reduce Out-of-Subbasin Impacts so that the Benefits of In-Subbasin Actions can be Realized

Elochoman and Skamokawa salmon and steelhead are exposed to a variety of human and natural threats in migrations outside of the subbasin. Human impacts include drastic habitat changes in the Columbia River estuary, effects of Columbia Basin hydropower operation on mainstem, estuary, and nearshore ocean conditions, interactions with introduced animal and plant species, and altered natural predation patterns by northern pikeminnow, birds, seals, and sea lions. A variety of restoration and management actions are needed to reduce these out-of-basin effects so that the benefits in-subbasin actions can be realized. Owing to its close proximity, estuary habitat improvements, including restoration of wetlands, will be particularly critical to Elochoman and Skamokawa salmonid populations. To ensure equivalent sharing of the recovery and mitigation burden, impacts in each area of effect (habitat, hydropower, etc.) should be reduced in proportion to their significance to species of interest.

D.2. Background

This plan describes a vision and framework for rebuilding salmon and steelhead populations in Washington's Elochoman River and Skamokawa Creek Watersheds. The plan addresses subbasin elements of a regional recovery plan for Chinook salmon, chum salmon, coho salmon, steelhead, and bull trout listed as Threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). The plan also serves as the Subbasin Plan for the Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NPCC) Fish and Wildlife Program to address effects of construction and operation of the Federal Columbia River Power System.

Development of this plan was led and coordinated by the Washington Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB). The LCFRB was established by state statute (RCW 77.85.200) in 1998 to oversee and coordinate salmon and steelhead recovery efforts in the lower Columbia region of Washington. It is comprised of representatives from the state legislature, city and county governments, the Cowlitz Tribe, private property owners, hydro project operators, the environmental community, and concerned citizens. A variety of partners representing federal agencies, tribal governments, Washington state agencies, regional organizations, and local governments participated in the process through involvement on the LCFRB, a Recovery Planning Steering Committee, planning working groups, public outreach, and other coordinated efforts.

The planning process integrated four interrelated initiatives to produce a single Recovery/Subbasin Plan for Washington subbasins of the lower Columbia:

- Endangered Species Act recovery planning for listed salmon and trout.
- Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NPCC) fish and wildlife subbasin planning for eight full and three partial subbasins.
- Watershed planning pursuant to the Washington Watershed Management Act, RCW 90-82.
- Habitat protection and restoration pursuant to the Washington Salmon Recovery Act, RCW 77.85.

This integrated approach ensures consistency and compatibility of goals, objectives, strategies, priorities and actions; eliminates redundancy in the collection and analysis of data; and establishes the framework for a partnership of federal, state, tribal and local governments under which agencies can effectively and efficiently coordinate planning and implement efforts.

The plan includes an assessment of limiting factors and threats to key fish species, an inventory of related projects and programs, and a management plan to guide actions to address specific factors and threats. The assessment includes a description of the watershed, focal fish species, current conditions, and evaluations of factors affecting focal fish species inside and outside the watershed. This assessment forms the scientific and technical foundation for developing a vision, objectives, strategies, and measures for the watershed. The inventory summarizes current and planned fish and habitat protection, restoration, and artificial production activities and programs. This inventory illustrates current management direction and existing tools for plan implementation. The management plan details biological objectives, strategies, measures, actions, and expected effects consistent with the planning process goals and the corresponding subbasin vision.

D.3. Assessment

D.3.1. Subbasin Description

Topography & Geology

Streams in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed originate in the Willapa Hills in southwest Lewis County, northeast Cowlitz County, and Wahkiakum County and flow generally south to the Columbia. The watershed area is approximately 163 mi². From west to east, the stream systems include Jim Crow Creek, Skamokawa Creek, Brooks Slough, the Elochoman River, and Birnie Creek. The highest elevation lies at the head of the Elochoman watershed at 2,673 feet and the lowest is near sea level on the Columbia. The surface geology is a combination of volcanic and sedimentary materials. Less than 20% of the soils are classified as highly erodible.

Climate

The watershed has a typical northwest maritime climate. Summers are dry and cool and winters are mild, wet, and cloudy. Most precipitation falls between October and March, with mean annual precipitation ranging from 45-118 inches with an average mean of 70-85 inches. Snowfall is light and transient owing to the relative low elevation and moderate temperatures. Less than 10% of the watershed area is within the rain-on-snow zone or higher (WDNR data).

Land Use, Ownership, and Cover

Forestry is the predominant land use in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed. Considerable logging occurred in the past without regard for riparian and instream habitat, resulting in sedimentation of salmonid spawning and rearing habitat (WDF 1990). Nearly 0% of the forest cover is in late-seral stages, however, as the forest matures, watershed conditions are recovering. Agriculture and residential land use is located along lower alluvial stream segments of the Elochoman River and Skamokawa Creek. Skamokawa and Cathlamet are the two largest population centers. The watershed is primarily in private ownership, as shown in the following chart. The bulk of the private land is industrial forestland and road densities are high. The extent of the road network has important implications for watershed processes such as flow generation, sediment production, and contaminant transport. The State of Washington owns, and the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) manages the beds of all navigable waters within the subbasin. Any proposed use of those lands must be approved in advance by the DNR. A breakdown of land ownership and land cover/land use in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed is presented in Figure D-2 and Figure D-3.

A broad agricultural valley extends up the mainstem Skamokawa, West Fork Skamokawa, and Wilson Creek. There are considerable agricultural impacts to fish habitat in these areas, which suffer from non-forested riparian zones and disconnected floodplains. Chum, fall Chinook, and coho utilize these lower valley reaches and are therefore heavily impacted by agricultural land-uses. The upper reaches of the mainstem and all major tributaries are impacted most heavily by forest harvest and the forest road network. Winter steelhead and coho occupy upper watershed reaches, and are therefore affected most by forest practices. A similar land-use pattern can be found in the Elochoman watershed, with the exception being that the agricultural valley is found primarily only along the mainstem. The species effects are also similar, with agricultural uses having the greatest impact on chum and fall Chinook and forest practices having the greatest effect on winter steelhead and coho.

Development Trends

Projected population change from 2000-2020 for unincorporated areas in WRIA 25 is 37% (LCFRB 2001). Continued population growth will increase pressures for conversion of forestry and agricultural land uses to residential uses, with potential impacts to habitat conditions.




Figure D-2. Landownership within the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed. Data is WDNR data that was obtained from the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP).




Figure D-3. Land cover within the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed. Vegetation cover (pie chart) derived from Landsat data based on methods in Lunetta et al. 1997. Mapped data was obtained from the USGS National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD).

D.3.2. Focal and Other Species of Interest

Listed salmon, as well as steelhead, and trout species are focal species of this planning effort for the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed. Other species of interest were also identified as appropriate. Species were selected because they are listing under the U.S. Endangered Species Act or because viability or use is significantly affected by the Federal Columbia Hydropower system. Federal hydropower system effects are not significant within the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed although anadromous species are subject to effects in the Columbia River, estuary, and nearshore ocean. The Elochoman/Skamokawa ecosystem supports and depends on a wide variety of fish and wildlife in addition to designated species. A comprehensive ecosystem-based approach to salmon and steelhead recovery will provide significant benefits to other native species through restoration of landscape-level processes and habitat conditions. Other fish and wildlife species not directly addressed by this plan are subject to a variety of other Federal, State, and local planning or management activities.

Focal salmonid species in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed include fall Chinook, chum, coho, and winter steelhead. Bull trout do not occur in the subbasin. Salmon and steelhead numbers have declined to only a fraction of historical levels (Table D-1). Extinction risks are significant for all focal species – the current health or viability is very low for all four anadromous species, except steelhead which have moderate viability. Returns of fall Chinook, coho, and winter steelhead include both natural and hatchery produced fish.

Table D-1. Status of focal salmonid and steelhead populations in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed.

Species	Population	Recovery Priority ¹	Viability		Improve ment ⁴	Abundance		
			Status ²	Obj ³		Historic ⁵	Current ⁶	Target ⁷
Fall Chinook ^(Tule)	Elochoman/Skamokawa	Primary	VL	H	150%	3,000	<50	1500
Chum	Elochoman/Skamokawa	Primary	M-	M+	>500%	16,000	<200	1,300
Winter Steelhead	Elochoman/Skamokawa	Contributing	M	M+	0% ⁸	1,100	600	600
Coho	Elochoman/Skamokawa	Primary	VL	H	170%	6,500	<50	2,400

¹ Primary, contributing, and stabilizing designations reflect the relative contribution of a population to major population group recovery goals.

² Baseline viability is based on Technical Recovery Team viability rating approach.

³ Viability objective is based on the scenario contribution.

⁴ Improvement is the relative increase in population production required to reach the prescribed viability goal

⁵ Historical population size inferred from presumed habitat conditions using Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment Model and NMFS back-of-envelope calculations.

⁶ Approximate current annual range in number of naturally-produced fish returning to the watershed.

⁷ Abundance targets were estimated by population viability simulations based on viability goals.

⁸ Improvement increments are based on abundance and productivity, however, this population will require improvements in spatial structure or diversity to meet recovery objectives.


Other species of interest in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed include coastal cutthroat trout and Pacific lamprey. These species have been affected by many of the same habitat factors that have reduced numbers of anadromous salmonids. Brief summaries of the population characteristics and status follow. Additional information on life history, population characteristics, and status assessments may be found in Appendix A (focal species) and B (other species).

Fall Chinook—Elochoman Subbasin (Elochoman/Skamokawa)

ESA: Threatened 1999

SASSI: Elochoman - Healthy; Skamokawa - Depressed
2002

The historical Elochoman/Skamokawa adult population is estimated from 5,000-10,000 fish. The vast majority of fish returned to the Elochoman River. Current natural spawning returns range from 100-2,300 in the Elochoman River and 50-500 in Skamokawa Creek. The majority of current returns are hatchery origin fish. Spawning occurs in the lower Elochoman from above tidewater (RM 4 to the Elochoman Hatchery (RM 9). Spawning occurs in Skamokawa Creek from Wilson Creek upstream to Standard and McDonald creeks (4.5 miles). Juvenile rearing occurs near and downstream of the spawning areas. Juveniles emerge in early spring and migrate to the Columbia in spring and summer of their first year.




Distribution

- Spawning occurs in the lower mainstem Elochoman between RM 4 and 9 (downstream of the Elochoman Hatchery)
- Spawning occurs in the mainstem Skamokawa from Wilson Creek upstream to Standard and McDonald Creeks (4.5 miles)

Life History

- Columbia River tule fall Chinook migration occurs from mid August to mid September, depending partly on early fall rain
- Natural spawning occurs between late September and late October, peaking in mid-October
- Elochoman fall Chinook age ranges from 2-year old jacks to 6-year old adults, with dominant adult ages of 3 and 4 (averages are 46.7% and 38.4%, respectively)

- Fry emerge around early April, depending on time of egg deposition and water temperature; fall Chinook fry spend the spring in fresh water, and emigrate in the late spring/summer as sub-yearlings



Diversity

- Considered a tule population in the lower Columbia River Evolutionarily Significant Unit
- Elochoman fall Chinook were historically native to the system while the Skamokawa Chinook population is likely a result of stray hatchery produced spawners from recent decades
- Allozyme analyses indicate Elochoman fall Chinook allele frequencies are similar but distinct from other lower Columbia River fall Chinook stocks

Abundance

- In 1951, WDFW estimated fall Chinook escapement to the Elochoman River was 2,000 fish
- Elochoman River spawning escapements from 1964-2001 ranged from 53 to 2,392 (average 624)
- Skamokawa Creek spawning escapements from 1964-2001 ranged from 25 to 5,596 (average 1,065); natural spawners were primarily hatchery origin strays from other Columbia Basin systems

Productivity & Persistence

- Baseline risk assessment determined a high to very high risk of extinction for fall Chinook in the Elochoman subbasin
- Juvenile production from natural spawning is presumed to be low
- Skamokawa production is presumed to be very low as most adult spawners can be accounted for as first generation hatchery fish

Hatchery

- Elochoman Hatchery located about RM 9; hatchery completed 1953
- Hatchery releases of fall Chinook in the basin began in 1950; release data is displayed for the years 1967-2002
- The current program releases 2 million fall Chinook juveniles annually into the Elochoman River; there are no hatchery fish released into Skamokawa Creek

- The majority of recent year natural spawners in the Elochoman River can be accounted for as hatchery produced adults that were passed above a weir in the lower river and spawned naturally (82% hatchery produced spawners estimated in 1997)
- Abernathy Hatchery is not utilized by USFWS as a fishery research facility

Harvest


- Fall Chinook are harvested in ocean commercial and recreational fisheries from Oregon to Alaska, in addition to Columbia River commercial gill net and sport fisheries
- Lower Columbia tule fall Chinook are an important contributor to Washington ocean troll and sport fisheries and to the Columbia River estuary sport fishery
- Columbia River commercial harvest occurs primarily in September, but tule Chinook flesh quality is low once the fish move from salt water; the price is low compared to higher quality bright stock Chinook
- CWT data analysis of the 1991-94 brood years from the Elochoman Hatchery indicates a total harvest rate of 35% of the Elochoman fall Chinook stock
- The majority of the Elochoman fall Chinook harvest occurred in Southern British Columbia (34%), Alaska (36%), Washington ocean (11%), and Columbia River (9%) fisheries
- Sport harvest in the Elochoman River averaged 95 fall Chinook annually from 1981-1988
- Annual harvest is variable dependent on management response in PSC (U.S./Canada), PFMC (U.S. ocean), and Columbia River Compact Forums
- Ocean and mainstem Columbia harvest of Elochoman fall Chinook was limited by an ESA harvest limit of 49% for Coweeman tule fall Chinook in 2002. The 2009 limit was set at 38%.

Coho—Elochoman Subbasin (Elochoman/Skamokawa)

ESA: Threatened 2005

SASSI: Unknown 2002

The historical Elochoman/Skamokawa adult population is estimated from 15,000-40,000 fish, with the returns being late stock which spawn from late November to March. Current returns are unknown but assumed to be low. A number of hatchery produced fish spawn naturally. Natural spawning occurs in most areas of the Elochoman Watershed accessible to coho, principally in the upper watershed, in particular the West Fork Elochoman. Duck Creek is an important spawning area in the lower river. In Skamokawa Creek, important spawning areas include the mainstem, and Wilson, Left Fork, Quartz, Standard, and McDonald creeks. Juvenile rearing occurs upstream and downstream of spawning areas. Juveniles rear for a full year in these watersheds before migrating as yearlings in the spring.




Distribution

- Managers refer to early stock coho as Type S due to their ocean distribution generally south of the Columbia River
- Managers refer to late stock coho as Type N due to their ocean distribution generally north of the Columbia River
- Natural spawning is thought to occur in most areas accessible to coho. Duck Creek in the lower watershed is an important coho spawning area, but the majority of the spawning area is in the upper watershed above the Salmon hatchery, in particular the West Fork of the Elochoman
- Coho in the Skamokawa watershed spawn in the mainstem Skamokawa and Wilson, Left Fork, Quartz, Standard, and McDonald Creeks

Life History

- Adults enter the Elochoman River from mid-August through February (early stock primarily from mid-August through September and late stock primarily from late September to November)

- Peak spawning occurs in late October for early stock and late November to January for late stock



- Adults return as 2-year old jacks (age 1.1) or 3-year old adults (age 1.2)
- Fry emerge in spring, spend one year in fresh water, and emigrate as age-1 smolts in the following spring

Diversity

- Late stock coho (or Type N) were historically present in the Elochoman Watershed with spawning occurring from late November into March
- Early stock coho (or Type S) are also present and are currently produced in the Elochoman Hatchery program
- Columbia River early and late stock coho produced from Washington hatcheries are genetically similar

Abundance

- Elochoman River wild coho run is a fraction of its historical size
- USFWS surveys in 1936 and 1937 indicated coho presence in all accessible areas of the Elochoman River and its tributaries; 371 coho documented in Elochoman River; coho designated as 'observed' in Skamokawa
- In 1951 WDFW estimated an annual escapement of 2500 late coho to the Elochoman River and 2,000 late coho to Skamokawa Creek
- Hatchery production accounts for most coho returning to Elochoman River

Productivity & Persistence

- Natural coho production is presumed to be very low
- Baseline risk assessment determined a high to very high risk of extinction for coho in the Elochoman subbasin
- Smolt density model estimated Elochoman Basin production potential of 43,393 smolts

Hatchery

- The Elochoman Hatchery was built in 1953

- The Elochoman Hatchery is currently programmed for an annual release of 550,00 late coho and 360,000 early coho smolts

Harvest



- Until recent years, natural produced Columbia River coho were managed like hatchery fish and subjected to similar harvest rates; ocean and Columbia River combined harvest rates ranged from 70% to over 90% during 1970-83
- Ocean fisheries were reduced in the mid 1980s to protect several Puget Sound and Washington coastal wild coho populations
- Columbia River commercial coho fishing in November was eliminated in the 1990s to reduce harvest of late Clackamas coho
- Since 1999, returning Columbia River hatchery coho have been mass marked with an adipose fin clip to enable fisheries to selectively harvest hatchery coho and release wild coho
- Natural produced lower Columbia River coho are beneficiaries of harvest limits aimed at Federal ESA listed Oregon Coastal coho and Oregon state listed Clackamas and Sandy River coho
- During 1999-2002, fisheries harvest of ESA listed coho was less than 15% each year
- Hatchery Coho can contribute significantly to the lower Columbia River gill net fishery; commercial harvest of early coho in September is constrained by fall Chinook and Sandy River coho management; commercial harvest of late coho is focused in October during the peak abundance of hatchery late coho
- A substantial estuary sport fishery exists between Buoy 10 and the Astoria-Megler Bridge; majority of the catch is early coho, but late coho harvest can also be substantial
- An average of 1,183 coho (1981-1988) were harvested annually in the Elochoman River sport fishery
- CWT data analysis of 1995-97 early coho released from Elochoman Hatchery indicates 49% were captured in a fishery and 51% were accounted for in escapement
- CWT data analysis of 1995-97 brood late coho released from Elochoman Hatchery indicates 61% were captured in a fishery and 39% were accounted for in escapement
- Fishery CWT recoveries of 1995-97 brood Elochoman early coho were distributed between Columbia River (53%), Washington ocean (40%), and Oregon ocean (7%) sampling areas
- Fishery CWT recoveries of 1995-97 brood Elochoman late coho were distributed between Columbia River (59%), Washington ocean (29%), and Oregon ocean (11%) sampling areas


Chum—Elochoman Subbasin (Elochoman/Skamokawa)

ESA: Threatened 1999

SASSI: NA

The historical Elochoman/Skamokawa adult population is estimated from 15,000-50,000 fish. Current returns are about 200 fish or less. Recent year counts have been higher in Skamokawa Creek than in the Elochoman River. Natural spawning primarily occurs in the lower mainstem Elochoman between tidewater and the Elochoman Hatchery and in Skamokawa Creek between tidewater and Standard and McDonald creeks. Jim Crow Creek, which flows directly into the Columbia downstream of Skamokawa Creek, is also an important chum spawning area. Peak spawning occurs in December. Juveniles emerge in the early spring and migrate to the Columbia after a short rearing period.





Distribution

- Spawning occurs in the lower mainstem Elochoman River above tidal influence
- Spawning occurs in the lower 0.4 miles of Abernathy Creek and in the lower parts (above tidewater) of Skamokawa Creek, Mill Creek and Germany Creek

Life History

- Adults enter the Elochoman River, Skamokawa, Mill, Abernathy, and Germany Creeks from mid-October through November; peak spawner abundance occurs in late November
- Dominant age classes of adults are 3 and 4
- Fry emerge in early spring; chum emigrate as age-0 smolts with little freshwater rearing time

Diversity

- Periodic supplementation programs have used Hood Canal and Willipa Bay stocks

Abundance

- In 1936, escapement surveys documented 158 chum in Elochoman River, 92 in Abernathy Creek, and chum were “observed” in Germany Creek and “reported” in Skamokawa River and Mill Creek
- WDF 1951 report estimated escapement of approximately 1,000 chum to the Elochoman River and 3,000 chum to the Skamokawa River; 1973 survey reported “small” run
- In 2002, WDFW estimated an escapement of 14 chum to the Elochoman and 160 to Skamokawa Creek

Productivity & Persistence

- Natural chum production is expected to be low, although it is expected that some chum production continues in these streams
- Baseline risk assessment determined a high to very high risk of extinction for chum in the Elochoman subbasin
- A 1995 WDF seining operation in Abernathy Creek observed 7 chum juveniles

Hatchery

- Chum fry releases of various stocks occurred from 1958-1983 in the Elochoman River, 1958-1991 in Abernathy Creek, 1978-1983 in Skamokawa Creek, and 1982-1983 in Germany Creek
- Elochoman releases average 340,000 over 20 years, Skamokawa releases averaged 88,000 over four years, Germany Creek releases averaged 62,500 over 2 years, and Abernathy releases averaged 450,000 over 13 years
- Hatchery escapement accounts for most adults returning to the Elochoman

Harvest


- Currently very limited chum harvest occurs in the ocean and Columbia River and is incidental to fisheries directed at other species
- Columbia River commercial fishery historically harvested chum salmon in large numbers (80,000 to 650,000 in years prior to 1943); from 1965-1992 landings averaged less than 2,000 chum, and since 1993 less than 100 chum
- In the 1990s November commercial fisheries were curtailed and retention of chum was prohibited in Columbia River sport fisheries
- The ESA limits incidental harvest of Columbia River chum to less than 5% of the annual return

Winter Steelhead—Elochoman Subbasin (Elochoman/Skamokawa)

ESA: Not Warranted

SASSI: Depressed 2002

The historical Elochoman/Skamokawa adult population is estimated to be about 1,400 fish. Current natural spawning returns range from 100-400 in the Elochoman River and 100-300 in Skamokawa Creek. Interaction with Chambers Creek/Beaver Creek stock hatchery steelhead is likely lower due to different spawn timing. Spawning in the Elochoman occurs in the mainstem, West, North, and East Forks, as well as Otter, Rock, Clear, Beaver, and Duck creeks. Spawning in Skamokawa Creek occurs throughout the mainstem, Wilson, Left Fork, Quartz, McDonald, and Standard creeks, as well as several smaller tributaries. Spawning time is March to early June. Juvenile rearing occurs both downstream and upstream of the spawning areas. Juveniles rear for a full year or more before migrating to the Columbia River.




Distribution

- Winter steelhead are distributed throughout the mainstem Elochoman and in the lower reaches of Beaver, Duck, Clear, Rock, and Otter Creeks and the East, North, and West Fork Elochoman
- In the Skamokawa, steelhead are distributed throughout the mainstem Skamokawa, Wilson Left Fork, Quartz, and McDonald Creeks, and smaller tributaries such as Bell Canyon, Pollard, and Standard Creeks

Life History

- Adult migration timing for Elochoman and Skamokawa winter steelhead is from December through April
- Spawning timing on the Elochoman and Skamokawa is generally from early March to early June
- Age composition data for Elochoman and Skamokawa River winter steelhead are not available
- Wild steelhead fry emerge from March through May; juveniles generally rear in fresh water for two years; juvenile emigration occurs from April to May, with peak migration in early May



Diversity

- Elochoman and Skamokawa winter steelhead stocks both designated based on distinct spawning distribution
- Concern with wild stock interbreeding with hatchery brood stock from the Elochoman River, Chambers Creek, and the Cowlitz River
- Allele frequency analysis of Elochoman and Skamokawa winter steelhead in 1995 was unable to determine the distinctiveness of this stock compared to other lower Columbia steelhead stocks

Abundance

- In 1936, 7 steelhead were documented in the Elochoman River and steelhead were observed on the Skamokawa during escapement surveys
- Wild winter steelhead average run size in the 1960s was estimated to be about 8,000 fish
- Total escapement counts from 1991-2001 for the Elochoman ranged from 52 to 402 (average 197); redd counts from 1988-1999 ranged from 2.4 to 9.7 redds/mile; escapement goal for the Elochoman is 626 fish
- Total escapement counts from 1992-2001 for the Skamokawa ranged from 92 to 304 (average 202); redd counts from 1992-1999 ranged from 2.6 to 13.5 redds/mile; escapement goal for the Skamokawa is 227 fish

Productivity & Persistence

- Natural production in the basin is thought to be low
- Baseline risk assessment determined a moderate risk of extinction for winter steelhead in the Elochoman subbasin

Hatchery

- The Elochoman Hatchery, located on the mainstem, produces 90,000 winter steelhead smolts, of which 30,000 are from wild Elochoman River broodstock
- The Beaver Creek Hatchery, located several hundred yards upstream on Beaver Creek (RM 4), produced winter steelhead until closed in 1999; average annual production was 400,000 to 500,000 smolts
- Hatchery winter steelhead have been planted in the Elochoman River Basin since 1955; broodstock from the Elochoman and Cowlitz Rivers and Chambers Creek have been used; release data are displayed from 1983-2001

- Although hatchery winter steelhead constitute the majority of the run, hatchery fish contribute little to natural winter steelhead production in the Elochoman and Skamokawa River watersheds

Harvest


- No directed commercial or tribal fisheries target Elochoman or Skamokawa winter steelhead; incidental mortality currently occurs during the lower Columbia River spring Chinook tangle net fisheries
- Treaty Indian harvest does not occur in the Elochoman River Subbasin
- Winter steelhead sport harvest (hatchery and wild) in the Elochoman River from 1977-1984 ranged from 2,004 to 4,655; 75% were assumed to be hatchery fish; since 1986, regulations limit harvest to hatchery fish only
- ESA limits fishery impact on wild winter steelhead in the mainstem Columbia River and in the Elochoman Subbasin

Cutthroat Trout—Elochoman Subbasin (Elochoman/Skamokawa)

ESA: Not Listed

SASSI: Depressed

Coastal cutthroat abundance in Elochoman/Skamokawa has not been quantified but the population is considered depressed. Cutthroat trout are present throughout the watershed. Both anadromous and resident forms of cutthroat trout are present in the watershed. Anadromous cutthroat enter the Elochoman River and Skamokawa Creek from August to mid April and spawn from January through April. Most juveniles rear 2-3 years before migrating from their natal stream.



Distribution


- Anadromous forms have access to most of the Elochoman except at Beaver Creek, where a weir blocks passage; at Duck Creek, where a falls blocks entry; and upper tributary reaches where gradients may limit access during high flows
- Anadromous cutthroat have access to all Skamokawa tributaries
- Resident forms are documented throughout the systems

Life History

- Anadromous, resident and fluvial forms are present
- Anadromous river entry is from July through April
- Anadromous spawning occurs from December through June

Diversity

- The two drainages are defined as one stock due to their proximity, similar characteristics, and lack of biological data to distinguish them
- Genetic analysis has been conducted on samples taken at Beaver Creek Hatchery
- No significant genetic difference from Cowlitz stock
- Significant differences from Kalama and Lewis River collections



Abundance

- Beaver Creek Hatchery trap counts of unmarked fish originally included some unmarked hatchery origin fish
- By 1990 all hatchery releases were adipose-clipped
- From 1990-94 the annual number of unmarked returns has been no more than 5 fish, and has averaged 3 fish
- Long term decline in Columbia River sport catch from mouth to RM 48
- Declining trend in total hatchery returns from 1982-1994
- Spike in sea-run cutthroat numbers in the early 1980s likely related to strays from the Cowlitz Basin due to eruption of Mt. St. Helens
- No abundance information is available for resident life history forms

Hatchery

- Beaver Creek Hatchery (RM 6) released steelhead and anadromous cutthroat until its closure in 1999
- From 1989-1993 an average of 34,620 sea-run cutthroat smolts were released annually
- Elochoman Hatchery (RM 9) produces coho, winter steelhead, and fall Chinook

Harvest

- Not harvested in ocean commercial or recreational fisheries
- Angler harvest for adipose fin clipped hatchery fish occurs in mainstem Columbia summer fisheries downstream of the Elochoman River

Other Species

Pacific lamprey – Information on lamprey abundance is limited and does not exist for the Elochoman/Skamokawa population. However, based on declining trends measured at Bonneville Dam and Willamette Falls it is assumed that Pacific lamprey have also declined in the Elochoman/Skamokawa. The adult lamprey return from the ocean to spawn in the spring and summer. Spawning likely occurs in the small to mid-size streams of the basins. Juveniles rear in freshwater up to 6 years before migrating to the ocean.

D.3.3. Watershed Habitat Conditions

This section describes the current condition of aquatic and terrestrial habitats within the watershed. Descriptions are included for habitat features of particular significance to focal salmonid species including watershed hydrology, passage obstructions, water quality, key habitat availability, substrate and sediment, woody debris, channel stability, riparian function, and floodplain function. These descriptions will form the basis for subsequent assessments of the effects of habitat conditions on focal salmonids and opportunities for improvement.

Watershed Hydrology

Peak flows are associated with fall and winter rains and low flows typically occur in late summer (Figure D-4). Flow in the Elochoman averaged 375 cfs during the period of record (1941-1971), with a maximum of 8,530 cfs and a minimum of 9.8 cfs. The Elochoman is used as a domestic water supply for the Town of Cathlamet. The intake is located at approximately RM 4. There are currently no stream gages operating on any of the major streams in the watershed.




Figure D-4. Elochoman River hydrograph (1962-1971). Elochoman River flows exhibit a fall through spring rainfall dominated regime, with flows less than 50 cfs common in late summer. USGS Stream Gage #14247500; Elochoman River near Cathlamet, WA.

There has been a significant decrease in vegetative cover in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed, with potential impacts to runoff properties. Approximately 72% of the watershed is either in early-seral stage forests, is cultivated land, or is developed land. Late-seral stage forests are virtually non-existent. High road densities are also a concern, with road densities greater than 5 miles/mi² throughout most of the watershed. Forest and road conditions have potentially altered flow regimes. The Integrated Watershed Assessment (IWA), which is presented in greater detail later in this chapter, indicates that 23 of 31 subwatersheds in the watershed are ‘impaired’ with regards to runoff conditions; the remainder are ‘moderately impaired’. These results are similar to those from a peak flow risk assessment conducted by Lewis County GIS (2000), which revealed ‘impaired’ conditions in 6 of 7 watersheds. Only the North Elochoman Watershed Administrative Unit (WAU) had a rating of ‘likely impaired’.

Low flow assessments were conducted on several streams in the watershed in 1997 and 1998 using the Toe-Width method (Caldwell et al. 1999). These assessments indicate that all of the watersheds may suffer from a lack of adequate flows for fish. On Wilson Creek (Skamokawa tributary) flows were adequate for salmon and steelhead rearing in the fall but were inadequate for salmon spawning. On the Elochoman at the Steel Bridge, flows were below suitable for spawning on October 1 but were adequate by November 1. Flows became less than suitable for summer rearing by July 1.

Future surface and groundwater demand in the watershed has been projected to increase by as little as 1% in the Coal Creek/Longview Slough watershed and as much as 12.8% in the Elochoman watershed over the next 20 years. The effect of withdrawals on stream flow is expected to be low on a subbasin scale (LCFRB 2001).

Passage Obstructions

No passage barriers have been identified on Jim Crow Creek. Culverts and tidegates block 10% of presumed anadromous habitat on Skamokawa Creek. A tidegate and a few culverts need assessment on Alger and Risk Creeks. A pump station on Risk Creek blocks 1.4 miles of habitat. There are several culvert barriers on Birnie Creek. A fish screen associated with a high school fish-rearing pond has been a problem at the mouth of Birnie Creek in the past but efforts have been taken to correct the problem. There are many passage barriers associated with culverts in the Elochoman watershed. The hatchery intake near Beaver Creek may also be a problem (Wade 2002).

Water Quality

WCD temperature monitoring in the summer of 2000 recorded excursions beyond the state standard of 18°C¹ in the Upper Skamokawa and Wilson Creek (Skamokawa tributary). Temperatures in lower Wilson Creek regularly exceeded the standard in August. An assessment of water quality by the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) in response to a 1975 fish kill found elevated fecal coliform levels that were likely related to human and animal sources. Nevertheless, the fish kills were ultimately attributed to high fish numbers causing critically low dissolved oxygen levels. WCD monitoring of surface water and shallow groundwater in 1997 revealed elevated fecal coliform and nitrate levels. The source was believed to be septic systems and agricultural practices (Wade 2002).

The Elochoman was listed on the State's 303(d) list of impaired water bodies due to exceedance of temperature standards (WDOE 1998). Water temperature monitoring by WDFW on the Elochoman at the hatchery has recorded numerous excursions beyond temperature criteria. WCD monitoring in the summer of 2000 revealed that temperatures in the Lower Elochoman regularly exceed 18°C in August and the first half of September. Monitoring in the Upper Elochoman and tributaries revealed cooler temperatures with no exceedance of state standards (Wade 2002).

Key Habitat Availability

Information on side channel habitats is lacking in the Jim Crow and Skamokawa watersheds. Qualitative information from stream survey notes indicates that these systems are comprised primarily of single-thread channels with few side channels. Diking, roads/railroads, and channel incision in agricultural areas limit side channel development in the Elochoman watershed, however, some portions of the Elochoman, in particular the West Fork, have abundant side channels. In a few areas, the presence of side channels appears to be related to the accumulation of sediments behind large log jams, but these side channels are believed to be transient (Wade 2002).

¹ 18°C (64°F) is the state standard for Class A streams; 16°C (61°F) is the state standard for Class AA streams.

Pool habitat is considered poor in Jim Crow, the Skamokawa, and the Elochoman watersheds. Information is lacking for Alger, Risk, and Birnie Creeks. In Jim Crow Creek, 83% of surveyed reaches were given a “poor” pool habitat designation by the WCD. The few good pools were associated with beaver activity and the delivery of small diameter wood. In the Skamokawa and Elochoman watersheds pool habitat was less prevalent in the lower reaches where agriculture uses dominate and was more prevalent in the upper forested reaches. Pools were often associated with log jams (Wade 2002).

Substrate & Sediment

The majority (67%) of surveyed reaches (WCD surveys) on Jim Crow and Fink Creeks rated poor for substrate fines (>17% fines <0.85 mm). The Skamokawa watershed also has poor substrate fine conditions. This is attributed to steep slopes underlain with sedimentary rock that is prone to landslides (Ludwig 1992). The Wilson Creek and West Fork Skamokawa watersheds have the highest and second highest mass failure rates per square mile in Wahkiakum County, respectively (Waterstrat 1994). The lower reaches of the mainstem and tributaries tend to have the highest levels of fines. Levels of fines decrease as gradient increases. In the Elochoman watershed, substrate fine conditions are highly variable. Fines are generally high in the mainstem and in the lower reaches of tributaries. Gravel content increases as gradient increases. Especially high numbers of reaches in the Nelson Creek and North Fork Elochoman have elevated substrate fine conditions (WCD surveys, Wade 2002).

High road densities and naturally unstable soils create a risk of elevated sediment supply from hillslopes. Road density in the Jim Crow watershed is a high 5.14 mi/mi²; however, Waterstrat (1994) reported that most of the roads are well-established and adequately designed, with few failures, thus limiting sediment delivery to streams. The Skamokawa watershed has a road density greater than 4 mi/mi² and is composed of steep slopes with sedimentary rock that is prone to landslides. The watershed has 2 watersheds with the highest mass failure rates in the county (Waterstrat 1994). These processes likely result in elevated volumes of sediment delivered to stream channels. In the Elochoman watershed, forest practices have contributed to many mass failures, however, road erosion is probably responsible for most of the sediment delivery to streams (WDNR 1996).

Sediment supply conditions were evaluated as part of the IWA watershed process modeling, which is presented later in this chapter. The results suggest that nearly all (15 of 17) of the subwatersheds in the Elochoman subbasin are “moderately impaired” with respect to landscape conditions that influence sediment supply. Three subwatersheds are rated as “impaired” and three are rated as “functional”. The greatest impairments are located close to Longview. High road densities and naturally unstable soils are the primary drivers of the sediment supply impairment.

Sediment production from private forest roads is expected to decline over the next 15 years as roads are updated to meet the new forest practices standards, which include ditchline disconnect from streams and culvert upgrades. The frequency of mass wasting events should also decline due to the new regulations, which require geotechnical review and mitigation measures to minimize the impact of forest practices activities on unstable slopes.

Woody Debris

WCD surveys rated 97% of the Jim Crow watershed as poor for LWD (<0.2 pieces/meter). Some woody debris was found in middle valley reaches but it was of small diameter. Most delivery was believed to occur through windfall. The Skamokawa watershed was also mostly rated as poor for LWD. Where wood does exist it is typically small and deciduous. There are some log jams in places. Standard and McDonald Creeks have good LWD and recruitment potential, however, some areas have no wood whatsoever. The Elochoman had over 85% of reaches rated as poor. LWD is non-existent in many

reaches and the number of large (“key”) pieces is declining. Most of the wood that does exist is in jams. The majority of reaches with decent LWD quantities are in the upper reaches. The West Fork Elochoman watershed has a few segments with good LWD conditions (WDNR 1996).

Channel Stability

The Jim Crow and Skomokawa watersheds generally have good bank stability conditions. WCD surveys in the mid 1990s revealed that over 90% of the reaches on the mainstem Skamokawa had less than 10% actively eroding streambanks. Surveys in 1991 in the middle reaches of the Skamokawa revealed that 28% of surveyed banks were eroding; 34% in areas of agricultural use (Ludwig 1992). Bank erosion is high in agricultural land due to incision, alluvial soils, and a lack of vegetation on the streambanks. Bank stability in the Elochoman watershed is generally good. There is some road related erosion on the mainstem and some erosion problems on the West Fork and on Nelson Creek and its tributaries. Mass wasting events are seen as the bigger problem in the Elochoman watershed. In the West Fork, mass wasting is often associated with roads. In the North Elochoman basin, 205 of 383 surveyed landslides were related to forest practices activities (WDNR 1996).

Riparian Function

According to IWA watershed process modeling, which is presented in greater detail later in this chapter, 2 of the 17 subwatersheds in the Elochoman Subbasin are rated as ‘impaired’ for riparian function and 15 are rated as ‘moderately impaired’. Thus, none of the subwatersheds in the Elochoman/Skamokawa watershed are rated as ‘functional’. The greatest impairments are located in and around the Longview, WA metropolitan area. Results from the IWA are consistent with impaired conditions that were identified throughout the subbasin in surveys conducted by the WCD.

Riparian conditions were evaluated by the WCD according to buffer widths and riparian composition. The Jim Crow, Skamokawa, and Elochoman watersheds have 94.5%, 74%, and 78% of surveyed riparian areas in “poor” condition, respectively. Nearly all of the watersheds are at least 95% commercial and state timberland and were heavily harvested in the mid 20th century (Waterstrat 1994). In most cases, poor riparian areas are found in the lower river segments due to the impacts of agriculture, livestock grazing, roads, and diking on buffer widths and species composition. Upper reaches tend to suffer from young timber stands, and to a lesser extent, high deciduous composition. Poor riparian conditions in the Elochoman watershed have also been attributed to mass wasting and debris flows (WDNR 1996). The WCD is working with landowners to improve riparian conditions.

Floodplain Function

The Skamokawa has been diverted from its natural meandering channel into a straightened channel from its mouth to RM 1.7. From RM 1.7 to 6.6 it is entrenched as it flows through agricultural land. The lower reaches of tributaries have been diked and are also entrenched in areas of agricultural use. Alger Creek has been diked along the first 1,700 feet. A project is underway by the Columbia Land Trust to improve floodplain connectivity in this reach. The Elochoman is diked for the first 1.4 miles and the lower part of the tributary Nelson creek is also diked and incised. Stream adjacent roads and railroads limit floodplain connectivity on the lower mainstem Elochoman and the lower portions of lower mainstem tributaries. There is high entrenchment within areas of agricultural use. Floodplain connectivity improves in the upper watershed. Entrenchment from splash damming is apparent on the middle reaches of the Elochoman (Wade 2002).

D.3.4. Stream Habitat Limitations

A systematic link between habitat conditions and salmonid population performance is needed to identify the net effect of habitat changes, specific stream sections where problems occur, and specific habitat conditions that account for the problems in each stream reach. In order to help identify the links between fish and habitat conditions, the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment (EDT) model was applied to Elochoman/Skamokawa River fall Chinook, chum, coho and winter steelhead. A thorough description of the EDT model, and its application to lower Columbia salmonid populations, can be found in Appendix E.

Three general categories of EDT output are discussed in this section: population analysis, reach analysis, and habitat factor analysis. Population analysis has the broadest scope of all model outputs. It is useful for evaluating the reasonableness of results, assessing broad trends in population performance, comparing among populations, and for comparing past, present, and desired conditions against recovery planning objectives. Reach analysis provides a greater level of detail. Reach analysis rates specific reaches according to how degradation or restoration within the reach affects overall population performance. This level of output is useful for identifying general categories of management (i.e. preservation and/or restoration), and for focusing recovery strategies in appropriate portions of a subbasin. The habitat factor analysis section provides the greatest level of detail. Reach specific habitat attributes are rated according to their relative degree of impact on population performance. This level of output is most useful for practitioners who will be developing and implementing specific recovery actions.

Population Analysis

Population assessments that compare historical and current habitat conditions are useful for evaluating trends and establishing recovery goals. Fish population levels under current and historical habitat conditions were inferred using the EDT model based on habitat characteristics of each stream reach and a synthesis of habitat effects on fish life cycle processes.

Habitat-based assessments were completed for fall Chinook, chum, coho, and winter steelhead in the Elochoman and Skamokawa watersheds. In the Elochoman, adult productivity for all four species has been reduced to 17-42% of historical levels (Table D-2). Declines in adult abundance level have also been significant for all species (Figure D-5), with the greatest decline seen for chum and coho. Current adult abundance of chum and coho is estimated at 7% and 39% of historical levels, respectively. Abundance of both fall Chinook and winter steelhead in the Elochoman has declined to approximately 66% of historical levels (Figure D-5). Diversity (as measured by the diversity index) has remained steady for fall Chinook, but has declined for winter steelhead, coho and chum (Table D-2).

Smolt productivity numbers in the Elochoman have declined to 26-54% of historical for all four species (Table D-2), though losses have not been as great as for adult productivity, suggesting that out of basin factors are contributing to losses in adult productivity. Declines in smolt abundance levels have been greatest for chum and coho (84% and 60% decrease respectively), but losses have also occurred for fall Chinook and winter steelhead smolts (29% and 33% decrease respectively) (Table D-2).

Adult productivity declines in the Skamokawa watershed have also been severe, with current levels less than a third of historical levels for chum, winter steelhead and coho (Table D-3). Fall Chinook adult productivity has declined by 48% (Table D-3). Current adult chum and coho abundance is estimated at only 13-34% of historical levels, respectively (Figure D-6). While not as severe as chum and coho, the decline in abundance of adult winter steelhead and fall Chinook is such that current levels are estimated at 60% and 66% of historical levels (Figure D-6). Diversity (as measured by the diversity index) of all

species has been fairly well maintained, although chum, winter steelhead, and coho have experienced some loss (Table D-3).

Reductions in smolt productivity and abundance in the Skamokawa have been similar to those in the Elochoman, though to a slightly lesser degree. Current smolt productivity ranges from 29% to 64% of historical, and abundance ranges from 30% to 68% of historical values (Table D-3). Productivity losses were greatest for coho, and abundance losses have been greatest for chum.

Table D-2. Elochoman Population productivity, abundance, and diversity (of both smolts and adults) based on EDT analysis of current (P or patient) and historical (T or template)¹ habitat conditions.

Species	Adult Abundance		Adult Productivity		Diversity Index		Smolt Abundance		Smolt Productivity	
	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T
Fall Chinook	1,559	2,315	3.8	9.0	0.98	0.98	205,650	290,263	456	1,001
Chum	515	7,821	1.6	9.2	0.80	1.00	263,160	1,693,571	612	1,141
Coho	1,549	3,950	3.9	15.1	0.64	0.92	27,579	69,486	69	263
Winter Steelhead	447	692	7.5	23.6	0.91	0.97	6,235	9,267	105	317

¹ Estimate represents historical conditions in the subbasin and current conditions in the mainstem and estuary.

Table D-3. Skamokawa Creek— Population productivity, abundance, and diversity (of both smolts and adults) based on EDT analysis of current (P or patient) and historical (T or template) habitat conditions.

Species	Adult Abundance		Adult Productivity		Diversity Index		Smolt Abundance		Smolt Productivity	
	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T
Fall Chinook	444	677	4.1	8.6	0.92	0.93	75,571	110,868	603	1,174
Chum	1,125	8,499	2.3	9.3	0.94	1.00	564,503	1,898,126	739	1,148
Coho	880	2,582	5.1	17.5	0.69	0.78	16,207	47,396	93	316
Winter Steelhead	220	369	8.0	24.7	0.91	1.00	2,876	4,820	103	318

¹ Estimate represents historical conditions in the subbasin and current conditions in the mainstem and estuary.




Figure D-5. Adult abundance of Elochoman fall Chinook, winter steelhead, chum and coho based on EDT analysis of current (P or patient) and historical (T or template) habitat conditions.




Figure D-6. Adult abundance of Skamokawa fall Chinook, chum, winter steelhead and coho based on EDT analysis of current (P or patient) and historical (T or template) habitat conditions.

Stream Reach Analysis

Habitat conditions and suitability for fish are better in some portions of a subbasin than in others. The reach analysis of the EDT model uses estimates of the difference in projected population performance between current/patient and historical/template habitat conditions to identify core and degraded fish production areas. Core production areas, where habitat degradation would have a large negative impact on the population, are assigned a high value for preservation. Likewise, currently degraded areas that provide significant potential for restoration are assigned a high value for restoration. Collectively, these values are used to prioritize the reaches within a given subbasin/watershed. EDT reaches for the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed are displayed in Figure D-7.

Winter steelhead are distributed throughout the Elochoman Watershed including the mainstem and the tributaries of Beaver, Duck, Clear, Rock and Otter creeks and the East, North, and West Fork Elochoman. Fall Chinook are found in the lower mainstem between river miles 4 and 9. Chum distribution is primarily in the lower mainstem above tidal influence. Coho are suspected to use most of the watershed that is accessible, but primary areas include the mid to upper watershed and the West Fork Elochoman.

High priority reaches for fall Chinook (Figure D-8) and chum (Figure D-9) are found primarily in select areas of the lower and mid Elochoman (Elochoman 5, 7 and 8 for fall Chinook and Eloch 3 and 4 for chum). High priority reaches for fall Chinook have preservation emphasis. For chum, Eloch 3 has a combined preservation and restoration emphasis while Eloch 4 has a restoration only emphasis.

For coho in the Elochoman Watershed, high priority reaches include multiple areas in the middle mainstem Elochoman (Elochoman 6, 7, 10 and 13) (Figure D-10). Two tributaries also rank as high priority for coho (Clear-1 and EF Eloch-1). Mainstem reaches Eloch-6 and 7 have a restoration emphasis, Clear-1 has a preservation emphasis, and Eloch 10, 13, and EF Eloch-1 would benefit from a combination of approaches.

High priority areas for winter steelhead in the Elochoman include middle and upper mainstem reaches (Elochoman 8, 10-13) and reach NF Eloch-2. (Figure D-11). Each of the mainstem reaches, with the exception of Eloch 8, have a preservation emphasis. Eloch 8, however, has a combined preservation and restoration emphasis.



Figure D-7. Elochoman / Skamokawa Watershed with EDT reaches identified. For readability, not all reaches are labeled.

Elochoman Fall Chinook

Potential Change in Population Performance with Degradation and Restoration




Figure D-8. Elochoman fall Chinook ladder diagram. The rungs on the ladder represent the reaches and the three ladders contain a preservation value and restoration potential based on abundance, productivity, and diversity. The units in each rung are the percent change from the current population. For each reach, a reach group designation and recovery emphasis designation is given. Percentage change values are expressed as the change per 1,000 meters of stream length within the reach. See Appendix E Chapter 6 for more information on EDT ladder diagrams.

Elochoman Chum

Potential Change in Population Performance with Degradation and Restoration




Figure D-9. Elochoman chum ladder diagram. The rungs on the ladder represent the reaches and the three ladders contain a preservation value and restoration potential based on abundance, productivity, and diversity. The units in each rung are the percent change from the current population. For each reach, a reach group designation and recovery emphasis designation is given. Percentage change values are expressed as the change per 1,000 meters of stream length within the reach. See Appendix E Chapter 6 for more information on EDT ladder diagrams.

Elochoman Coho
Potential Change in Population Performance with Degradation and Restoration




Figure D-10. Elochoman coho ladder diagram. The rungs on the ladder represent the reaches and the three ladders contain a preservation value and restoration potential based on abundance, productivity, and diversity. The units in each rung are the percent change from the current population. For each reach, a reach group designation and recovery emphasis designation is given. Percentage change values are expressed as the change per 1,000 meters of stream length within the reach. See Appendix E Chapter 6 for more information on EDT ladder diagrams.

Elochoman Winter Steelhead
Potential Change in Population Performance with Degradation and Restoration




Figure D-11. Elochoman River Watershed winter steelhead ladder diagram. The rungs on the ladder represent the reaches and the three ladders contain a preservation value and restoration potential based on abundance, productivity, and diversity. The units in each rung are the percent change from the current population. For each reach, a reach group designation and recovery emphasis designation is given. Percentage change values are expressed as the change per 1,000 meters of stream length within the reach. See Appendix E Chapter 6 for more information on EDT ladder diagrams.

In the Skamokawa, winter steelhead are found in the mainstem and in numerous tributaries. Fall Chinook spawning is mainly between Wilson Creek and Standard and McDonald Creeks, a length of approximately 4.5 miles. Chum spawning in the Skamokawa is exclusively in the lowest reaches. Coho spawning in the Skamokawa is in the mainstem and in Wilson, Left Fork, Quartz, Standard, and McDonald Creeks (see Figure D-7 for reach locations).

For both fall Chinook (Figure D-12) and chum (Figure D-13), the high priority reaches are located in the area upstream of Falk Creek (Skamokawa 5 and 6). All high priority reaches for both species show a strong preservation emphasis.

Coho in the Skamokawa have high priority reaches located primarily in the mid to upper areas of the watershed (Skamokawa 5 and 6, Wilson 1-3, and an unmanned trib) (Figure D-14). These reaches show a combination of recovery emphasis. The high preservation value for diversity for the unnamed tributary is likely a result of production (returning adults per spawner) dropping below 1 for the degradation scenario, thus reducing the overall spatial diversity of the population.

High priority reaches for winter steelhead in the Skamokawa watershed include the middle areas of the mainstem (Skamokawa 7 and 8) and Wilson Creek 3-5 (Figure D-15). All high priority reaches show a combined preservation and restoration emphasis. The reach with the highest restoration and preservation emphasis is Skamokawa 8.




Figure D-12. Skamokawa fall Chinook ladder diagram. The rungs on the ladder represent the reaches and the three ladders contain a preservation value and restoration potential based on abundance, productivity, and diversity. The units in each rung are the percent change from the current population. For each reach, a reach group designation and recovery emphasis designation is given. Percentage change values are expressed as the change per 1,000 meters of stream length within the reach. See Appendix E Chapter 6 for more information on EDT ladder diagrams.




Figure D-13. Skamokawa chum ladder diagram. The rungs on the ladder represent the reaches and the three ladders contain a preservation value and restoration potential based on abundance, productivity, and diversity. The units in each rung are the percent change from the current population. For each reach, a reach group designation and recovery emphasis designation is given. Percentage change values are expressed as the change per 1,000 meters of stream length within the reach. See Appendix E Chapter 6 for more information on EDT ladder diagrams.

Skamokawa Coho

Potential Change in Population Performance with Degradation and Restoration




Figure D-14. Skamokawa coho ladder diagram. The rungs on the ladder represent the reaches and the three ladders contain a preservation value and restoration potential based on abundance, productivity, and diversity. The units in each rung are the percent change from the current population. For each reach, a reach group designation and recovery emphasis designation is given. Percentage change values are expressed as the change per 1,000 meters of stream length within the reach. See Appendix E Chapter 6 for more information on EDT ladder diagrams.

Skamokawa Winter Steelhead
Potential Change in Population Performance with Degradation and Restoration




Figure D-15. Skamokawa Watershed winter steelhead ladder diagram. The rungs on the ladder represent the reaches and the three ladders contain a preservation value and restoration potential based on abundance, productivity, and diversity. The units in each rung are the percent change from the current population. For each reach, a reach group designation and recovery emphasis designation is given. Percentage change values are expressed as the change per 1,000 meters of stream length within the reach. See Appendix E Chapter 6 for more information on EDT ladder diagrams.

Habitat Factor Analysis

The Habitat Factor Analysis of EDT identifies the most important habitat factors affecting fish in each reach. Whereas the EDT reach analysis identifies reaches where changes are likely to significantly affect the fish, the Habitat Factor Analysis identifies specific stream reach conditions that may be modified to produce an effect. Like all EDT analyses, the habitat factor analysis compares current/patient and historical/template habitat conditions. For each reach, EDT generates what is referred to as a “consumer reports diagram”, which identifies the degree to which individual habitat factors are acting to suppress population performance. The effect of each habitat factor is identified for each life stage that occurs in the reach and the relative importance of each life stage is indicated. For additional information and examples of this analysis, see Appendix E. Inclusion of the consumer report diagram for each reach is beyond the scope of this document. A summary of the most critical life stages and the habitat factors affecting them are displayed for each species in the Elochoman and Skamokawa in Table D-4 and Table D-5.

Table D-4. Summary of the primary limiting factors affecting life stages of focal salmonid species. Results are summarized from Elochoman River EDT Analysis.

Species and Lifestage		Primary factors	Secondary factors	Tertiary factors
Elochoman Fall Chinook				
<i>most critical</i>	Egg incubation	sediment	temperature, channel stability	
<i>second</i>	Spawning	temperature	harassment, predation, habitat diversity	sediment
<i>third</i>	Fry colonization	flow, channel stability, predation, sediment, habitat diversity	food	
Elochoman Chum				
<i>most critical</i>	Egg incubation	sediment	channel stability	harassment
<i>second</i>	Prespawning holding	habitat diversity, harassment, predation	sediment	key habitat
<i>third</i>	Spawning	harassment	habitat diversity, predation, sediment	flow
Elochoman Coho				
<i>most critical</i>	Egg incubation	sediment	channel stability	
<i>second</i>	0-age winter rearing	habitat diversity	flow, key habitat	channel stability, predation
<i>third</i>	0-age summer rearing	habitat diversity	key habitat	food, flow, competition (hatch), channel stability, predation, temperature
Elochoman Winter Steelhead				
<i>most critical</i>	Egg incubation	sediment	channel stability, temperature	
<i>second</i>	1-age winter rearing	habitat diversity, flow	channel stability, predation, sediment	
<i>third</i>	0-age summer rearing	habitat diversity	flow, competition (hatch), pathogens, predation, temperature	

Table D-5. Summary of the primary limiting factors affecting life stages of focal salmonid species. Results are summarized from Skamokawa Creek EDT Analysis.

Species and Lifestage	Primary factors	Secondary factors	Tertiary factors
Skamokawa Fall Chinook			
<i>most critical</i> Egg incubation	sediment	channel stability, temperature	
<i>second</i> Spawning	temperature	habitat diversity	
<i>third</i> Fry colonization	channel stability, sediment, predation, habitat diversity, food, flow	competition (other sp.)	
Skamokawa Chum			
<i>most critical</i> Egg incubation	channel stability, sediment		
<i>second</i> Prespawning holding	habitat diversity	flow, key habitat, harassment	
<i>third</i> Spawning	habitat diversity	harassment	
Skamokawa Coho			
<i>most critical</i> Egg incubation	sediment	channel stability	
<i>second</i> 0-age summer rearing	key habitat	temperature, habitat diversity	food, flow, competition (hatch), channel stability
<i>third</i> 0-age winter rearing	key habitat, habitat diversity	flow	food, channel stability
Skamokawa Winter Steelhead			
<i>most critical</i> Egg incubation	sediment	temperature, channel stability	
<i>second</i> 0-age summer rearing	habitat diversity, temperature	predation, pathogens, food, flow, competition (hatchery)	
<i>third</i> 1-age summer rearing	habitat diversity, temperature	flow, food, predation, key habitat, competition (hatch), channel stability	

The consumer reports diagrams have also been summarized to show the relative importance of habitat factors by reach. The summary figures are referred to as habitat factor analysis diagrams and are displayed for each species below. The reaches are ordered according to their combined restoration and preservation rank. The reach with the greatest potential benefit is listed at the top. The dots represent the relative impact of habitat attributes on reach-level performance.

Fall Chinook restoration reaches in the Elochoman are located in the lower and middle mainstem. These reaches have been degraded primarily by sedimentation and temperature increases (Figure D-16). Sediment impacts are related to upper watershed vegetation and road conditions. Over half of the North Elochoman WAU is in early-seral, non-forest, or other cover types, while none of the watershed is in the late-seral stage. Riparian vegetation conditions may be leading to increased temperatures. Entrenchment in the mainstem has altered flow, reduced habitat diversity, and reduced channel stability. Habitat diversity has also been reduced by diking, roads, railroads, and agricultural practices. Lack of LWD has precluded the formation of pools. Road density in the watershed is approximately 4

mi/mi², which likely contributes to increased fine sediments and altered flow regimes. WDNR (1996) cited road erosion as a primary culprit in delivery of fines to the Elochoman. Predation concerns arise because of the presence of the Elochoman hatchery. Hatchery releases can trigger ill-timed migration of wild fish while increasing the attraction of predators.

Primary coho restoration reaches are scattered throughout the Elochoman. The most important restoration reaches have been negatively affected by fine sediment, reduced habitat diversity, loss of key habitat, reduced channel stability, and altered flow (Figure D-17). These impacts are related to the causes described above for fall Chinook. These causes include land use practices and hatchery impacts.

Key winter steelhead restoration reaches in the Elochoman River are located in both mainstem and tributaries areas between Clear Creek and the North Fork Elochoman. These reaches have degraded sediment, habitat diversity, flow regimes, and channel stability (Figure D-18). With the exception of predation effects, impacts result from causes described in the fall Chinook discussion.

Important chum restoration reaches are in the lower mainstem below Duck Creek. These reaches have been impacted primarily by sediment, habitat diversity, predation, and harassment/poaching (Figure D-19). Harvest concerns, related to harassment and poaching, are primarily due to the take of wild fish while fishing for returning hatchery fish.

**Elochoman Fall Chinook
Protection and Restoration Strategic Priority Summary**

Geographic area priority		Attribute class priority for restoration															
Geographic area		Channel stability	Chemicals	Competition (w/ hatch)	Competition (other sp)	Flow	Food	Habitat diversity	Harassment/poaching	Obstructions	Oxygen	Pathogens	Predation	Sediment load	Temperature	Withdrawals	Key habitat quantity
Eloch-7	●					●		●	●				●	●	●		●
Eloch-8	●					●		●						●	●		●
Eloch-5	●					●		●	●				●	●	●		●
Eloch-4	●					●		●	●				●	●	●		●
Eloch-6	●					●		●	●				●	●	●		●
Eloch-3	●					●	●	●	●				●	●	●		●
Eloch-9	●					●		●						●	●		●
Eloch-2	●					●	●	●					●	●	●		●
Eloch-1						●	●	●	●				●	●	●		●

Key to strategic priority (corresponding Benefit Category letter also shown)
 1/ "Channel stability" applies to freshwater areas only.
 A High B Medium C Low D & E Indirect or General

Figure D-16. Elochoman subbasin fall Chinook habitat factor analysis diagram. Diagram displays the relative impact of habitat factors in specific reaches. The reaches are ordered according to their restoration and preservation rank, which factors in their potential benefit to overall population abundance, productivity, and diversity. The reach with the greatest potential benefit is listed at the top. The dots represent the relative impact of habitat attributes on reach-level performance. See Appendix E Chapter 6 for more information on habitat factor analysis diagrams. Some low priority reaches may not be included for display purposes.

Elochoman Coho
Protection and Restoration Strategic Priority Summary

Geographic area priority		Attribute class priority for restoration														
Geographic area	Channel stability	Chemicals	Competition (w/ hatch)	Competition (other sp)	Flow	Food	Habitat diversity	Harassment/poaching	Obstructions	Oxygen	Pathogens	Predation	Sediment load	Temperature	Withdrawals	Key habitat quantity
Eloch-10	●				●		●						●			●
EF Eloch-1	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-13	●				●		●						●			●
Clear-1	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-7	●		●		●		●	●				●	●	●		●
Eloch-6	●		●		●		●	●				●	●	●		●
Rock-1	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-9	●				●		●						●			●
Duck-1	●				●		●	●					●			●
Clear-3	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-8	●				●		●						●	●		●
Duck-4	●				●		●						●			●
Duck-6	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-12	●				●		●						●			●
Beaver-2	●				●		●						●			●
WF Eloch-1	●				●		●						●			●
Duck-3	●				●		●						●			●
EF Eloch-2	●				●		●						●			●
Beaver-1	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-15	●				●	●	●						●			●
Nelson-2	●		●	●	●	●	●				●	●	●	●		●
Eloch-11	●				●		●						●			●
WF Eloch-2	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-14	●				●	●	●						●			●
Eloch-2	●		●	●	●	●	●				●	●	●	●		●
Eloch-4	●		●		●		●					●	●	●		●
Longtrain-1	●				●		●						●			●
Nelson-3	●		●		●		●						●			●
Trib1232156463572	●				●		●						●			●
Trib1232567463186	●				●		●						●			●
Beaver-6	●				●		●						●			●
Trib1232562463641	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-1	●		●	●	●	●	●				●	●	●	●		●
Otter-1	●				●		●						●			●
Trib1233032462252-1	●				●		●	●					●			●
Eloch-5	●		●		●		●					●	●	●		●
NF Eloch-1	●				●		●						●			●
WF Eloch-3	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-3			●		●		●					●	●	●		●

1/ "Channel stability" applies to freshwater areas only.

Key to strategic priority (corresponding Benefit Category letter also shown)




Figure D-17. Elochoman coho habitat factor analysis. Some low priority reaches may not be included for display purposes. Diagram displays the relative impact of habitat factors in specific reaches. The reaches are ordered according to their restoration and preservation rank, which factors in their potential benefit to overall population abundance, productivity, and diversity. The reach with the greatest potential benefit is listed at the top. The dots represent the relative impact of habitat attributes on reach-level performance. See Appendix E Chapter 6 for more information on habitat factor analysis diagrams. Some low priority reaches may not be included for display purposes.

**Elochoman Winter Steelhead
Protection and Restoration Strategic Priority Summary**

Geographic area priority	Attribute class priority for restoration															
	Channel stability	Chemicals	Competition (w/ hatch)	Competition (other sp)	Flow	Food	Habitat diversity	Harassment/poaching	Obstructions	Oxygen	Pathogens	Predation	Sediment load	Temperature	Withdrawals	Key habitat quantity
Eloch-13	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-12	●				●		●						●			●
NF Eloch-2	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-10							●						●			●
Eloch-8	●				●		●				●		●	●		●
Eloch-11	●				●		●						●			●
Otter-1	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-9	●				●		●						●	●		●
WF Eloch-1	●				●		●						●			●
NF Eloch-1					●		●						●			●
EF Eloch-1	●				●		●						●			●
NF Eloch-3	●				●		●						●			●
Rock-1	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-14					●		●						●			●
Eloch-7	●		●		●		●	●			●		●	●		●
WF Eloch-2	●				●		●						●			●
EF Eloch-2					●		●						●			●
Trib1232509463400					●		●						●			●
Eloch-15					●		●						●			●
Duck-1	●				●		●	●					●			●
Trib1232540463591					●		●						●			●
Beaver-1	●				●		●						●	●		●
Clear-1	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-6	●		●		●		●	●			●		●	●		●
Trib1232567463186					●		●						●			●
Duck-3	●				●		●						●			●
Clear-3	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-5	●		●		●		●				●		●	●		●
Eloch-4	●		●		●		●				●		●	●		●
Eloch-2			●	●	●		●	●			●		●	●		●
Eloch-3			●		●		●				●		●	●		●
Trib1232562463641					●		●						●			●
Rock-3					●		●						●			●
Beaver-2	●				●		●						●			●
Eloch-1			●	●	●		●	●				●	●	●		●
Clear-5	●				●		●						●			●
Trib1232156463572					●		●						●			●
Nelson-1	●				●		●					●	●			●
WF Eloch-3					●		●						●			●

1/ "Channel stability" applies to freshwater areas only.

Key to strategic priority (corresponding Benefit Category letter also shown)

A High B Medium C Low D & E Indirect or General

Figure D-18. Elochoman River Watershed winter steelhead habitat factor analysis diagram. Some low priority reaches may not be included for display purposes. Diagram displays the relative impact of habitat factors in specific reaches. The reaches are ordered according to their restoration and preservation rank, which factors in their potential benefit to overall population abundance, productivity, and diversity. The reach with the greatest potential benefit is listed at the top. The dots represent the relative impact of habitat attributes on reach-level performance. See Appendix E Chapter 6 for more information on habitat factor analysis diagrams. Some low priority reaches may not be included for display purposes.

Elochoman Chum




Figure D-19. Elochoman subbasin chum habitat factor analysis diagram. This chum habitat factor analysis diagram differs from the others in that the dot size represents not only the relative within-reach impact of the habitat attributes, but also the relative contribution of each reach’s impact on total population performance. The dots therefore decrease in size towards the bottom of the chart.

Fall Chinook restoration reaches are in the mainstem Skamokawa between Wilson Creek and Quarry Creek. These reaches have been impacted by fine sediment, increased temperatures, decreased habitat diversity, decreased food availability, flow alterations, channel instability, and loss of key habitat (Figure D-20). None of the vegetative cover in the watershed is in the late-seral stage, while 74% is in the early-seral, non-forest or other stage. This vegetation condition combined with a high road density has potentially altered the flow regime, increased sedimentation, and increased summer temperatures. Habitat diversity in the watershed is not well quantified, but qualitative reports indicate that important restoration reaches are deficient of side channels. Sedimentation is exacerbated by steep slopes in the watershed underlain with sedimentary rock prone to landslides (Ludwig 1992 as cited in Wade 2002). These important restoration reaches lack LWD because of historical land use practices and stream management. The loss of LWD has reduced habitat diversity and key habitat.

Primary coho restoration reaches are spread throughout the mainstem Skamokawa and in various smaller tributaries. These reaches have been negatively affected by numerous impacts, including sediment, reduced habitat diversity, loss of key habitat, reduced food, altered flow, and temperature regime impairment (Figure D-22). These impacts are the result of the same causes as those described in the fall Chinook discussion. These causes are generally related to watershed management and land use practices.

Key restoration reaches for winter steelhead in the Skamokawa are in the upper mainstem, as well as in Wilson and McDonald Creeks. These reaches are degraded in numerous ways including sediment, flow, habitat diversity, temperature, food availability, channel stability, and key habitat (Figure D-23). These impacts are the result of the same causes as those described in the fall Chinook discussion.

There are two important chum restoration areas in the Skamokawa Watershed. The first is in the mainstem Skamokawa, and the other is in lower Wilson Creek. Both sections are influenced primarily by the loss of habitat diversity and increased sediment (Figure D-21). These impacts are the result of the same causes as those described in the fall Chinook discussion.

**Skamokawa Fall Chinook
Protection and Restoration Strategic Priority Summary**

Geographic area priority		Attribute class priority for restoration															
Geographic area		Channel stability	Chemicals	Competition (w/ hatch)	Competition (other sp)	Flow	Food	Habitat diversity	Harassment/poaching	Obstructions	Oxygen	Pathogens	Predation	Sediment load	Temperature	Withdrawals	Key habitat quantity
Skamokawa-6	●					●	●	●						●	●		●
Skamokawa-5	●					●	●	●						●	●		●
Skamokawa-7	●					●	●	●						●	●		●
Skamokawa-8	●					●	●	●						●	●		●
Skamokawa-3						●	●	●					●	●			●
Skamokawa-1						●	●	●					●	●			●
Skamokawa-2						●	●	●					●	●			●

Key to strategic priority (corresponding Benefit Category letter also shown)

1/ "Channel stability" applies to freshwater areas only.

A High
 B Medium
 C Low
 D & E Indirect or General

Figure D-20. Skamokawa subbasin fall Chinook habitat factor analysis diagram. Diagram displays the relative impact of habitat factors in specific reaches. The reaches are ordered according to their restoration and preservation rank, which factors in their potential benefit to overall population abundance, productivity, and diversity. The reach with the greatest potential benefit is listed at the top. The dots represent the relative impact of habitat attributes on reach-level performance. See Appendix E Chapter 6 for more information on habitat factor analysis diagrams. Some low priority reaches may not be included for display purposes.


Skamokawa Chum

Reach Name	Channel stability	Habitat diversity	Temperature	Predation	Competition (other spp)	Competition (hatchery fish)	Withdrawals	Oxygen	Flow	Sediment	Food	Chemicals	Obstructions	Pathogens	Harassment / poaching	Key habitat quantity
Skamokawa-6	●	●	●						●	●	●					+
Skamokawa-5	●	●	●						●	●	●					+
Wilson-1	●	●							●	●	●				●	+
Wilson-2	●	●							●	●	●					●
Skamokawa-1	●	●		●	●				●	●	●				●	●
Skamokawa-2		●		●							●					+
Skamokawa-3		●		●	●				●	●	●					●

High Impact
 Moderate Impact
 Low Impact
 None
 Low Positive Impact
 Moderate Positive Impact
 High Positive Impact

Figure D-21. Skamokawa subbasin chum habitat factor analysis diagram. This chum habitat factor analysis diagram differs from the others in that the dot size represents not only the relative within-reach impact of the habitat attributes, but also the relative contribution of each reach's impact on total population performance. The dots therefore decrease in size towards the bottom of the chart.

Skamokawa Coho
Protection and Restoration Strategic Priority Summary



1/ "Channel stability" applies to freshwater areas only.

Key to strategic priority (corresponding Benefit Category letter also shown)
 A High B Medium C Low D & E Indirect or General

Figure D-22. Skamokawa coho habitat factor analysis. Some low priority reaches may not be included for display purposes. Diagram displays the relative impact of habitat factors in specific reaches. The reaches are ordered according to their restoration and preservation rank, which factors in their potential benefit to overall population abundance, productivity, and diversity. The reach with the greatest potential benefit is listed at the top. The dots represent the relative impact of habitat attributes on reach-level performance. See Appendix E Chapter 6 for more information on habitat factor analysis diagrams. Some low priority reaches may not be included for display purposes.

**Skamokawa Winter Steelhead
Protection and Restoration Strategic Priority Summary**

Geographic area priority	Attribute class priority for restoration															
	Channel stability	Chemicals	Competition (w/ hatch)	Competition (other sp)	Flow	Food	Habitat diversity	Harassment/poaching	Obstructions	Oxygen	Pathogens	Predation	Sediment load	Temperature	Withdrawals	Key habitat quantity
Skamokawa-8	●				●		●						●	●		●
Wilson-3	●					●							●	●		●
Skamokawa-7	●					●							●	●		●
Wilson-4	●				●	●	●						●	●		●
Wilson-5	●				●	●	●						●	●		●
McDonald-1	●												●	●		●
Wilson-6	●				●		●						●	●		●
McDonald-2	●				●		●						●	●		●
Skamokawa-6	●				●	●	●				●		●	●		●
Standard-1	●				●		●						●	●		●
Wilson-2	●					●	●						●	●		●
LF Skamokawa-1	●				●	●	●				●		●	●		●
Wilson-1	●				●	●	●				●		●	●		●
LF Skamokawa-3	●				●	●	●						●	●		●
LF Skamokawa-2	●				●	●	●						●	●		●
Skamokawa-5	●				●	●	●				●		●	●		●
Skamokawa-3				●	●	●	●				●	●	●	●		●
Skamokawa-1							●					●				
Skamokawa-2					●		●					●	●			●
Falk-2	●						●									
Trib1233641463035-3					●		●									
Bell Canyon-1					●		●									
Falk-1																
Quarry-1					●		●									
Trib1233686463037																
Trib1234475463088																
Brooks-1					●		●					●	●			
Trib1233641463035-2																
Trib1233641463035-1							●									

Key to strategic priority (corresponding Benefit Category letter also shown)

1/ "Channel stability" applies to freshwater areas only.




Figure D-23. Skamokawa winter steelhead habitat factor analysis. Some low priority reaches may not be included for display purposes. Diagram displays the relative impact of habitat factors in specific reaches. The reaches are ordered according to their restoration and preservation rank, which factors in their potential benefit to overall population abundance, productivity, and diversity. The reach with the greatest potential benefit is listed at the top. The dots represent the relative impact of habitat attributes on reach-level performance. See Appendix E Chapter 6 for more information on habitat factor analysis diagrams. Some low priority reaches may not be included for display purposes.

D.3.5. Watershed Process Limitations

This section describes watershed process limitations that contribute to stream habitat conditions significant to focal fish species. Reach level stream habitat conditions are influenced by systemic watershed processes. Limiting factors such as temperature, high and low flows, sediment input, and large woody debris recruitment are often affected by upstream conditions and by contributing landscape factors. Accordingly, restoration of degraded channel habitat may require action outside the targeted reach, often extending into riparian and hillslope (upland) areas that are believed to influence the condition of aquatic habitats.

Watershed process impairments that affect stream habitat conditions were evaluated using a watershed process screening tool termed the Integrated Watershed Assessment (IWA). The IWA is a GIS-based assessment that evaluates watershed impairments at the subwatershed scale (3,000 to 12,000 acres). The tool uses landscape conditions (i.e. road density, impervious surfaces, vegetation, soil erodability, and topography) to identify the level of impairment of 1) riparian function, 2) sediment supply conditions, and 3) hydrology (runoff) conditions. For sediment and hydrology, the level of impairment is determined for local conditions (i.e. within subwatersheds, not including upstream drainage area) and at the watershed level (i.e. integrating the entire drainage area upstream of each subwatershed). See Appendix E for additional information on the IWA.

The Skamokawa-Elochoman watershed is a composite watershed that incorporates two primary stream drainages, Skamokawa Creek and Elochoman River. Other important drainages include Jim Crow Creek, Alger Creek, Risk Creek, and Nelson Creek. For the purpose of the IWA analysis, the Skamokawa-Elochoman watershed is divided into 17 LCFRB recovery planning subwatersheds. IWA results for the Skamokawa-Elochoman watershed are shown in Table D-6. A reference map showing the location of each subwatershed in the basin is presented in Figure D-24. Maps of the distribution of local and watershed level IWA results are displayed in Figure D-25.

Hydrology

Current Conditions— Local and watershed level hydrologic ratings are identical in the Elochoman-Skamokawa basin. Conditions are rated impaired in the downstream subwatersheds of the Elochoman (60401, 60201 and 60204), the West Fork Elochoman (60101) and in the headwaters Elochoman (60103). The middle and upper Elochoman (60202 and 60102) and Beaver Creek (60203) are rated moderately impaired. Hydrologic conditions in the Skamokawa drainage are rated as impaired in all subwatersheds except the headwaters (60301).

The Elochoman drainage as a whole averages 50% mature forest cover, with Beaver Creek (60203) and the upper mainstem Elochoman (60102 and 60202) collectively approaching 60%. The remaining subwatersheds in the drainage range between 13% and 47% mature forest cover. Road densities in the drainage are generally high, ranging from 3.2 to over 6 mi/mi². Of particular concern are impairment ratings in headwaters areas in the East Fork and West Fork (60103 and 60101). These subwatersheds are higher elevation with significant area in the rain-on-snow zone (55% and 17%, respectively). The East Fork headwaters are borderline in terms of road density and forest cover thresholds for hydrology, suggesting that conditions in this watershed are closer to moderately impaired.

The majority of land-use in the Elochoman drainage is timber production on private timber lands. Only two subwatersheds have significant area in public ownership. These are Beaver Creek (60203) and the middle mainstem Elochoman (60202), which are 72% and 48% WDNR lands, respectively. Remaining subwatersheds are predominantly in private timber lands.

Local and watershed level hydrologic conditions in the Skamokawa drainage are rated impaired except in the headwaters of the Skamokawa in McDonald and Standard Creeks (60301), which is rated as moderately impaired. The Skamokawa drainage is the lower elevation large drainage in the watershed, with only the headwaters and upper Wilson Creek (60301 and 60307) having significant area in the rain-on-snow zone (32% and 17%, respectively).

Only limited areas of the Skamokawa drainage have hydrologically mature forest coverage, averaging only 17% across all subwatersheds. Only the McDonald Creek/Standard Creek drainage (60301) has significant mature forest coverage (53%). Road densities are moderately high, with a range of 3.2 to over 5.2 mi/mi². Collectively, these factors account for the distribution of impaired ratings in the watershed. The majority of this drainage (70%) is in private lands, primarily timber holdings. The remaining public lands are held by WDNR in the uplands, and in NWR lands at the river mouth.

The generally impaired ratings for hydrology in the watershed are corroborated by acknowledged problems with watershed hydrology. Both the Skamokawa and Elochoman drainages have peak flow and low flow issues characteristic of altered hydrologic patterns. These changes are associated with an increase in the drainage network density due to forest roads, and loss of hydrologically mature forest cover.

Hydrologic conditions in estuarine subwatersheds (60305, 60401 and 60402) are rated moderately impaired to impaired. These ratings are primarily driven by lack of forest cover and higher road densities in these lowland areas, and downstream effects from the remainder of the watershed. However, it is important to note that these areas are more strongly influenced by the hydrology and tidal fluctuations of the Columbia River than by watershed level effects. In addition, the hydrologic condition of these subwatersheds are fundamentally affected by the draining and channelization of floodplain areas for agricultural development. Actual hydrologic conditions in these subwatersheds are less likely to be accurately predicted by the IWA than those in upstream subwatersheds.

Predicted Future Trends— Given the high proportion of watershed area in active forest lands, high road densities, and young forest, and given the likelihood of continuing harvest rotations, hydrologic conditions in the Elochoman and Skamokawa drainages are predicted to trend stable (i.e., moderately impaired to impaired) over the next 20 years.

The estuarine portion of the watershed (60305, 60401 and 60402) is expected to trend stable with respect to hydrologic conditions due to the extent of development and the presence of extensive NWR lands.

Table D-6. IWA results for the Skamokawa-Elochoman Watershed

Subwatershed ^a	Local Process Conditions ^b			Watershed Level Process Conditions ^c		Upstream Subwatersheds ^d
	Hydrology	Sediment	Riparian	Hydrology	Sediment	
60101	I	M	M	I	M	none
60102	M	M	M	M	M	60101, 60103
60103	I	M	M	I	M	none
60201	I	M	M	I	M	60101, 60102, 60103, 60202, 60203
60202	M	M	M	M	M	60101, 60102, 60103
60203	M	M	M	M	M	none
60204	I	M	M	I	M	60101, 60102, 60103, 60201, 60202, 60203
60301	M	M	M	M	M	none
60302	I	M	M	I	M	60301
60303	I	M	M	I	M	none
60304	I	M	M	I	M	none
60305	I	M	M	I	M	none
60306	I	F	M	I	M	60301, 60302, 60303, 60307
60307	I	M	M	I	M	none
60308	I	M	M	I	M	60304
60401	I	M	I	I	M	60101, 60102, 60103, 60201, 60202, 60203, 60204
60402	M	F	I	M	F	none

Notes:

^a LCFRB subwatershed identification code abbreviation. All codes are 14 digits starting with 170800030#####.

^b IWA results for watershed processes at the subwatershed level (i.e., not considering upstream effects). This information is used to identify areas that are potential sources of degraded conditions for watershed processes, abbreviated as follows:

F: Functional

M: Moderately impaired

I: Impaired

^c IWA results for watershed processes at the watershed level (i.e., considering upstream effects). These results integrate the contribution from all upstream subwatersheds to watershed processes and are used to identify the probable condition of these processes in subwatersheds where key reaches are present.

^d Subwatersheds upstream from this subwatershed.



Figure D-24. Map of the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed showing the location of the IWA subwatersheds.




Figure D-25. IWA subwatershed impairment ratings by category for the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed.

Sediment Supply

Current Conditions— Local sediment conditions are uniformly rated moderately impaired in the Elochoman drainage, with the exception of the lower Elochoman/Bernie Creek subwatershed (60402). A similar situation exists in the Skamokawa drainage, where all the subwatersheds are classified as moderately impaired at the local level, with the exception of the lower Skamokawa River (60306), which is rated functional. The watershed level results are nearly identical to the local level results. An exception is the lower Skamokawa subwatershed (60306), which is rated moderately impaired for sediment at the watershed level (versus functional at the local level). In this case, factors potentially affecting sediment conditions in the Wilson Creek headwaters (60307) and the upper Skamokawa (60302) are extensive enough to have potential downstream effects.

In the Elochoman Watershed, riparian zones are generally degraded due to historical and current land use practices, which in combination with degraded hydrologic conditions is a source of widespread bank and channel erosion (Wade 2002). High road densities in upland areas are also significant sources of sediment loading, particularly when located on sensitive slopes in areas with extensive timber harvest. The North Elochoman Watershed Analysis identified shallow rapid landslides associated with forest practices and high road densities as major contributors of fine sediment to the stream system (WDNR 1996). The IWA results generally corroborate the findings of the watershed analysis.

Despite the acknowledged problems with sediment in the drainage, the natural erodability rates for these subwatersheds are relatively low in comparison with the remainder of the LCR. Erodability ratings in the Elochoman drainage range from 7-27 (on a scale of 0-126), with only two exceeding a rating of 20. The fact that sediment loading is an ongoing problem in the basin despite the relatively low erodability in the drainage suggests numerous widespread chronic sources of sedimentation. Road densities in the Elochoman are generally high, ranging from 3.2 to over 6 mi/mi², with five of seven subwatersheds exceeding 4.5 mi/mi². Streamside road densities are generally low (<0.2 miles/stream mile), but stream crossing densities are high. Crossing densities range from 2.0-4.8 crossings/stream mile, with five of seven subwatersheds having over 3 crossings/stream mile. Culvert failures at stream crossings are potentially large sources of sediment delivery.

The causes and sources of sediment problems in the Skamokawa drainage are similar to those for the Elochoman. Sediment loading is an acknowledged problem for fish habitat in the Skamokawa drainage. Bank erosion and numerous mass-wasting problems occur in areas with alluvial deposits where past timber harvest and agricultural activities have removed protective riparian vegetation (Wade 2002). The generally degraded hydrologic conditions present in the watershed exacerbate this effect.

Watershed level ratings for sediment conditions are uniformly rated as moderately impaired throughout the Skamokawa drainage, based on the intersection of roads, steep slopes and erodable geology types. Natural erodability rates in the drainage are low to moderate (11-29 on a scale of 0-126), with the least erodable areas in bedrock zones in the headwaters. The remainder of the drainage is in the moderately erodable range. This natural instability, combined with extensive road construction and timber management, has led to substantial sediment loads and unstable, aggrading stream channels. Much of the sediment originated from past forest practices, including indiscriminate logging around and through streams, the use of splash dams to transport logs, and poor road construction (WDW 1990).

Forest road densities in the Skamokawa drainage are relatively high, ranging from 3.2 to 6.1 mi/mi². In contrast, streamside road densities are low (0.03-0.13 miles/mile of stream). Stream crossing densities range from low to moderate (1.3-3.6 crossings/stream mile). In combination, these factors suggest that the current high road densities and history of land use are primary drivers of sediment problems. Local

bank and channel erosion caused by degraded hydrologic conditions is also likely to contribute to sediment delivery.

Sediment conditions in estuary subwatersheds (60305, 60401 and 60402) are affected by sediment delivery from the upper watershed. However, sediment conditions in these tidally influenced areas of the watershed are more strongly influenced by tidal fluctuations and the hydrology of the mainstem Columbia. Due to this dominant influence, IWA results are not expected to predict actual sediment conditions in these subwatersheds as accurately as for upstream subwatersheds.

Predicted Future Trends— In the Elochoman and Skamokawa Watersheds, timber harvests on private forest lands are likely to continue for the foreseeable future. Because the forest road network will be maintained to support these activities, road related indicators (road density, streamside road density, and stream crossing density) are expected to remain relatively constant. Based on this information, the trend in sediment conditions is expected to remain relatively constant over the next 20 years, with the potential for some improvement if old roads are replaced using improved road design and management.

Given the extent of development and the presence of extensive NWR lands in the estuarine portion of the watershed, hydrologic conditions are expected to trend stable, following general trends for the remainder of the watershed.

Riparian Condition

Current Conditions— Riparian conditions are rated moderately impaired to impaired throughout the majority of the Skamokawa-Elochoman watershed. Impaired ratings are concentrated in the lowland estuary subwatersheds (60401, 60402) where extensive floodplain and side channel habitat has been disconnected from most of the lower river mainstems and tributaries by diking and agricultural conversion. The riparian rating for these subwatersheds also reflects a natural tendency towards less coniferous vegetation. Information is lacking on the quantity and quality of floodplain, side channel, estuary, or wetland habitats in the watershed, and the loss of these habitats due to various land use activities (Wade 2002).

Predicted Future Trends— Riparian conditions throughout most of the watershed are expected to improve over time due to improved forest practices that aim to protect riparian areas. In the lower mainstem and estuarine areas of the watershed, the potential for riparian recovery is relatively limited due to the extent of channelization. Therefore, riparian conditions are generally predicted to trend stable. Tidal water areas at the mouth of the Skamokawa and Jim Crow Creek (60304 and 60405) are being managed as wildlife refuges. Actual conditions in these areas are not accurately reflected by the riparian ratings which average conditions over the entire subwatershed. Riparian conditions in these subwatersheds should trend towards improvement over the next 20 years.

D.3.6. Other Factors and Limitations

Hatcheries

Hatcheries currently release over 50 million salmon and steelhead per year in Washington lower Columbia River subbasins. Many of these fish are released to mitigate for loss of habitat. Hatcheries can provide valuable mitigation and conservation benefits but may also cause significant adverse impacts if not prudently and properly employed. Risks to wild fish include genetic deterioration, reduced fitness and survival, ecological effects such as competition or predation, facility effects on passage and water quality, mixed stock fishery effects, and confounding the accuracy of wild population status estimates. This section describes hatchery programs in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed and discusses their potential effects. Historically, two hatcheries operated in the watershed: the Elochoman Hatchery and the Beaver Creek Hatchery. The Beaver Creek Hatchery (since 1957) reared early-run winter steelhead for distribution to several lower Columbia basins until it was closed in 1999. The Elochoman Hatchery still operates in the watershed.

The Elochoman Hatchery: The Elochoman Hatchery (since 1954) produces winter and summer steelhead, fall Chinook, and coho for harvest opportunity (Table D-7). The winter steelhead program includes both a composite stock from Beaver Creek Hatchery and a local stock program. The summer steelhead are Skamania stock. The Elochoman Hatchery also provides coho for net pen rearing and harvest in Steamboat Slough and winter steelhead for release into the Coweeman River. There are no hatchery fish released into Skamokawa Creek. The main threats from hatchery steelhead are potential domestication of the naturally produced steelhead as a result of adult interactions or ecological interactions between natural juvenile salmon and hatchery released juvenile steelhead. The main threats from the Elochoman Hatchery salmon programs are domestication of natural fall Chinook and coho and potential ecological interactions between hatchery and natural juvenile salmon.




Figure D-26. Magnitude and timing of hatchery releases in the Deep River, Grays River, and Elochoman basins by species, based on 2003 brood production goals.




Figure D-27. Recent average hatchery returns and estimates of natural spawning escapement in the Deep, Grays, and Elochoman River basins by species. The years used to calculate averages varied by species, based on available data. The data used to calculate average hatchery returns and natural escapement for a particular species and basin were derived from the same years in all cases. All data were from 1992 to the present. Calculation of each average utilized a minimum of 5 years of data.

Table D-7. Current Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed hatchery production.

Hatchery	Release Location	Fall Chinook	Early Coho	Late Coho	Local Winter Steelhead	Winter Steelhead	Summer Steelhead
Elochoman	Elochoman	2,000,000	418,000	512,000	30,000	90,000 ¹	30,000
	Coweeman					20,000	
	Steamboat Sl.		200,000				

¹ Includes 60,000 Beaver Creek stock and 30,000 wild Elochoman stock.

Biological Risk Assessment: The evaluation of hatchery programs and implementation of hatchery reform in the Lower Columbia is occurring through several processes. These include: 1) the LCFRB recovery planning process; 2) Hatchery Genetic Management Plan (HGMP) preparation for ESA permitting; 3) FERC related plans on the Cowlitz River and Lewis River; 4) the federally mandated Artificial Production Review and Evaluation (APRE) process, and 5) the congressionally mandated, Hatchery Scientific Review Group (HSRG) review of all state, tribal and federal hatchery programs in Puget Sound and Coastal Washington, and in the Columbia River Basin. Through each of these processes, WDFW is applying a consistent framework to identify the hatchery program enhancements that will maximize fishing-related economic benefits and promote attainment of regional recovery goals. Developing hatcheries into an integrated, productive, stock recovery tool requires a policy framework for considering the acceptable risks of artificial propagation, and a scientific assessment of the benefits and risks of each proposed hatchery program.

WDFW completed a Benefit-Risk Assessment Procedure (BRAP) in 2004 to provide a framework for considerations of hatchery reforms consistent with the Recovery Plan. The BRAP evaluates hatchery programs in the ecological context of the watershed, with integrated assessment and decisions for hatcheries, harvest, and habitat. The risk assessment procedure consists of five basic steps, grouped into two blocks. A policy framework assesses population status of wild populations, develops risk tolerance profiles for all stock conditions, and assign risk tolerance profiles to all stocks. A risk assessment characterizes risk assessments for each hatchery program and identifies appropriate management actions to reduce risk.

Table D-8 identifies hazards levels associated with risks involved with hatchery programs in the Grays River / Columbia Estuary Tributaries Basins. Table D-9 identifies preliminary strategies proposed to address risks identified in the BRAP for the same populations. The BRAP risk assessments and strategies to reduce risk have been key in providing the biological context to develop the hatchery recovery measures for lower Columbia River sub-basins.

Table D-8. Preliminary BRAP for hatchery programs affecting populations in the Elochoman/Skamokawa River Watershed.

Symbol Description
 ○ Risk of hazard consistent with current risk tolerance profile.
 ⊗ Magnitude of risk associated with hazard unknown.
 ● Risk of hazard exceeds current risk tolerance profile.
 ■ Hazard not relevant to population

Elochoman/ Skamakawa Population	Hatchery Program		Risk Assessment of Hazards											
			Genetic			Ecological			Demographic		Facility			
	Name	Release (millions)	Effective Population Size	Domestication	Diversity	Predation	Competition	Disease	Survival Rate	Reproductive Success	Catastrophic Loss	Passage	Screening	Water Quality
Fall Chinook	Elochoman Fall Chinook	2.000	○	●	○	○	⊗	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Elochoman Coho Type N 1+	0.497	■	■	■	⊗	⊗	○	■	■	■	○	○	○
	Elochoman Coho Type S 1+	0.418	■	■	■	⊗	⊗	○	■	■	■	○	○	○
	Elochoman W. Steelhead 1+	0.090	■	■	■	⊗	⊗	○	■	■	■	○	○	○
	Elochoman S. Steelhead 1+	0.030	■	■	■	⊗	⊗	○	■	■	■	○	○	○
Winter Steelhead	Elochoman Fall Chinook	2.000	■	■	■	○	⊗	○	■	■	■	○	○	○
	Elochoman Coho Type N 1+	0.497	■	■	■	⊗	⊗	○	■	■	■	○	○	○
	Elochoman Coho Type S 1+	0.418	■	■	■	⊗	⊗	○	■	■	■	○	○	○
	Elochoman W. Steelhead 1+	0.090	○	○	⊗	⊗	⊗	○	■	■	■	○	○	○
	Elochoman S. Steelhead 1+	0.030	○	○	⊗	⊗	⊗	○	■	■	■	○	○	○
Chum	Elochoman Fall Chinook	2.000	■	■	■	⊗	○	○	■	■	■	○	○	○
	Elochoman Coho Type N 1+	0.497	■	■	■	⊗	○	○	■	■	■	○	○	○
	Elochoman Coho Type S 1+	0.418	■	■	■	⊗	○	○	■	■	■	○	○	○
	Elochoman W. Steelhead 1+	0.090	■	■	■	⊗	○	○	■	■	■	○	○	○
	Elochoman S. Steelhead 1+	0.030	■	■	■	⊗	○	○	■	■	■	○	○	○

Table D-9. Preliminary strategies proposed to address risks identified in the BRAP for Elochoman/Skamokawa River populations.

Elochoman/ Skamakawa Population	Hatchery Program		Risk Assessment of Hazards														
			Address Genetic Risks					Address Ecological Risks				Address Demographic Risks	Address Facility Risks				
	Name	Release (millions)	Mating Procedure	Integrated Program	Segregated Program	Research/Monitoring	Broodstock Source	Number Released	Release Procedure	Disease Containment	Research/Monitoring	Culture Procedure	Research/Monitoring	Reliability	Improve Passage	Improve Screening	Pollution Abatement
Fall Chinook	Elochoman Fall Chinook	2.000	●	●	●	■	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Elochoman Coho Type N 1+	0.497	■	■	■	■	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Elochoman Coho Type S 1+	0.418	■	■	■	■	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Elochoman W. Steelhead	0.090	■	■	■	■	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Elochoman S. Steelhead	0.030	■	■	■	■	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

The regional Hatchery Scientific Review Group (HSRG) completed an assessment of lower Columbia River hatcheries in 2009 (http://www.hatcheryreform.us/mfs/welcome_show.action). The HSRG is the independent scientific review panel of the Pacific Northwest Hatchery Reform Project established by Congress in 2000 in recognition that while hatcheries play a legitimate role in meeting harvest and conservation goals for Pacific Northwest salmon and steelhead, the hatchery system was in need of

comprehensive reform. The HSRG has reviewed all state, tribal and federal hatchery programs in Puget Sound, Coastal Washington, and the Columbia River Basin. The HSRG concluded that hatcheries play an important role in the management of salmon and steelhead populations in the Columbia River Basin but that hatchery programs must be viewed not as surrogates or replacements for lost habitat, but as tools that can be managed as part of a coordinated strategy to meet watershed or regional resource goals, in concert with actions affecting habitat, harvest rates, water allocation and other important components of the human environment. The HSRG reached several critical, overarching conclusions regarding areas where current hatchery and harvest practices need to be reformed. Recommendation included:

- Manage hatchery broodstocks to achieve proper genetic integration with, or segregation from, natural populations;
- Promote of local adaptation of natural and hatchery populations;
- Minimize adverse ecological interactions between hatchery- and natural-origin fish;
- Minimize effects of hatchery facilities on the ecosystem in which they operate; and
- Maximize the survival of hatchery fish.

The HSRG developed a series of criteria for evaluating hatchery influence on wild populations based on Population Viability objectives identified in the Recovery Plan. Criteria are based on the proportion of effective hatchery-origin spawners (pHOS), the proportion of natural-origin adults in the broodstock (pNOB), and the proportionate natural influences (PNI) which is a product of pHOS and pNOB.

For Primary populations:

- pHOS should be less than 5% of the naturally spawning population, unless the hatchery population is integrated with the natural population.
- For integrated populations, pNOB should exceed pHOS by at least a factor of two, corresponding to a PNI (proportionate natural influence) value of 0.67 or greater and pHOS should be less than 0.30.

For Contributing populations:

- The proportion of effective hatchery-origin spawners (pHOS) should be less than 10% of the naturally spawning population, unless the hatchery population is integrated with the natural population.
- For integrated populations, pNOB should exceed pHOS, corresponding to a PNI value of 0.50 or greater and pHOS should be less than 0.30.

For Stabilizing populations:

- The current operating conditions were considered adequate to meet conservation goals. No criteria were developed for proportion of effective hatchery-origin spawners (pHOS) or PNI.

Evaluations of current hatchery programs relative to population recovery objectives and hatchery criteria led the HSRG to provide detailed recommendations for reform of specific hatchery programs for each species and programs. General recommendations are summarized below for each species. More specific recommendations for each hatchery program are detailed, along with analyses of alternatives, in the HSRG report (http://www.hatcheryreform.us/mfs/welcome_show.action). These recommendations inform the hatchery actions identified for this subbasin and hatchery reform implementation planning reflected in WDFW's Conservation and Sustainable Fisheries plans under current development.

For Chinook, the HSRG concluded that a major concern with these programs is the effect hatchery strays have on the long-term fitness of naturally spawning populations. Although programs provide significant harvest benefits, and in some cases, help preserve genetic resources in the ESU, there are

many poorly segregated and poorly integrated programs. HSRG recommendations for Chinook hatchery reform included:

- In segregated programs, improve the ability to control hatchery fish on the spawning grounds so that harvest benefits can be maintained while improving natural-origin spawning abundance and productivity for instance, by installing weirs in specific drainages where straying limits the ability to meet conservation goals.
- Move production from some tributaries into larger segregated harvest programs in Select Area Fishery Evaluation areas, where excess hatchery fish can be removed by applying higher harvest rates.
- Reduce reliance of some programs on imported out-of-basin broodstock or rearing to improve homing and increase productivity.
- For integrated programs, increase the proportion of natural-origin fish used in hatchery broodstock and control the contribution of hatchery-origin fish to natural spawning areas. In some cases, meeting the criteria for the population designation requires reducing program size.

For coho, the HSRG concluded that a major concern with these programs is the effect hatchery strays have on the long-term fitness of naturally spawning populations. These programs provide significant harvest benefits, and in some cases, help preserve genetic resources in the ESU. However, the ESU is dominated by many poorly segregated and a few poorly integrated programs. HSRG recommendations for coho hatchery reform included:

- In segregated programs, improve the ability to control hatchery fish on the spawning grounds so that harvest benefits can be maintained while improving natural-origin spawning abundance and productivity for instance, by installing weirs in specific drainages where straying limits the ability to meet conservation goals.
- Move production from some tributaries into larger segregated harvest programs in Select Area Fishery Evaluation areas, where excess hatchery fish can be removed by applying higher harvest rates.
- For integrated programs, increase the proportion of natural-origin fish used in hatchery broodstock and control the contribution of hatchery-origin fish to natural spawning areas. In some cases, meeting the criteria for the population designation requires reducing program size.
- In some cases, harvest benefits could be maintained and conservation improved by developing highly integrated conservation programs with associated segregated harvest programs (stepping-stone programs).
- More emphasis on monitoring and evaluation programs to accurately estimate straying is also recommended.

For chum, the HSRG concluded that hatchery intervention can reduce demographic risk by boosting abundance and additional conservation propagation programs should be promptly initiated within each of the ESU's three geographic strata to reduce this risk. The HSRG had no recommendations to improve on single existing chum program (Grays River) and recommends its continued operation as an important safety net in the lower Columbia.

For steelhead, the HSRG concluded that all populations in this DPS meet or exceed the HSRG criteria for their population designation. No recommendations to change programs were made by the HSRG. However, due to uncertainty about the number of unharvested hatchery-origin fish from segregated

programs that remain in the natural environment, the HSRG identified a need for additional monitoring to further clarify these values and to aid in assessing the ecological impacts to the natural populations.

Subbasin Specific Recommendations: The HSRG provided subbasin and population specific advice. For the Elochoman subbasin, the following recommendations were made:

Elochoman River – Fall Chinook

HSRG noted that every possible step should be taken to achieve the abundance goal for this population and recommends:

- reduce out-of-basin strays, uniquely tag hatchery fish, but not adipose clipped, for selected harvest
- rebuild lower river weir to more effectively remove strays and collect broodstock, and update the hatchery facility
- implement a BKD control strategy where BKD has been a recurring problem

Elochoman River (Bernie Slough) – Coho

Since this is an educational program, the HSRG recommended that the coho program continue to be operated and sized for educational purposes only. In addition, the FFA and WDFW could consider using the program to raise chum for recovery purposes.

Elochoman River – Coho

- reduce the Type N integrated program to reduce risks to recovery of naturally produced coho
- continue the Type S segregated program only if repairs are made to the barrier at the hatchery to exclude 95% of hatchery fish upstream of the barrier
- explore opportunities to produce an additional 400,000 fish release at Beaver Creek Hatchery

Elochoman River – Chum

- monitor chum abundance and consider the population for a small conservation hatchery program
- implement a low cost conservation program; mark and monitor hatchery fish and then “sunset” the program after 3 generations, unless evidence suggests otherwise

Elochoman River – Winter Steelhead

The HSRG noted that the current programs are consistent with the designation as a Contributing population and has no specific recommendations to modify the program. If the barrier dam were more effective, it is possible that the program would meet the genetic guidelines for a Primary population.

The HSRG also suggested that managers consider the ecological effects of summer steelhead, although currently the outplants do not appear to be having a genetic effect.

Impacts: Impacts of hatchery fish on local wild populations are estimated in this plan, for the purposes of comparison with the relative magnitude of other factors, based on hatchery fractions and assumed fitness effects estimated by the HSRG. Detailed explanations of these impact estimates may be found in Volume I, Chapter 3 of this Recovery Plan.

Harvest

Fishing generally affects salmon populations through directed and incidental harvest, catch and release mortality, and size, age, and run timing alterations because of uneven fishing on different run components. From a population biology perspective, this can result in fewer spawners and can alter age, size, run timing, fecundity, and genetic characteristics. Fewer spawners result in fewer eggs for future generations and diminish marine-derived nutrients delivered via dying adults, now known to be

significant to the growth and survival of juvenile salmon in aquatic ecosystems. The degree to which harvest-related limiting factors influence productivity varies by species and location.

Most harvest of wild Columbia River salmon and steelhead occur incidental to the harvest of hatchery fish and healthy wild stocks in the Columbia estuary, mainstem, and ocean. Fish are caught in the Canada/Alaska ocean, U.S. West Coast ocean, lower Columbia River commercial and recreational, tributary recreational, and in-river treaty Indian (including commercial, ceremonial, and subsistence) fisheries. Total exploitation rates have decreased for lower Columbia salmon and steelhead, especially since the 1970s as increasingly stringent protection measures were adopted for declining natural populations.

At the time of interim plan completion, fishing impact rates on lower Columbia River naturally-spawning salmon populations ranges from 2.5% for chum salmon to 45% for tule fall Chinook (Table D-10). These rates include estimates of direct harvest mortality as well as estimates of incidental mortality in catch and release fisheries. Fishery impact rates for hatchery produced coho and steelhead are higher than for naturally-spawning fish of the same species because of selective fishing regulations. These rates generally reflect recent year (2001-2003) fishery regulations and quotas controlled by weak stock impact limits and annual abundance of healthy targeted fish. Actual harvest rates will vary for each year dependent on annual stock status of multiple west coast salmon populations, however, these rates generally reflect expected impacts of harvest on lower Columbia naturally-spawning and hatchery salmon and steelhead under current harvest management plans.

Columbia River fall Chinook are subject to freshwater and ocean fisheries from Alaska to their rivers of origin in fisheries targeting abundant Chinook stocks originating from Alaska, Canada, Washington, Oregon, and California. Columbia tule fall Chinook harvest is constrained by a Recovery Exploitation Rate (RER) developed by NMFS for management of Coweeman naturally-spawning fall Chinook. Some in-basin sport fisheries are closed to the retention of Chinook to naturally spawning populations. Harvest of lower Columbia bright fall Chinook is managed to achieve an escapement goal of 5,700 natural spawners in the North Fork Lewis.

Table D-10. Approximate annual exploitation rates (% harvested) for naturally-spawning lower Columbia salmon and steelhead under current management controls (represents 2001-2003 fishing period).

	AK./Can. Ocean	West Coast Ocean	Col. R. Comm.	Col. R. Sport	Trib. Sport	Wild Total	Hatchery Total	Historic Highs
Fall Chinook (Tule)	15	15	5	5	5	45	45	80
Fall Chinook (Bright)	19	3	6	2	10	40	Na	65
Chum	0	0	1.5	0	1	2.5	2.5	60
Coho	<1	9	6	2	1	18	51	85
Steelhead	0	<1	3	0.5	5	8.5	70	75

Rates are very low for chum salmon, which are not encountered by ocean fisheries and return to freshwater in late fall when significant Columbia River commercial fisheries no longer occur. Chum are no longer targeted in Columbia commercial seasons and retention of chum is prohibited in Columbia River and Elochoman/Skamokawa sport fisheries. Chum are impacted incidental to fisheries directed at coho and winter steelhead.

Harvest of Elochoman/Skamokawa coho occurs in the ocean commercial and recreational fisheries off the Washington and Oregon coasts and Columbia River as well as recreational fisheries in the Elochoman River. Wild coho impacts are limited by fishery management to retain marked hatchery fish and release unmarked wild fish.

Steelhead, like chum, are not encountered by ocean fisheries and non-Indian commercial steelhead fisheries are prohibited in the Columbia River. Incidental mortality of steelhead occurs in freshwater

commercial fisheries directed at Chinook and coho and freshwater sport fisheries directed at hatchery steelhead and salmon. All recreational fisheries are managed to selectively harvest fin-marked hatchery steelhead and commercial fisheries cannot retain hatchery or wild steelhead.

Access to harvestable surpluses of strong stocks in the Columbia River and ocean is regulated by impact limits on weak populations mixed with the strong. Weak stock management of Columbia River fisheries became increasingly prevalent in the 1960s and 1970s in response to continuing declines of upriver runs affected by mainstem dam construction. In the 1980s coordinated ocean and freshwater weak stock management commenced. More fishery restrictions followed ESA listings in the 1990s. Each fishery is controlled by a series of regulating factors. Many of the regulating factors that affect harvest impacts on Columbia River stocks are associated with treaties, laws, policies, or guidelines established for the management of other stocks or combined stocks, but indirectly control impacts of Columbia River fish as well. Listed fish generally comprise a small percentage of the total fish caught by any fishery. Every listed fish may correspond to tens, hundreds, or thousands of other stocks in the total catch. As a result of weak stock constraints, surpluses of hatchery and strong naturally-spawning runs often go unharvested. Small reductions in fishing rates on listed populations can translate to large reductions in catch of other stocks and recreational trips to communities which provide access to fishing, with significant economic consequences.

Selective fisheries for adipose fin-clipped hatchery spring Chinook (since 2001), coho (since 1999), and steelhead (since 1984) have substantially reduced fishing mortality rates for naturally-spawning populations and allowed concentration of fisheries on abundant hatchery fish. Selective fisheries occur in the Columbia River and tributaries, for spring Chinook and steelhead, and in the ocean, Columbia River, and tributaries for coho. Columbia River hatchery fall Chinook are not marked for selective fisheries, but likely will be in the future because of recent legislation enacted by Congress.

Mainstem and Estuary Habitat

Conditions in the Columbia River mainstem, estuary, and plume affect all anadromous salmonid populations within the Columbia Basin. Juvenile and adult salmon may be found in the mainstem and estuary at all times of the year, as different species, life history strategies and size classes continually rear or move through these waters. A variety of human activities in the mainstem and estuary have decreased both the quantity and quality of habitat used by juvenile salmonids. These include floodplain development; loss of side channel habitat, wetlands and marshes; and alteration of flows due to upstream hydro operations and irrigation withdrawals.

Effects on salmonids of habitat changes in the mainstem and estuary are complex and poorly understood. Effects are similar for Elochoman/Skamokawa populations to those of most other subbasin salmonid populations. Effects are likely to be greater for chum and fall Chinook which rear for extended periods in the mainstem and estuary than for steelhead and coho which move through more quickly. Estimates of the impacts of human-caused changes in mainstem and estuary habitat conditions are available based on changes in river flow, temperature, and predation as represented by EDT analyses for the NPCC Multispecies Framework Approach (Marcot et al. 2002). These estimates generally translate into a 10-60% reduction in salmonid productivity depending on species (Appendix E). Estuary effects are described more fully in the estuary subbasin volume of this plan (Volume II-A).

Hydropower Construction and Operation

There are no hydro-electric dams in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed. However, Elochoman/Skamokawa species are affected by changes in Columbia River mainstem and estuary related to Columbia Basin hydropower development and operation. The mainstem Columbia River and

estuary provide important habitats for anadromous species during juvenile and adult migrations between spawning and rearing streams and the ocean where they grow and mature. These habitats are particularly important for fall Chinook and chum which rear extensively in the Columbia mainstem and estuary. Aquatic habitats have been fundamentally altered throughout the Columbia River Basin by the construction and operation of a complex of tributary and mainstem dams and reservoirs for power generation, navigation, and flood control.

The hydropower infrastructure and flow regulation affects adult migration, juvenile migration, mainstem spawning success, estuarine rearing, water temperature, water clarity, gas supersaturation, and predation. Dams block or impede passage of anadromous juveniles and adults. Columbia River spring flows are greatly reduced from historical levels as water is stored for power generation and irrigation, while summer and winter flows have increased. These flow changes affect juvenile and adult migration, and have radically altered habitat forming processes. Flow regulation and reservoir construction have increased average water temperature in the Columbia River mainstem and summer temperatures regularly exceed optimums for salmon. Supersaturation of water with atmospheric gases, primarily nitrogen, when water is spilled over high dams causes gas bubble disease. Predation by fish, bird, and marine mammals has been exacerbated by habitat changes. The net effect of these direct and indirect effects is difficult to quantify but is expected to be less significant for populations originating from lower Columbia River subbasins than for upriver salmonid populations. Additional information on hydropower effects can be found in Volume I.

Ecological Interactions

Ecological interactions focus on how salmon and steelhead, other fish species, and wildlife interact with each other and the subbasin ecosystem. Salmon and steelhead are affected throughout their lifecycle by ecological interactions with non native species, food web components, and predators. Each of these factors can be exacerbated by human activities either by direct actions or indirect effects of habitat alternation. Effects of non-native species on salmon, effects of salmon on system productivity, and effects of native predators on salmon are difficult to quantify. Strong evidence exists in the scientific literature on the potential for significant interactions but effects are often context- or case-specific.

Predation is one interaction where effects can be estimated although interpretation can be complicated. In the lower Columbia River, northern pikeminnow, Caspian tern, and marine mammal predation on salmon has been estimated at approximately 5%, 10-30%, and 3-12%, respectively of total salmon numbers (see Appendix E for additional details). Predation has always been a source of salmon mortality but predation rates by some species have been exacerbated by human activities.

Ocean Conditions

Salmonid numbers and survival rates in the ocean vary with ocean conditions and low productivity periods increase extinction risks of populations stressed by human impacts. The ocean is subject to annual and longer-term climate cycles just as the land is subject to periodic droughts and floods. The El Niño weather pattern produces warm ocean temperatures and warm, dry conditions throughout the Pacific Northwest. The La Niña weather pattern is typified by cool ocean temperatures and cool/wet weather patterns on land. Recent history is dominated by a high frequency of warm dry years, along with some of the largest El Niños on record—particularly in 1982-83 and 1997-98. In contrast, the 1960s and early 1970s were dominated by a cool, wet regime. Many climatologists suspect that the conditions observed since 1998 may herald a return to the cool wet regime that prevailed during the 1960s and early 1970s.

Abrupt declines in salmon populations throughout the Pacific Northwest coincided with a regime shift to predominantly warm dry conditions from 1975 to 1998 (Beamish and Bouillon 1993, Hare et al 1999, McKinnell et al. 2001, Pyper et al. 2001). Warm dry regimes result in generally lower survival rates and abundance, and they also increase variability in survival and wide swings in salmon abundance. Some of the largest Columbia River fish runs in recorded history occurred during 1985–1987 and 2001–2002 after strong El Niño conditions in 1982–83 and 1997–98 were followed by several years of cool wet conditions.

The reduced productivity that accompanied an extended series of warm dry conditions after 1975 has, together with numerous anthropogenic impacts, brought many weak Pacific Northwest salmon stocks to the brink of extinction and precipitated widespread ESA listings. Salmon numbers naturally ebb and flow as ocean conditions vary. Healthy salmon populations are productive enough to withstand these natural fluctuations. Weak salmon populations may disappear or lose the genetic diversity needed to withstand the next cycle of low ocean productivity (Lawson 1993).

Recent improvements in ocean survival may portend a regime shift to generally more favorable conditions for salmon. The large spike in recent runs and a cool, wet climate would provide a respite for many salmon populations driven to critical low levels by recent conditions. The National Research Council (1996) concluded: *“Any favorable changes in ocean conditions—which could occur and could increase the productivity of some salmon populations for a time—should be regarded as opportunities for improving management techniques. They should not be regarded as reasons to abandon or reduce rehabilitation efforts, because conditions will change again”*. Additional details on the nature and effects of variable ocean conditions on salmonids can be found in Volume I.

D.3.7. Summary of Human Impacts on Salmon and Steelhead

Stream habitat, estuary/mainstem habitat, harvest, hatchery and ecological interactions have all contributed to reductions in productivity, numbers, and population viability. Pie charts in Figure D-28 describe the relative magnitude of potentially-manageable human impacts in each category of limiting factor for Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed salmon and steelhead. Impact values were developed for a base period corresponding to species listing dates. This depiction is useful for identifying which factors are most significant for each species and where improvements might be expected to provide substantial benefits. Larger pie slices indicate greater significance and scope for improvement in an impact for a given species. These numbers also serve as a working hypothesis for factors limiting salmonid numbers and viability.

This assessment indicates that current salmonid status is the result of large impacts distributed among several factors. No single factor accounts for a majority of effects on all species. Thus, substantial improvements in salmonid numbers and viability will require significant improvements in several factors. Loss of tributary habitat quality and quantity accounts for the largest relative impact on chum, coho, and winter steelhead. Loss of estuary habitat quantity and quality is relatively moderate for all species. Harvest has a sizeable effect on fall Chinook, coho and winter steelhead. Hatchery impacts are substantial for coho and fall Chinook, and relatively low for chum and winter steelhead. The main threats from the Elochoman Hatchery are domestication of natural fall Chinook and coho and potential ecological interactions with hatchery produced fall Chinook and coho. There are no hatchery releases into Skamokawa Creek. Predation impacts are moderate for coho, chum, and fall Chinook but higher for winter steelhead. No dams are operated in the subbasin and hydrosystem impacts are relatively minor and limited to habitat effects in the Columbia River mainstem and estuary.

Impacts were defined as the proportional reduction in average numbers or productivity associated with each effect. Tributary and estuary habitat impacts are the differences between the pre-development historical baseline and current conditions. Hydro impacts identify the percentage of historical habitat

blocked by impassable dams and the mortality associated with juvenile and adult passage of other dams. Fishing impacts are the direct and indirect mortality in ocean and freshwater fisheries. Hatchery impacts include the equilibrium effects of reduced natural population productivity caused by natural spawning of less-fit hatchery fish and also effects of inter-specific predation by larger hatchery smolts on smaller wild juveniles. Hatchery impacts do not include other potentially negative indirect effects or potentially beneficial effects of augmentation of natural production. Predation includes mortality from northern pikeminnow, Caspian terns, and marine mammals in the Columbia River mainstem and estuary. Predation is not a direct human impact but was included because of widespread interest in its relative significance. Methods and data for these analyses are detailed in Appendix E.

Potentially-manageable human impacts were estimated for each factor based on the best available scientific information. Proportions are standardized to a total of 1.0 for plotting purposes. The index is intended to illustrate order-of-magnitude rather than fine-scale differences. Only the subset of factors we can potentially manage were included in this index – natural mortality factors beyond our control (e.g. naturally-occurring ocean mortality) are excluded. Not every factor of interest is included in this index – only readily-quantifiable impacts are included.




Figure D-28. Relative contribution of potentially manageable impacts on Elochoman/Skamokawa salmonid populations.

D.4. Key Programs and Projects

This section provides brief summaries of current federal, state, local, and non-governmental programs and projects pertinent to recovery, management, and mitigation measures and actions in this basin. These descriptions provide a context for descriptions of specific actions and responsibilities in the management plan portion of this subbasin plan. More detailed descriptions of these programs and projects can be found in the Comprehensive Program Directory (Appendix C).

D.4.1. Federal Programs

NMFS

NMFS is responsible for conserving, protecting and managing pacific salmon, ground fish, halibut, marine mammals and habitats under the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Magnuson-Stevens Act, and enforcement authorities. NMFS administers the ESA under Section 4 (listing requirements), Section 7 (federal actions), and Section 10 (non-federal actions).

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is the Federal government's largest water resources development and management agency. USACE programs applicable to Lower Columbia Fish & Wildlife include: 1) Section 1135 – provides for the modification of the structure or operation of a past USACE project, 2) Section 206 – authorizes the implementation of aquatic ecosystem restoration and protection projects, 3) Hydroelectric Program – applies to the construction and operation of power facilities and their environmental impact, 4) Regulatory Program – administration of Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Environmental Protection Agency

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is responsible for the implementation of the Clean Water Act (CWA). The broad goal of the CWA is to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters so that they can support the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water. The CWA requires that water quality standards (WQS) be set for surface waters. WQS are aimed at translating the broad goals of the CWA into waterbody-specific objectives and apply only to the surface waters (rivers, lakes, estuaries, coastal waters, and wetlands) of the United States.

Natural Resources Conservation Service

Formerly the Soil Conservation Service, the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) works with landowners to conserve natural resources on private lands. The NRCS accomplishes this through various programs including, but not limited to, the Conservation Technical Assistance Program, Soil Survey Program, Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, and the Wetlands Reserve Program. The NRCS works closely with local Conservation Districts; providing technical assistance and support.

Northwest Power and Conservation Council

The Northwest Power and Conservation Council, an interstate compact of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, has specific responsibility in the Northwest Power Act of 1980 to mitigate the effects of the hydropower system on fish and wildlife of the Columbia River Basin. The Council does this through its Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, which is funded by the Bonneville Power Administration. Beginning in Fiscal Year 2006, funding is guided by locally developed subbasin plans that are expected to be formally adopted in the Council's Fish and Wildlife Program in December 2004.

D.4.2. State Programs

Washington Department of Natural Resources

The Washington Department of Natural Resources governs forest practices on non-federal lands and is steward to state owned aquatic lands. Management of DNR public forest lands is governed by tenets of their proposed Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). Management of private industrial forestlands is subject to Forest Practices regulations that include both protective and restorative measures.

Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife

WDFW's Habitat Division supports a variety of programs that address salmonids and other wildlife and resident fish species. These programs are organized around habitat conditions (Science Division, Priority Habitats and Species, and the Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Inventory and Assessment Program); habitat restoration (Landowner Incentive Program, Lead Entity Program, and the Conservation and Reinvestment Act Program, as well as technical assistance in the form of publications and technical resources); and habitat protection (Landowner Assistance, GMA, SEPA planning, Hydraulic Project Approval, and Joint Aquatic Resource Permit Applications).

Washington Department of Ecology

The Department of Ecology (Ecology) oversees: the Water Resources program to manage water resources to meet current and future needs of the natural environment and Washington's communities; the Water Quality program to restore and protect Washington's water supplies by preventing and reducing pollution; and Shoreline and the Environmental Assistance program for implementing the Shorelines Management Act, the State Environmental Protection Act, the Watershed Planning Act, and 401 Certification of USACE Permits.

Washington Department of Transportation

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) must ensure compliance with environmental laws and statutes when designing and executing transportation projects. Programs that consider and mitigate for impacts to salmonid habitat include: the Fish Passage Barrier Removal program; the Regional Road Maintenance ESA Section 4d Program, the Integrated Vegetation Management & Roadside Development Program; Environmental Mitigation Program; the Stormwater Retrofit Program; and the Chronic Environmental Deficiency Program.

Washington Recreation and Conservation Office

Created through the enactment of the Salmon Recovery Act (Washington State Legislature, 1999), the Salmon Recovery Funding Board provides grant funds to protect or restore salmon habitat and assist

related activities with local watershed groups known as lead entities. SRFB has helped finance over 500 salmon recovery projects statewide. The Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) was established in 1984 and is used to provide grant support for the purchase, improvement, or protection of aquatic lands for public purposes, and for providing and improving access to such lands. The Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP), established in 1990 and administered by the RCO, provides funding assistance for a broad range of land protection, park development, preservation/conservation, and outdoor recreation facilities.

Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board

The Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board encompasses five counties in the Lower Columbia River Region. The 15-member board has four main programs, including habitat protection and restoration activities, watershed planning for water quantity, quality, habitat, and instream flows, facilitating the development of an integrated recovery plan for the Washington portion of the lower Columbia Evolutionarily Significant Units, and conducting public outreach activities.

D.4.3. Local Government Programs

Wahkiakum County

Wahkiakum County is not planning under the State's Growth Management Act in its Comprehensive Planning process. Wahkiakum County manages natural resources primarily through its Critical Areas Ordinance.

Cowlitz / Wahkiakum Conservation District

The Cowlitz/Wahkiakum CD provides technical assistance, cost-share assistance, project and water quality monitoring, community involvement and education, and support of local stakeholder groups within the two county service area. The CD is involved in a variety of projects, including fish passage, landowner assistance an environmental incentive program an education program, and water quality monitoring.

D.4.4. Non-governmental Programs

Columbia Land Trust

The Columbia Land Trust is a private, non-profit organization founded in 1990 to work exclusively with willing landowners to find ways to conserve the scenic and natural values of the land and water. Landowners donate the development rights or full ownership of their land to the Land Trust. CLT manages the land under a stewardship plan and, if necessary, will legally defend its conservation values.

Columbia River Estuary Study Taskforce

The Columbia River Estuary Study Taskforce (CREST) is a council of local governments. CREST developed the Columbia River Estuary Regional Management Plan, which was adopted in local comprehensive plans and shoreline master programs. This plan contains an inventory of physical, biological and cultural characteristics of the estuary. Based on data needs identified during the development of the plan, Congress authorized and funded the Columbia River Estuary Data Development Program (CREDDP). This

program provided a wealth of information that is still used by the local governments and by state and federal agencies in resource planning.

Lower Columbia Fish Enhancement Group

The Washington State Legislature created the Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group Program in 1990 to involve local communities, citizen volunteers, and landowners in the state’s salmon recovery efforts. RFEGs help lead their communities in successful restoration, education and monitoring projects. Every group is a separate, nonprofit organization led by their own board of directors and operational funding from a portion of commercial and recreational fishing license fees administered by the WDFW, and other sources. The mission of the Lower Columbia RFEG (LCFEG) is to restore salmon runs in the lower Columbia River region through habitat restoration, education and outreach, and developing regional and local partnerships.

D.4.5. Tribal Programs

Cowlitz Indian Tribe

The Cowlitz Indian Tribe’s Natural Resources program participates in research and restoration efforts in the lower Columbia region. The focus of their fish research and restoration efforts includes salmon, steelhead, eulachon, and lamprey.

D.4.6. NPCC Fish & Wildlife Program Projects

There are no NPCC Fish & Wildlife Program Projects in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Basin.

D.4.7. Washington Salmon Recovery Funding Board Projects

Type	Project Name	Subbasin
Restoration	Birnie Creek Una Road Fish Passage	Elochoman/Skamokawa
Restoration	Duck Creek Fish Passage	Elochoman/Skamokawa
Preservation	Columbia Estuary – Elochoman River Habitat Conservation	Elochoman/Skamokawa
Restoration	Historic Skamokawa Creek Restoration	Elochoman/Skamokawa
Restoration	Walters Stream Restoration	Elochoman/Skamokawa
Restoration	Turner’s Middle Valley Skamokawa Restoration	Elochoman/Skamokawa
Restoration	Skamokawa Creek Community Watershed Implementation	Elochoman/Skamokawa

D.5. Management Plan

D.5.1. Vision

Washington lower Columbia salmon, steelhead, and bull trout are recovered to healthy, harvestable levels that will sustain productive sport, commercial, and tribal fisheries through the restoration and protection of the ecosystems upon which they depend and the implementation of supportive hatchery and harvest practices.

The health of other native fish and wildlife species in the lower Columbia will be enhanced and sustained through the protection of the ecosystems upon which they depend, the control of non-native species, and the restoration of balanced predator/prey relationships.

The Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed will play a key role in the regional recovery of salmon and steelhead. Natural populations of fall Chinook, winter steelhead, chum, and coho will be restored to medium to high levels of viability by significant reductions in human impacts throughout the lifecycle. Salmonid recovery efforts will provide broad ecosystem benefits to a variety of subbasin fish and wildlife species. Recovery will be accomplished through a combination of improvements in subbasin, Columbia River mainstem, and estuary habitat conditions as well as careful management of hatcheries, fisheries, and ecological interactions among species.

Habitat protection or restoration will involve a wide range of Federal, State, Local, and non-governmental programs and projects. Success will depend on effective programs as well as a dedicated commitment to salmon recovery across a broad section of society.

Some hatchery programs will be realigned to focus on protection, conservation, and recovery of native fish. The need for hatchery measures will decrease as productive natural habitats are restored. Where consistent with recovery, other hatchery programs will continue to provide fish for fishery benefits for mitigation purposes in the interim until habitat conditions are restored to levels adequate to sustain healthy, harvestable natural populations.

Directed fishing on sensitive wild populations will be eliminated and incidental impacts of mixed stock fisheries in the Columbia River and ocean will be regulated and limited consistent with wild fish recovery needs. Until recovery is achieved, fishery opportunities will be focused on hatchery fish and harvestable surpluses of healthy wild stocks.

Columbia Basin hydropower effects on Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed salmonids will be addressed by mainstem Columbia and estuary habitat restoration measures. Hatchery facilities in the Elochoman/Skamokawa will also be called upon to produce fish to help mitigate for hydropower impacts on upriver stocks where compatible with wild fish recovery.

This plan uses a planning period or horizon of 25 years. The goal is to achieve recovery of the listed salmon species and the biological objectives for other fish and wildlife species of interest within this time period. It is recognized, however, that sufficient restoration of habitat conditions and watershed processes for all species of interest will likely take 75 years or more.

D.5.2. Biological Objectives

Biological objectives for Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed salmonid populations are based on recovery criteria developed by scientists on the Willamette/Lower Columbia Technical Recovery Team convened by NMFS. Criteria involve a hierarchy of ESU, Strata (i.e. ecosystem areas within the ESU – Coast, Cascade, Gorge), and Population standards. A recovery scenario describing population-scale biological objectives for all species in all three strata in the lower Columbia ESUs was developed through a collaborative process with stakeholders based on biological significance, expected progress as a result of existing programs, the absence of apparent impediments, and the existence of other management opportunities. Under the preferred alternative, individual populations will variously contribute to recovery according to habitat quality and the population's perceived capacity to rebuild. Criteria, objectives, and the regional recovery scenario are described in greater detail in Volume I.

Focal populations in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed are targeted to improve to a level that contributes to recovery of the species. The scenario differentiates the role of populations by designating primary, contributing, and stabilizing categories. *Primary populations* are those that would be restored to high or better probabilities of persistence. *Contributing populations* are those where low to medium improvements will be needed to achieve stratum-wide average of moderate persistence probability. *Stabilizing populations* are those maintained at current levels.

The Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed was identified as one of the most significant areas for salmon recovery among Washington coastal subbasins based on fish population significance and realistic prospects for restoration. Recovery goals call for restoring fall Chinook, chum, and coho populations to a high viability level. This level will provide for a 95% or better probability of population survival over 100 years. Recovery goals call for restoring winter steelhead populations to medium viability levels which will provide for a 75-95% probability of survival over 100 years. Cutthroat will benefit from improvements in stream habitat conditions for anadromous species. Lamprey are also expected to benefit from habitat improvements in the estuary, Columbia River mainstem and Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed although specific spawning and rearing habitat requirements are not well known. Bull trout do not occur in the watershed.

D.5.3. Integrated Strategy

An Integrated Regional Strategy for recovery emphasizes that 1) it is feasible to recover Washington lower Columbia natural salmon and steelhead to healthy and harvestable levels; 2) substantial improvements in salmon and steelhead numbers, productivity, distribution, and diversity will be required; 3) recovery cannot be achieved based solely on improvements in any one factor; 4) existing programs are insufficient to reach recovery goals, 5) all manageable effects on fish and habitat conditions must contribute to recovery, 6) actions needed for salmon recovery will have broader ecosystem benefits for all fish and wildlife species of interest, and 7) strategies and measures likely to contribute to recovery can be identified but estimates of the incremental improvements resulting from each specific action are highly uncertain. The strategy is described in greater detail in Volume I.

The Integrated Strategy recognizes the importance of implementing measures and actions that address each limiting factor and risk category, prescribing improvements in each factor/threat category in proportion to its magnitude of contribution to salmon declines, identifying an appropriate balance of strategies and measures that address regional, upstream, and downstream threats, and focusing near term actions on species at-risk of extinction while also ensuring a long term balance with other species and the ecosystem.

Population productivity improvement increments identify proportional improvements in productivity needed to recover populations from current status to medium, high, and very high levels of population viability consistent with the role of the population in the recovery scenario. Productivity is defined as the inherent population replacement rate and is typically expressed by models as a median rate of population increase (PCC model) or a recruit per spawner rate (EDT model). Corresponding improvements in spawner numbers, juvenile outmigrants, population spatial structure, genetic and life history diversity, and habitat are implicit in productivity improvements.

Improvement targets were developed for each impact factor based on desired population productivity improvements and estimates of potentially manageable impacts (see Section 3.7). Impacts are estimates of the proportional reduction in population productivity associated with human-caused and other potentially manageable impacts from stream habitats, estuary/mainstem habitats, hydropower, harvest, hatcheries, and selected predators. Reduction targets were driven by regional strategy of equitably allocating recovery responsibilities among the six manageable impact factors. Given the ultimate uncertainty in the effects of recovery actions and the need to implement an adaptive recovery program, this approximation should be adequate for developing order-of-magnitude estimates to which recovery actions can be scaled consistent with the current best available science and data. Objectives and targets will need to be confirmed or refined during plan implementation based on new information and refinements in methodology.

The following table (Table D-11) identifies population and factor-specific improvements consistent with the biological objectives for this watershed. Per factor increments are less than the population net because factor affects are compounded at different life stages and density dependence is largely limited to freshwater tributary habitat. For example, productivity of Elochoman River and Skamokawa Creek fall Chinook must increase by 95% to reach population viability goals. This requires impact reductions equivalent to a 24% improvement in productivity or survival for each of six factor categories. Thus, tributary habitat impacts must decrease from a 30% to a 23% impact to achieve the required 24% increase in tributary habitat from the current 70% of the historical potential to 77% of the historical potential.

Table D-11. Productivity improvements consistent with biological objectives for the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed.

Species	Net increase	Per factor	Baseline impacts					
			Hab	Estuary	Dams	Pred.	Fishery	Hatch.
Fall Chinook ^(tule)	150%	29%	0.40	0.23	0.00	0.09	0.65	0.23
Chum	500%	50%	0.90	0.25	0.00	0.03	0.05	0.00
Coho	170%	35%	0.60	0.16	0.00	0.14	0.50	0.32
Winter Steelhead	0%	0%	0.40	0.15	0.00	0.23	0.10	0.07

D.5.4. Tributary Habitat

Habitat assessment results were synthesized in order to develop specific prioritized measures and actions that are believed to offer the greatest opportunity for species recovery in the watershed. As a first step toward measure and action development, habitat assessment results were integrated to develop a multi-species view of: 1) priority areas, 2) factors limiting recovery, and 3) contributing land-use threats. For the purpose of this assessment, limiting factors are defined as the biological and physical conditions serving to suppress salmonid population performance, whereas threats are the land-

use activities contributing to those factors. Limiting Factors refer to local (reach-scale) conditions believed to be directly impacting fish. Threats, on the other hand, may be local or non-local. Non-local threats may impact instream limiting factors in a number of ways, including: 1) through their effects on habitat-forming processes – such as the case of forest road impacts on reach-scale fine sediment loads, 2) due to an impact in a contributing stream reach – such as riparian degradation reducing wood recruitment to a downstream reach, or 3) by blocking fish passage to an upstream reach.

Priority areas and limiting factors were determined through the technical assessment, including primarily EDT analysis and the Integrated Watershed Assessment (IWA). As described later in this section, priority areas are also determined by the relative importance of subbasin focal fish populations to regional recovery objectives. This information allows for scaling of the subbasin recovery effort in order to best accomplish recovery at the regional scale. Land-use threats were determined from a variety of sources including Washington Conservation Commission Limiting Factors Analyses, the IWA, the State 303(d) list, air photo analysis, the Barrier Assessment, personal knowledge of investigators, or known cause-effect relationships between stream conditions and land-uses.

Priority areas, limiting factors and threats were used to develop a prioritized suite of habitat measures. Measures are based solely on biological and physical conditions. For each measure, the key programs that address the measure are identified and the sufficiency of existing programs to satisfy the measure is discussed. The measures, in conjunction with the program sufficiency considerations, were then used to identify specific actions necessary to fill gaps in measure implementation. Actions differ from measures in that they address program deficiencies as well as biophysical habitat conditions. The process for developing measures and actions is illustrated in Figure D-29 and each component is presented in detail in the sections that follow.

D.5.5. Priority Areas, Limiting Factors and Threats

Priority habitat areas and factors in the watershed are discussed below in two sections. The first section contains a generalized (coarse-scale) summary of conditions throughout the watershed. The second section is a more detailed summary that presents specific reach and subwatershed priorities.




Figure D-29. Flow chart illustrating the development of subbasin measures and actions.

Summary: Decades of human activity in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed have significantly altered watershed processes and reduced both the quality and quantity of habitat needed to sustain viable populations of salmon and steelhead. Moreover, with the exception of fall Chinook, stream habitat conditions within the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed have a high impact on the health and

viability of salmon and steelhead relative to other limiting factors. The following bullets provide a brief overview of each of the priority areas in the watershed. These descriptions are a summary of the reach-scale priorities that are presented in the next section. These descriptions summarize the species most affected, the primary limiting factors, the contributing land-use threats, and the general type of measures that will be necessary for recovery. A tabular summary of the key limiting factors and land-use threats can be found in Table D-12.

- **Upper Skamokawa & tributaries** (*reaches Skamokawa 5-8; LF Skamokawa 1; McDonald 1, 2*) – The upper Skamokawa and tributaries provide potentially productive habitat for all species. These reaches are heavily impacted by agriculture and rural residential development. Effective recovery measures will include riparian reforestation, cattle exclusion fencing, and floodplain re-connection.
- **Wilson Creek** (*reaches Wilson 1-5*) – Wilson Creek primarily supports winter steelhead and coho. These reaches are heavily impacted by agriculture and rural residential development. Effective recovery measures will include riparian reforestation, cattle exclusion fencing, and floodplain re-connection.
- **Lower Elochoman & tributaries** (*reaches Elochoman 3-7; Clear Creek 1-3; Duck 1*) – The lower Elochoman and the lower reaches of mainstem tributaries have been impacted by agriculture and rural residential development. Effective recovery measures will involve riparian and floodplain restoration.
- **Upper Elochoman & tributaries** (*reaches Elochoman 8-13; WF Elochoman 1-2; NF Elochoman 1; EF Elochoman 1*) – Winter steelhead make the greatest use of upper Elochoman reaches. These reaches are predominantly impacted by forest practices occurring in the upper watershed. Effective recovery of these reaches will involve watershed-wide recovery of runoff and sediment supply function.

Table D-12. Salmonid habitat limiting factors and threats in priority areas. Priority areas include the upper Skamokawa and tributaries (US), Wilson Creek (WC), lower Elochoman and tributaries (LE), and the upper Elochoman and tributaries (UE). Linkages between each threat and limiting factor are not displayed – each threat directly and indirectly affects a variety of habitat factors.

Limiting Factors	Limiting Factors				Threats	Threats			
	US	WC	LE	UE		US	WC	LE	UE
Habitat connectivity					Agriculture / grazing				
Blockages to channel habitats			✓		Clearing of vegetation	✓	✓	✓	
Habitat diversity					Riparian grazing	✓	✓	✓	
Lack of stable instream woody debris	✓	✓	✓	✓	Floodplain filling	✓	✓	✓	
Altered habitat unit composition	✓	✓	✓	✓	Rural development				
Loss of off-channel and/or side-channel habitats	✓	✓	✓		Clearing of vegetation	✓	✓	✓	
Channel stability					Floodplain filling	✓	✓	✓	
Bed and bank erosion	✓	✓		✓	Roads – riparian/floodplain impacts	✓	✓	✓	
Channel down-cutting (incision)	✓	✓			Increased watershed imperviousness	✓	✓	✓	
Mass wasting				✓	Leaking septic systems	✓	✓	✓	
Riparian function					Forest practices				
Reduced stream canopy cover	✓	✓	✓	✓	Timber harvests –sediment supply impacts	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reduced bank/soil stability	✓	✓	✓	✓	Timber harvests – impacts to runoff	✓	✓	✓	✓
Exotic and/or noxious species	✓	✓	✓		Riparian harvests			✓	✓
Reduced wood recruitment	✓	✓	✓	✓	Forest roads – impacts to sediment supply	✓	✓	✓	✓
Floodplain function					Forest roads – impacts to runoff	✓	✓	✓	✓
Altered nutrient exchange processes	✓	✓	✓		Forest roads – riparian/floodplain impacts			✓	✓
Reduced flood flow dampening	✓	✓	✓		Splash-dam logging (historical)			✓	
Restricted channel migration	✓	✓	✓		Channel manipulations				
Disrupted hyporheic processes	✓	✓	✓		Bank hardening	✓	✓	✓	
Stream flow					Channel straightening	✓	✓	✓	
Altered magnitude, duration, or rate of change	✓	✓	✓	✓	Artificial confinement	✓	✓	✓	
Water quality									
Altered stream temperature regime	✓	✓	✓						
Excessive turbidity	✓	✓							
Bacteria	✓	✓	✓						
Substrate and sediment									
Excessive fine sediment	✓	✓	✓	✓					
Embedded substrates	✓	✓	✓	✓					

Specific Reach and Subwatershed Priorities: Specific reaches and subwatersheds have been prioritized based on the plan’s biological objectives, fish distribution, critical life history stages, current habitat conditions, and potential fish population performance. Reaches have been placed into Tiers (1-4), with Tier 1 reaches representing the areas where recovery measures would yield the greatest benefits towards accomplishing the biological objectives. The reach tiering factors in each fish population’s importance relative to regional recovery objectives, as well as the relative importance of reaches within the populations themselves. Reach tiers are most useful for identifying habitat recovery measures in channels, floodplains, and riparian areas. Reach-scale priorities were initially identified within individual populations (species) through the EDT Restoration and Preservation Analysis. This resulted in reaches grouped into categories of high, medium, and low priority for each population (see Stream Habitat Limitations section). Within this watershed, reach rankings for all of the modeled populations were combined, using population designations as a weighting factor. Population designations for this watershed are described in the Biological Objectives section. The population designations are ‘primary’, ‘contributing’, and ‘stabilizing’; reflecting the level of emphasis that needs to be placed on population recovery in order to meet ESA recovery criteria.

Spatial priorities were also identified at the subwatershed scale. Subwatershed-scale priorities were directly determined by reach-scale priorities, such that a Group A subwatershed contains one or more Tier 1 reaches. Scaling up from reaches to the subwatershed level was done in recognition that actions to protect and restore critical reaches might need to occur in adjacent and/or upstream upland areas. For example, high sediment loads in a Tier 1 reach may originate in an upstream contributing subwatershed where sediment supply conditions are impaired because of current land use practices. Subwatershed-scale priorities can be used in conjunction with the IWA to identify watershed process restoration and preservation opportunities. The specific rules for designating reach tiers and subwatershed groups are presented in Table D-13. Reach tier designations for this watershed are included in Table D-14. Reach tiers and subwatershed groups are displayed on a map in Figure D-30.

Table D-13. Rules for designating reach tier and subwatershed group priorities. See Biological Objectives section for information on population designations.

Designation	Rule
<i>Reaches</i>	
Tier 1:	All high priority reaches (based on EDT) for one or more primary populations.
Tier 2:	All reaches not included in Tier 1 and which are medium priority reaches for one or more primary species and/or all high priority reaches for one or more contributing populations.
Tier 3:	All reaches not included in Tiers 1 and 2 and which are medium priority reaches for contributing populations and/or high priority reaches for stabilizing populations.
Tier 4:	Reaches not included in Tiers 1, 2, and 3 and which are medium priority reaches for stabilizing populations and/or low priority reaches for all populations.
<i>Subwatersheds</i>	
Group A:	Includes one or more Tier 1 reaches.
Group B:	Includes one or more Tier 2 reaches, but no Tier 1 reaches.
Group C:	Includes one or more Tier 3 reaches, but no Tier 1 or 2 reaches.
Group D:	Includes only Tier 4 reaches.

Table D-14. Reach Tiers in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed

Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3	Tier 4	
Clear-1	Eloch-9	NF Eloch-1	Alger-1	McDonald-4
EF Eloch-1	Eloch-11	Otter-1	Alger-2	Nelson-1
Eloch-3	Eloch-12	WF Eloch-1	Beaver-1	Nelson-2
Eloch-4	NF Eloch-2	McDonald-1	Beaver-2	Nelson-3
Eloch-5	Clear-3	McDonald-2	Beaver-3 (culvert)	NF Eloch-3
Eloch-6	Duck-1	Standard-1	Beaver-4	Otter-2
Eloch-7	Rock-1	Wilson-6	Beaver-5 (culvert)	Pollard-1
Eloch-8	Skamokawa-7		Beaver-6	Quarry-1
Eloch-10	Skamokawa-8		Bell Canyon-1	Rock-2 (culvert)
Eloch-13	Wilson-2		Brooks-1	Rock-3
Skamokawa-5	Wilson-4		Cadman-1	Skamokawa-1
Skamokawa-6	Wilson-5		Cadman-2	Skamokawa-2
Trib1233641463035-1	LF Skamokawa-1		Cadman-3	Skamokawa-3
Wilson-1			Clear-2 (culvert)	Standard-2
Wilson-3			Clear-4 (culvert)	Trib1232156463572
			Clear-5	Trib1232509463400
			Duck-2 (culvert)	Trib1232540463591
			Duck-3	Trib1232562463641
			Duck-4	Trib1232567463186
			Duck-5 (culvert)	Trib1232902463299
			Duck-6	Trib1233032462252-1
			EF Eloch-2	Trib1233032462252-2 (culvert)
			EF Eloch-3	Trib1233032462252-3
			Eggman-1	Trib1233218462941
			Eggman-2	Trib1233243462950-1
			Eloch-1	Trib1233641463035-2
			Eloch-14	Trib1233641463035-3
			Eloch-15	Trib1233686463037
			Eloch-2	Trib1234475463088
			Falk-1	West Valley-1
			Falk-2	West Valley-2
			Falk-3	West Valley-3
			Kelly-1	WF Eloch-2
			Kelly-2	WF Eloch-3
			LF Skamokawa-2	WF Skamokawa-1
			LF Skamokawa-3	WF Skamokawa-2
			LF Skamokawa-4	WF Skamokawa-3
			LF Skamokawa-5	WF Skamokawa-4
			Longtrain-1	Wilson-7
			McDonald-3	




Figure D-30. Reach tiers and subwatershed groups in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed. Tier 1 reaches and Group A subwatersheds represent the areas where recovery actions would yield the greatest benefits with respect to species recovery objectives. The subwatershed groups are based on Reach Tiers. Priorities at the reach scale are useful for identifying stream corridor recovery measures. Priorities at the subwatershed scale are useful for identifying watershed process recovery measures. Watershed process recovery measures for stream reaches will need to occur within the surrounding (local) subwatershed as well as in upstream contributing subwatersheds.

Habitat Measures

Measures are means to achieve the regional strategies that are applicable to the Elochoman/Skamokawa subbasin and necessary to accomplish the biological objectives for focal fish species. Measures are based on the technical assessments for this watershed (Section 3.0) as well as on the synthesis of priority areas, limiting factors, and threats presented earlier in this section. The measures applicable to the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed are presented in priority order in Table D-15. Each measure has a set of submeasures that define the measure in greater detail and add specificity to the particular circumstances occurring within the watershed. The table for each measure and associated submeasures indicates the limiting factors that are addressed, the contributing threats that are addressed, the species that would be most affected, and a short discussion. Priority locations are given for some measures. Priority locations typically refer to either stream reaches or subwatersheds, depending on the measure. Addressing measures in the highest priority areas first will provide the greatest opportunity for effectively accomplishing the biological objectives.

Following the list of priority locations is a list of the programs that are the most relevant to the measure. Each program is qualitatively evaluated as to whether it is sufficient or needs expansion with respect to the measure. This exercise provides an indication of how effectively the measure is already covered by existing programs, policy, or projects; and therefore indicates where there is a gap in measure implementation. This information is summarized in a discussion of the Program Sufficiency and Gaps.

The measures themselves are prioritized based on the results of the technical assessment and in consideration of principles of ecosystem restoration (e.g. NRC 1992, Roni et al. 2002). These principles include the hypothesis that the most efficient way to achieve ecosystem recovery in the face of uncertainty is to focus on the following priorities for approaches: 1) protect existing functional habitats and the processes that sustain them, 2) allow no further degradation of habitat or supporting processes 3) re-connect isolated habitat, 4) restore watershed processes (ecosystem function), 5) restore habitat structure, and 6) create new habitat where it is not recoverable. These priorities have been adjusted for the specific circumstances occurring in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed. These priorities are adjusted depending on the results of the technical assessment and on the specific circumstances occurring in the basin. For example, re-connecting isolated habitat could be adjusted to a lower priority if there is little impact to the population created from passage barriers.

Habitat Actions

The prioritized measures and associated gaps are used to develop specific Actions for the watershed. These are presented in Table D-15. Actions are different than the measures in a number of ways: 1) actions have a greater degree of specificity than measures, 2) actions consider existing programs and are therefore not based strictly on biophysical conditions, 3) actions refer to the agency or entity that would be responsible for carrying out the action, and 4) actions are related to an expected outcome with respect to the biological objectives. Actions are not presented in priority order, but instead represent the suite of activities that are all necessary for recovery of listed species. The priority for implementation of these actions must consider the priority of the measures they relate to, the “size” of the gap they are intended to fill, and feasibility considerations.

Table D-15. Prioritized measures for the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed.

#1 – Protect stream corridor structure and function

Submeasures	Factors Addressed	Threats Addressed	Target Species	Discussion
A. Protect floodplain function and channel migration processes B. Protect riparian function C. Protect access to habitats D. Protect instream flows through management of water withdrawals E. Protect channel structure and stability F. Protect water quality G. Protect the natural stream flow regime	Potentially addresses many limiting factors	Potentially addresses many limiting factors	All Species	Streams in upper elevations have been heavily impacted by past riparian timber harvests and splash-dam logging. Stream channel conditions within the broad agricultural valley in the middle and lower Skamokawa and Wilson Creek have been heavily impacted by agricultural practices. Reaches in agricultural areas along the lower and middle Elochoman have also received significant alteration. Preventing further degradation of stream channel structure, riparian function, and floodplain function will be an important component of recovery.

Priority Locations

- 1st- Tier 1 or 2 reaches in mixed-use lands (agriculture, rural residential) at risk of further degradation
- 2nd- Remaining Tier 1 and 2 reaches

Key Programs

Agency	Program Name	Sufficient	Needs Expansion
NMFS	ESA Section 7 and Section 10	✓	
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	Dredge & fill permitting (Clean Water Act sect. 404); Navigable waterways protection (Rivers & Harbors Act Sect, 10)	✓	
WA Department of Natural Resources (WDNR)	State Lands HCP, State Forest Practices, Riparian Easement Program	✓	
WA Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)	Hydraulics Projects Approval	✓	
Wahkiakum County	Comprehensive Planning		✓
Town of Cathlamet	Comprehensive Planning, Water Supply		✓
Cowlitz/Wahkiakum Conservation District / NRCS	Agriculture Land Habitat Protection Programs		✓
Noxious Weed Control Boards (State and County level)	Noxious weed control		✓
Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) (e.g. Columbia Land Trust) and public agencies	Land acquisition and easements		✓

Program Sufficiency and Gaps

Alterations to stream corridor structure that may impact aquatic habitats are regulated through the WDFW Hydraulics Project Approval (HPA) permitting program. Other regulatory protections are provided through USACE permitting, ESA consultations, HCPs, and local government regulations. Riparian areas within private timberlands are protected through the Forest Practices Rules (FPR) administered by WDNR. The FPRs came out of an extensive review process and are believed to adequately protect riparian areas with respect to stream shading, bank stability, and LWD recruitment. The program is new, however, and careful monitoring of the effect of the regulations is necessary, particularly effects on subwatershed hydrology and sediment delivery. Land-use conversion is increasing throughout the basin and current programs are inadequate to ensure that habitat will be protected. Conversion of land-use from forest or agriculture to residential use has the potential to increase impairment of aquatic habitat, particularly when residential development is paired with flood control measures. Local government ordinances can limit potentially harmful land-use conversions by thoughtfully directing growth through comprehensive planning and tax incentives, by providing consistent protection of critical areas across jurisdictions, and by preventing development in floodplains. In cases where existing programs are unable to protect critical habitats due to inherent limitations of regulatory mechanisms, conservation easements and land acquisition may be necessary.

#2 – Protect hillslope processes

Submeasures	Factors Addressed	Threats Addressed	Target Species	Discussion
A. Manage forest practices to minimize impacts to sediment supply processes, runoff regime, and water quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excessive fine sediment Excessive turbidity Embedded substrates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timber harvest – impacts to sediment supply, water quality, and runoff processes Forest roads – impacts to sediment supply, water quality, and runoff processes 	All species	Hillslope runoff and sediment delivery processes have been degraded due to past intensive timber harvest and road building. Lowland hillslope processes have been impacted by agriculture. Limiting additional degradation will be necessary to prevent further habitat impairment.
B. Manage agricultural practices to minimize impacts to sediment supply processes, runoff regime, and water quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stream flow – altered magnitude, duration, or rate of change of flows 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agricultural practices – impacts to sediment supply, water quality, and runoff processes 		
C. Manage growth and development to minimize impacts to sediment supply processes, runoff regime, and water quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water quality impairment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development – impacts to sediment supply, water quality, and runoff processes 		

Priority Locations

- 1st- Functional subwatersheds contributing to Tier 1 or 2 reaches (functional for sediment *or* flow according to IWA – local rating)
- 2nd- All other functional subwatersheds plus Moderately Impaired subwatersheds contributing to Tier 1 or 2 reaches
- 3rd- All other Moderately Impaired subwatersheds plus Impaired subwatersheds contributing to Tier 1 or 2 reaches
- 4th- All remaining subwatersheds

Key Programs

Agency	Program Name	Sufficient	Needs Expansion
WDNR	Forest Practices Rules, State Lands HCP	✓	
Town of Cathlamet	Comprehensive Planning		✓
Wahkiakum County	Comprehensive Planning		✓
Cowlitz/Wahkiakum Conservation District / NRCS	Agriculture Land Habitat Protection Programs		✓

Program Sufficiency and Gaps

Hillslope processes on private forest lands are protected through Forest Practices Rules administered by the WDNR. These rules, developed as part of the Forests & Fish Agreement, are believed to be adequate for protecting watershed sediment supply, runoff processes, and water quality on private forest lands. Small private landowners may be unable to meet some of the requirements on a timeline commensurate with large industrial landowners. Financial assistance to small owners would enable greater and quicker compliance. On non-forest lands (agriculture and developed), local government comprehensive planning is the primary nexus for protection of hillslope processes. Local governments can control impacts through zoning that protects open-space, through stormwater management ordinances, and through tax incentives to prevent agricultural and forest lands from becoming developed. There are few to no regulatory protections of hillslope processes that relate to agricultural practices; such deficiencies need to be addressed through local or state authorities. Protecting hillslope processes on agricultural lands would also benefit from the expansion of technical assistance and landowner incentive programs (NRCS, Conservation Districts).

#3- Restore degraded hillslope processes on forest and agricultural lands with an emphasis on sediment supply processes

Submeasures	Factors Addressed	Threats Addressed	Target Species	Discussion
A. Upgrade or remove problem forest roads B. Reforest heavily cut areas not recovering naturally C. Employ agricultural Best Management Practices with respect to contaminant use, erosion, and runoff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excessive fine sediment Excessive turbidity Embedded substrates Stream flow – altered magnitude, duration, or rate of change of flows Water quality impairment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timber harvest – impacts to sediment supply, water quality, and runoff processes Forest roads – impacts to sediment supply, water quality, and runoff processes Agricultural practices – impacts to sediment supply, water quality, and runoff processes 	All species	Hillslope runoff and sediment delivery processes have been degraded due to past intensive timber harvest and road building. According to EDT, the sediment impact to egg incubation is the greatest limiting factor for all species in the Elochoman and Skamokawa Basins. Sediment supply processes must be addressed for reach-level habitat recovery to be successful.

Priority Locations

1st- Moderately impaired or impaired subwatersheds contributing to Tier 1 reaches (mod. Impaired or impaired for sediment *or* flow according to IWA – local rating)

2nd- Moderately impaired or impaired subwatersheds contributing to other reaches

Key Programs

Agency	Program Name	Sufficient	Needs Expansion
WDNR	State Lands HCP, State Forest Practices	✓	
WDFW	Habitat Program		✓
Lower Columbia Fish Enhancement Group	Habitat Projects		✓
Wahkiakum County	Stormwater Management		✓
Town of Cathlamet	Stormwater Management		✓
Cowlitz/Wahkiakum Conservation District / NRCS	Agricultural Lands Habitat Restoration Programs		✓
NGOs, tribes, Conservation Districts, agencies, landowners	Habitat Projects		✓

Program Sufficiency and Gaps

Forest management programs including the new Forest Practices Rules (private timber lands) and the WDNR HCP (state timber lands) are expected to afford protections that will passively and actively restore degraded hillslope conditions. Timber harvest rules are expected to passively restore sediment and runoff processes. The road maintenance and abandonment requirements are expected to actively address road-related impairments within a 15 year time-frame. While these strategies are believed to be largely adequate to protect watershed processes, the degree of implementation and the effectiveness of the prescriptions will not be fully known for at least another 15 or 20 years. Of particular concern is the capacity of some forest land owners, especially small forest owners, to conduct the necessary road improvements (or removal) in the required timeframe. Additional financial and technical assistance would enable small forest landowners to conduct the necessary improvements in a timeline parallel to large industrial timber land owners. Ecological restoration of existing agricultural lands occurs relatively infrequently and there are no programs that specifically require restoration in these areas. Restoring existing agricultural lands can involve retrofitting facilities with new materials, replacing existing systems, and adopting new management practices. Means of increasing restoration activity include increasing landowner participation through education and incentive programs, requiring Best Management Practices through permitting and ordinances, and increasing available funding for landowners to conduct restoration projects.

#4 - Restore floodplain function and channel migration processes in lowland mixed-use areas along the major streams

Submeasures	Factors Addressed	Threats Addressed	Target Species	Discussion
A. Set back, breach, or remove artificial confinement structures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bed and bank erosion • Altered habitat unit composition • Restricted channel migration • Disrupted hyporheic processes • Reduced flood flow dampening • Altered nutrient exchange processes • Channel incision • Loss of off-channel and/or side-channel habitat • Blockages to off-channel habitats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Floodplain filling • Channel straightening • Artificial confinement 	Chum, fall Chinook, coho	There has been significant degradation of floodplain connectivity and constriction of channel migration zones in the agricultural valleys of the Elochoman, Skamokawa, and Wilson Creek. Removal of confining structures would restore floodplain and CMZ function as well as facilitate the creation of off-channel and side channel habitats. There are feasibility issues with implementation due to private lands, existing infrastructure already in place, potential flood risk to property, and large expense.

Priority Locations

- 1st- Tier 1 reaches in mixed-use areas with hydro-modifications (obtained from EDT ratings)
- 2nd- Tier 2 reaches in mixed-use areas with hydro-modifications
- 3rd- Other reaches with hydro-modifications

Key Programs

Agency	Program Name	Sufficient	Needs Expansion
WDFW	Habitat Program		✓
USACE	Water Resources Development Act (Sect. 1135 & Sect. 206)		✓
Lower Columbia Fish Enhancement Group	Habitat Projects		✓
NGOs, tribes, Conservation Districts, agencies, landowners	Habitat Projects		✓

Program Sufficiency and Gaps

There currently are no programs that set forth strategies for restoring floodplain function and channel migration processes in the Elochoman and Skamokawa Basins. Without programmatic changes, projects are likely to occur only seldom as opportunities arise and only if financing is made available. Means of increasing restoration activity include building partnerships with landowners, increasing landowner participation in conservation programs, allowing restoration projects to serve as mitigation for other activities, and increasing funding for NGOs, government entities, and landowners to conduct projects. Floodplain restoration projects are often expensive, large-scale efforts that require partnerships among many agencies, NGOs, and landowners. Building partnerships is a necessary first step toward floodplain and CMZ restoration. The USACE is conducting a Lower Columbia River Ecosystem Restoration Study which may identify and assess potential floodplain restoration projects in the lower Elochoman/Skamokawa Basin.

#5 - Restore riparian conditions throughout the basin

Submeasures	Factors Addressed	Threats Addressed	Target Species	Discussion
A. Restore the natural riparian plant community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced stream canopy cover • Altered stream temperature regime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timber harvest – riparian harvests 	All species	There is a high potential benefit due to the many limiting factors that are addressed. Riparian impairment is related to most land-uses and is a concern throughout the basin. The increasing abundance of exotic and invasive species is of particular concern. Riparian restoration projects are relatively inexpensive and are often supported by landowners.
B. Exclude livestock from riparian areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced bank/soil stability • Reduced wood recruitment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riparian grazing 		
C. Eradicate invasive plant species from riparian areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of stable instream woody debris • Exotic and/or invasive species • Bacteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearing of vegetation due to agriculture and residential development 		

Priority Locations

- 1st- Tier 1 reaches
- 2nd- Tier 2 reaches
- 3rd- Tier 3 reaches
- 4th- Tier 4 reaches

Key Programs

Agency	Program Name	Sufficient	Needs Expansion
WDNR	State Lands HCP, State Forest Practices	✓	
WDFW	Habitat Program		✓
Cowlitz/Wahkiakum Conservation District / NRCS	Agriculture Lands Habitat Restoration Programs		✓
Lower Columbia Fish Enhancement Group	Habitat Projects		✓
NGOs, tribes, Conservation Districts, agencies, landowners	Habitat Projects		✓
Noxious Weed Control Boards (State and County level)	Noxious Weed Education, Enforcement, Control		✓

Program Sufficiency and Gaps

There are no regulatory mechanisms for actively restoring riparian conditions; however, existing programs will afford protections that will allow for the *passive* restoration of riparian forests. These protections are believed to be adequate for riparian areas on forest lands that are subject to Forest Practices Rules or the State forest lands HCP. Other lands receive variable levels of protection and passive restoration through Wahkiakum County and the Town of Cathlamet’s Comprehensive Plan. Many degraded riparian zones in agricultural, rural residential, or transportation corridors will not passively restore with existing regulatory protections and will require active measures. Riparian restoration in these areas may entail livestock exclusion, tree planting, road relocation, invasive species eradication, and adjusting current land-use in the riparian zone. Means of increasing restoration activity include building partnerships with landowners, increasing landowner participation in conservation programs, allowing restoration projects to serve as mitigation for other activities, and increasing funding for NGOs, government entities, and landowners to conduct restoration projects.

#6 – Restore degraded water quality with emphasis on temperature impairments

Submeasures	Factors Addressed	Threats Addressed	Target Species	Discussion
A. Exclude livestock from riparian areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Altered stream temperature regime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timber harvest – riparian harvests 	All species	There are known impairments to stream temperature and fecal coliform bacteria in the basin. Bacteria is more of a human health concern than a fish health concern. Excluding livestock from riparian areas is particularly important in the heavily grazed lowland areas. Leaking septic systems may be contributing to bacteria levels in some areas. The degree of impact of agricultural pollutants is unknown and needs further assessment.
B. Increase riparian shading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bacteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Riparian grazing 		
C. Decrease channel width-to-depth ratios	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chemical contaminants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearing of vegetation due to rural development and agriculture 		
D. Reduce delivery of chemical contaminants to streams		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leaking septic systems 		
E. Address leaking septic systems		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chemical contaminants from agricultural and developed lands 		

Priority Locations

- 1st- Tier 1 or 2 reaches with 303(d) listings
- 2nd- Other reaches with 303(d) listings
- 3rd- All remaining reaches

Key Programs

Agency	Program Name	Sufficient	Needs Expansion
Washington Department of Ecology WDNR WDFW Cowlitz/Wahkiakum Conservation District / NRCS	Water Quality Program		✓
	State Lands HCP, State Forest Practices	✓	
	Habitat Program		✓
Lower Columbia Fish Enhancement Group NGOs, tribes, Conservation Districts, agencies, landowners Wahkiakum County Health Department	Agricultural Land Habitat Restoration Programs, Centennial Clean Water Program		✓
	Habitat Projects		✓
	Habitat Projects		✓
	Septic System Program		✓

Program Sufficiency and Gaps

Ecology’s Water Quality Program manages the State 303(d) list of impaired water bodies. There are several listed stream segments in the Elochoman Subbasin for temperature and there are a few segments listed as concern for fecal coliform bacteria impairment (WDOE 2004). Water Quality Clean-up Plans (TMDLs) that address the temperature impairments are required by Ecology and it is anticipated that the TMDLs will adequately set forth strategies to address the temperature concerns in the basin. It will be important that the strategies specified in the TMDLs are implementable and adequately funded. The 303(d) listings are believed to address the primary water quality concerns, however, other impairments may exist that the current monitoring effort is unable to detect. Additional monitoring is needed to fully understand the degree of water quality impairment in the basin, especially regarding agricultural pollutants.

#7 – Create/restore off-channel and side-channel habitat

Submeasures	Factors Addressed	Threats Addressed	Target Species	Discussion
A. Restore historical off-channel and side-channel habitats where they have been eliminated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of off-channel and/or side-channel habitat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Floodplain filling Channel straightening Artificial confinement 	chum coho	There has been significant loss of off-channel and side-channel habitats, especially along lowland portions of the large streams that are now in agricultural uses. This has severely limited chum spawning habitat and coho overwintering habitat. Targeted restoration or creation of habitats would increase available habitat where full floodplain and CMZ restoration is not possible.
B. Create new channel or off-channel habitats (i.e. spawning channels)				

Priority Locations

Lower basin alluvial reaches (lower Skamokawa Creek; lower WF Skamokawa; Wilson Creek; lower and middle Elochoman)

Key Programs

Agency	Program Name	Sufficient	Needs Expansion
WDFW	Habitat Program		✓
Lower Columbia Fish Enhancement Group	Habitat Projects		✓
NGOs, tribes, Conservation Districts, agencies, landowners	Habitat Projects		✓
USACE	Water Resources Development Act (Sect. 1135 & Sect. 206)		✓

Program Sufficiency and Gaps

There are no regulatory mechanisms for creating or restoring off-channel and side-channel habitat. Means of increasing restoration activity include building partnerships with landowners, increasing landowner participation in conservation programs, allowing restoration projects to serve as mitigation for other activities, and increasing funding for NGOs, government entities, and landowners to conduct restoration projects.

#8 – Restore access to habitat blocked by artificial barriers

Submeasures	Factors Addressed	Threats Addressed	Target Species	Discussion
A. Restore access to isolated habitats blocked by culverts, dams, or other barriers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blockages to channel habitats • Blockages to off-channel habitats 	Dams, culverts, in-stream structures	All species	As many as 10 miles of potentially accessible habitat are blocked by culverts or other barriers (approximately 8 barriers total). The blocked habitat is believed to be marginal in most cases. The water intake dam for the hatchery on Beaver Creek is believed to be a partial barrier. Passage restoration projects should focus on cases where it can be demonstrated that there is good potential benefit and reasonable project costs.

Priority Locations

- 1st- Beaver Creek
- 2nd- Other small tributaries with blockages

Key Programs

Agency	Program Name	Sufficient	Needs Expansion
WDNR	Forest Practices Rules, Family Forest Fish Passage, State Forest		
	Lands HCP		✓
WDFW	Habitat Program		✓
	Lower Columbia Fish Enhancement Group		✓
Washington Department of Transportation / WDFW	Habitat Projects		✓
	Fish Passage Program		✓
Wahkiakum County	Roads		✓

Program Sufficiency and Gaps

The Forest Practices Rules require forest landowners to restore fish passage at artificial barriers by 2016. Small forest landowners are given the option to enroll in the Family Forest Fish Program in order to receive financial assistance to fix blockages. The Washington State Department of Transportation, in a cooperative program with WDFW, manages a program to inventory and correct blockages associated with state highways. The Salmon Recovery Funding Board, through the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, funds barrier removal projects. Past efforts have corrected major blockages and have identified others in need of repair. Additional funding is needed to correct remaining blockages. Further monitoring and assessment is needed to ensure that all potential blockages have been identified and prioritized.

#9 - Restore channel structure and stability

Submeasures	Factors Addressed	Threats Addressed	Target Species	Discussion
A. Place stable woody debris in streams to enhance cover, pool formation, bank stability, and sediment sorting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of stable instream woody debris 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None (symptom-focused restoration strategy) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All species 	Large wood installation projects could benefit habitat conditions in many areas although watershed processes contributing to wood deficiencies should be considered and addressed prior to placing wood in streams. Other structural enhancements to stream channels may be warranted in some places, especially in lowland alluvial reaches that have been simplified through channel straightening and confinement. Most areas of bank instability are located in the agricultural middle valley of the Skamokawa River and Wilson Creeks. Bio-engineered approaches that rely on structural as well as vegetative measures are the most appropriate. These projects have a high risk of failure if causative factors are not adequately addressed.
B. Structurally modify channel morphology to create suitable habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Altered habitat unit composition • Reduced bank/soil stability 			
C. Restore natural rates of erosion and mass wasting within river corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive fine sediment • Excessive turbidity • Embedded substrates 			

Priority Locations

- 1st- Tier 1 reaches
- 2nd- Tier 2 reaches
- 3rd- Tier 3 reaches
- 4th- Tier 4 reaches

Key Programs

Agency	Program Name	Sufficient	Needs Expansion
NGOs, tribes, agencies, landowners	Habitat Projects		✓
WDFW	Habitat Program		✓
Lower Columbia Fish Enhancement Group	Habitat Projects		✓
USACE	Water Resources Development Act (Sect. 1135 & Sect. 206)		✓
Cowlitz/Wahkiakum Conservation District / NRCS	Agriculture Land Habitat Restoration Programs		✓

Program Sufficiency and Gaps

There are no regulatory mechanisms for actively restoring channel stability and structure. Passive restoration is expected to slowly occur as a result of protections afforded to riparian areas and hillslope processes. Projects are likely to occur in a piecemeal fashion as opportunities arise and if financing is made available. The lack of LWD in stream channels, and the importance of wood for habitat of listed species, places an emphasis on LWD supplementation projects. Means of increasing restoration activity include building partnerships with landowners, increasing landowner participation in conservation programs, allowing restoration projects to serve as mitigation for other activities, and increasing funding for NGOs, government entities, and landowners to conduct restoration projects.

#10 – Provide for adequate instream flows during critical periods

Submeasures	Factors Addressed	Threats Addressed	Target Species	Discussion
A. Protect instream flows through water rights closures and enforcement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stream flow – maintain or improve flows in tributaries during low-flow Summer months 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water withdrawals 	All species	Instream flow management strategies for the Elochoman Subbasin have been identified as part of Watershed Planning for WRIA 25 (LCFRB 2004). Strategies include water rights closures, setting of minimum flows, and drought management policies. This measure applies to instream flows associated with water withdrawals and diversions, generally a concern only during low flow periods. Hillslope processes also affect low flows but these issues are addressed in separate measures.
B. Restore instream flows through acquisition of existing water rights				
C. Restore instream flows through implementation of water conservation measures				

Priority Locations

Entire Basin

Key Programs

Agency	Program Name	Sufficient	Needs Expansion
WRIA 25/26 Watershed Planning Unit	Watershed Planning	✓	
Town of Cathlamet	Water Supply	✓	
Washington Department of Ecology	Water Resources Program		✓

Program Sufficiency and Gaps

The Water Resources Program of Ecology, in cooperation with the WDFW and other entities, manages water rights and instream flow protections. A collaborative process for setting and managing instream flows was launched in 1998 with the Watershed Planning Act (HB 2514), which called for the establishment of local watershed planning groups who's objective was to recommend instream flow guidelines to Ecology through a collaborative process. The current status of this planning effort is to adopt a watershed plan by December 2004. Instream flow management in the Elochoman Subbasin will be conducted using the recommendations of the WRIA 25/26 Planning Unit, which is coordinated by the LCFRB. Draft products of the WRIA 25/26 watershed planning effort can be found on the LCFRB website: www.lcfrb.gen.wa.us. The recommendations of the planning unit have been developed in close coordination with recovery planning and the instream flow prescriptions developed by this group are anticipated to adequately protect instream flows necessary to support healthy fish populations. The measures specified above are consistent with the planning group's recommended strategies. Ecology should follow the recommendations of the WRIA 25/26 Watershed Planning Unit in terms of instream flow management.

Table D-16. Habitat actions for the Elochoman/Skamokawa Basin.

Action	Status	Responsible Entity	Measures Addressed	Spatial Coverage of Target Area ²	Expected Biophysical Response ³	Certainty of Outcome ⁴
Eloch-Skam 1. Fully implement and enforce the Forest Practices Rules (FPRs) on private timber lands in order to afford protections to riparian areas, sediment processes, runoff processes, water quality, and access to habitats	Activity is currently in place	WDNR	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, & 8	High: Private commercial timber lands.	High: Increase in instream LWD; reduced stream temperature extremes; greater streambank stability; reduction in road-related fine sediment delivery; decreased peak flow volumes; restoration and preservation of fish access to habitats	Medium
Eloch-Skam 2. Expand standards in local government comprehensive plans to afford adequate protections of ecologically important areas (i.e. stream channels, riparian zones, floodplains, CMZs, wetlands, unstable geology)	Expansion of existing program or activity	Wahkiakum County, Town of Cathlamet, Pacific County	1 & 2	Medium: Private lands. Applies primarily to lands in the lower basin in agriculture, rural residential, and forestland uses	High: Protection of water quality, riparian function, stream channel structure (e.g. LWD), floodplain function, CMZs, wetland function, runoff processes, and sediment supply processes	High
Eloch-Skam 3. Prevent floodplain impacts from development through land use controls and Best Management Practices	New program or activity	Wahkiakum County, Ecology, Town of Cathlamet	1	Medium: Private lands currently in agriculture or timber production in lowland areas.	High: Protection of floodplain function, CMZ processes, and off-channel/side-channel habitat. Prevention of reduced habitat diversity and key habitat availability	High
Eloch-Skam 4. Seize opportunities to conduct voluntary floodplain restoration on lands being phased out of agricultural production. Survey landowners, build partnerships, and provide financial incentives	New program or activity	NRCS/WCD, NGOs, WDFW, LCFRB, USACE, LCFEG	4, 5, 6, 7, & 9	Medium: Middle mainstem Skamokawa, lower WF Skamokawa, Wilson Creek, lower and middle mainstem Elochoman	High: Restoration of floodplain function, CMZ function, habitat diversity, and habitat availability.	High

² Relative amount of basin affected by action

³ Expected response of action implementation

⁴ Relative certainty that expected results will occur as a result of full implementation of action

Action	Status	Responsible Entity	Measures Addressed	Spatial Coverage of Target Area ²	Expected Biophysical Response ³	Certainty of Outcome ⁴
Eloch-Skam 5. Manage future growth and development patterns to ensure the protection of watershed processes. This includes limiting the conversion of agriculture and timber lands to developed uses through zoning regulations and tax incentives	Expansion of existing program or activity	Wahkiakum County, Town of Cathlamet, Pacific County	1 & 2	Medium: Private lands. Applies primarily to lands in the lower basin in agriculture, rural residential, and forestland uses	High: Protection of water quality, riparian function, stream channel structure (e.g. LWD), floodplain function, CMZs, wetland function, runoff processes, and sediment supply processes	High
Eloch-Skam 6. Review and adjust operations to ensure compliance with the Endangered Species Act; examples include roads, parks, and weed management	Expansion of existing program or activity	Wahkiakum County, Town of Cathlamet	1, 3, 5, & 6	Low: Applies to lands under public jurisdiction	Medium: Protection of water quality, greater streambank stability, reduction in road-related fine sediment delivery, restoration and preservation of fish access to habitats	High
Eloch-Skam 7. Create and/or restore lost side-channel/off-channel habitat for chum spawning and coho overwintering	New program or activity	LCFRB, BPA (NPCC), NGOs, WDFW, NRCS/WCD, LCFEG	7	Medium: Lower mainstem Elochoman and Skamokawa Creeks	High: Increased habitat availability for spawning and rearing	Medium
Eloch-Skam 8. Implement the prescriptions of the WRIA 25/26 Watershed Planning Unit regarding instream flows	Activity is currently in place	ECOLOGY, WDFW, WRIA 25/26 Planning Unit, Town of Cathlamet	10	High: Entire basin	Medium: Adequate instream flows to support life stages of salmonids and other aquatic biota.	Medium
Eloch-Skam 9. Increase the level of implementation of voluntary habitat enhancement projects in high priority reaches and subwatersheds. This includes building partnerships, providing incentives to landowners, and increasing funding	Expansion of existing program or activity	LCFRB, BPA (NPCC), NGOs, WDFW, NRCS/WCD, LCFEG	3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, & 9	High: Priority stream reaches and subwatersheds throughout the basin	Medium: Improved conditions related to water quality (temperature and bacteria), LWD quantities, bank stability, key habitat availability, habitat diversity, riparian function, floodplain function, sediment availability, & channel migration processes	Medium

Action	Status	Responsible Entity	Measures Addressed	Spatial Coverage of Target Area ²	Expected Biophysical Response ³	Certainty of Outcome ⁴
Eloch-Skam 10. Increase technical support and funding to small forest landowners faced with implementation of Forest and Fish requirements for fixing roads and barriers to ensure full and timely compliance with regulations	Expansion of existing program or activity	WDNR	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, & 8	Low: Small private timberland owners	High: Reduction in road-related fine sediment delivery; preservation of fish access to habitats	Medium
Eloch-Skam 11. Increase funding available to purchase easements or property in sensitive areas in order to protect watershed function where existing programs are inadequate	Expansion of existing program or activity	LCFRB, NGOs, WDFW, USFWS, BPA (NPCC)	1 & 2	Low: Mixed-use lands at risk of degradation	High: Protection of riparian function, floodplain function, water quality, wetland function, and runoff and sediment supply processes	High
Eloch-Skam 12. Increase technical assistance to landowners and increase landowner participation in conservation programs that protect and restore habitat and habitat-forming processes. Includes increasing the incentives (financial or otherwise) and increasing program marketing and outreach	Expansion of existing program or activity	NRCS/WCD, WDNR, WDFW, Wahkiakum County, Town of Cathlamet	All measures	Medium: Private lands. Applies primarily to lands in the lower basin in agriculture, rural residential, and forestland uses	High: Increased landowner stewardship of habitat. Potential improvement in all factors	Medium
Eloch-Skam 13. Conduct forest practices on state lands in accordance with the Habitat Conservation Plan in order to afford protections to riparian areas, sediment processes, runoff processes, water quality, and access to habitats	Activity is currently in place	WDNR	1 & 2	Medium: State timber lands in the Eloch-Skam Watershed (approximately 21% of the basin area)	High: Increase in instream LWD; reduced stream temperature extremes; greater streambank stability; reduction in road-related fine sediment delivery; decreased peak flow volumes; restoration and preservation of fish access to habitats.	Medium
Eloch-Skam 14. Protect and restore native plant communities from the effects of invasive species	Expansion of existing program or activity	Weed Control Boards (local and state); NRCS/WCD, LCFEG	1 & 5	Medium: Greatest risk is in lower basin agriculture and residential areas	Medium: restoration and protection of native plant communities necessary to support watershed and riparian function	Low

Action	Status	Responsible Entity	Measures Addressed	Spatial Coverage of Target Area ²	Expected Biophysical Response ³	Certainty of Outcome ⁴
Eloch-Skam 15. Assess, upgrade, and replace on-site sewage systems that may be contributing to water quality impairment	Expansion of existing program or activity	Wahkiakum County, WCD	6	Low: Private agricultural and rural residential lands in lower basin	Medium: Protection and restoration of water quality (bacteria)	Low
Eloch-Skam 16. Assess the impact of fish passage barriers throughout the basin and restore access to potentially productive habitats	Expansion of existing program or activity	WDFW, WDNR, Wahkiakum County, WSDOT, LCFEG	8	Low: As many as 10 miles of stream are blocked by artificial barriers	Low: Increased spawning and rearing capacity due to access to blocked habitat. Habitat is marginal in most cases	High

D.5.6. Hatcheries

This subbasin plan describes potential hatchery strategies and actions designed to address recovery objectives and hatchery risks detailed in Volume I and in hatchery program assessments described earlier in this Volume II chapter. These strategies and actions are largely based on assessments in the interim planning process that was completed in 2004. Strategies and actions are generally consistent with more recent plans based on HSRG analyses and WDFW’s Conservation and Sustainable Fisheries Plan. However, in several cases, the ongoing hatchery reform and planning process has identified revisions to the alternatives presented herein.

Subbasin Hatchery Strategy

The desired future state of fish production within the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed includes natural salmon and steelhead populations that are improving on a trajectory to recovery and hatchery programs that either enhance the natural fish recovery trajectory or are operated to not impede progress towards recovery. Hatchery recovery measures in each subbasin are tailored to the specific ecological and biological circumstances for each species in the subbasin. This may involve substantial changes in some hatchery programs from their historical focus on production for mitigation for fishery benefits. The recovery strategy includes a mixture of conservation programs and mitigation programs. Mitigation programs involve areas or practices selected for consistency with natural population conservation and recovery objectives. A summary of the types of natural production enhancement strategies and fishery enhancement strategies to be implemented in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed are displayed by species in Table D-17. More detailed descriptions and discussion of the regional hatchery strategy can be found in Volume I.

Table D-17. Summary of potential natural production and fishery enhancement strategies to be implemented in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed.

		Species					
		Fall Chinook	Spring Chinook	Coho	Chum	Winter Steelhead	Summer Steelhead
Natural Production Enhancement	Supplementation			✓	✓		
	Hatch/Nat Conservation ¹	✓					
	Isolation					✓ ²	
	Refuge						
Fishery Enhancement	Hatchery Production	✓		✓		✓	✓

¹ Hatchery and natural population management strategy coordinated to meet biological recovery objectives. Strategy may include integration and/or isolation strategy over time. Strategy will be unique to biological and ecological circumstances in each watershed.

² Isolated area for winter steelhead is in upper watershed upstream of the Elochoman Hatchery

Conservation-based hatchery programs include strategies and actions which are specifically intended to enhance or protect production of a particular wild fish population within the watershed. A unique conservation strategy is developed for each species and watershed depending on the status of the natural population, the biological relationship between the hatchery and natural populations, ecological attributes of the watershed, and logistical opportunities to jointly manage the populations. Four types of hatchery conservation strategies may be employed:

Natural Refuge Watersheds: In this strategy, certain subbasins are designated as wild-fish-only areas for a particular species. The refuge areas include watersheds where populations have persisted with minimum hatchery influence and areas that may have a history of hatchery production but would not be subjected to future hatchery influence as part of the recovery strategy. More refuge areas may be added over time as wild populations recover. These refugia provide an opportunity to monitor population trends independent of the confounding influence of hatchery fish natural population on fitness and our ability to measure natural population productivity and will be key indicators of natural population status within the ESU. This strategy is not proposed for the Elochoman/Skamokawa subbasin..

Hatchery Supplementation: This strategy utilizes hatchery production as a tool to assist in rebuilding depressed natural populations. Supplementation would occur in selected areas that are producing natural fish at levels significantly below current capacity or capacity is expected to increase as a result of immediate benefits of habitat or passage improvements. This is intended to be a temporary measure to jump start critically low populations and to bolster natural fish numbers above critical levels in selected areas until habitat is restored to levels where a population can be self sustaining. This strategy would include coho and chum in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed.

Hatchery/Natural Isolation: This strategy is focused on physically separating hatchery adult fish from naturally-produced adult fish to avoid or minimize spawning interactions to allow natural adaptive processes to restore native population diversity and productivity. The strategy may be implemented in the entire watershed or more often in a section of the watershed upstream of a barrier or trap where the hatchery fish can be removed. This strategy is currently aimed at hatchery steelhead in watersheds with trapping capabilities. The strategy may also become part of spring and fall Chinook as well as coho strategy in certain watersheds in the future as unique wild runs develop. This strategy would be included for winter steelhead in the upper Elochoman River Watershed upstream of the Elochoman Hatchery and could be considered in the future for coho. This definition refers only to programs where fish are physically sorted using a barrier or trap. Some fishery mitigation programs, particularly for steelhead, are managed to isolate hatchery and wild stocks based on run timing and release locations.

Hatchery/Natural Merged Conservation Strategy: This strategy addresses the case where natural and hatchery fish have been homogenized over time such that they are principally all one stock that includes the native genetic material for the watershed. Many spring Chinook, fall Chinook, and coho populations in the lower Columbia currently fall into this category. In many cases, the composite stock productivity is no longer sufficient to support a self-sustaining natural population especially in the face of habitat degradation. The hatchery program will be critical to maintaining any population until habitat can be improved and a strictly natural population can be re-established. This merged strategy is intended to transition these mixed populations to a self-supporting natural population that is not subsidized by hatchery production or subject to deleterious hatchery impacts. Elements include separate management of hatchery and natural subpopulations, regulation of hatchery fish in natural areas, incorporation of natural fish into hatchery broodstock, and annual abundance-driven distribution. Corresponding programs are expected to evolve over time dependent on changes in the populations and in the habitat productivity. This strategy is primarily aimed at Chinook salmon in areas where harvest production occurs and is included in the Elochoman Watershed.

Not every lower Columbia River hatchery program will be turned into a conservation program. The majority of funding for lower Columbia basin hatchery operations (including the Elochoman Hatchery) is for producing salmon and steelhead for harvest to mitigate for lost harvest of natural production due to hydro development and habitat degradation. Programs for fishery enhancement will continue during the recovery period, but will be managed to minimize risks and ensure they do not compromise recovery objectives for natural populations. It is expected that the need to produce compensatory fish for harvest through artificial production will reduce in the future as natural populations recover and

become harvestable. There are fishery enhancement programs for winter steelhead and early coho in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed.

The Elochoman River Hatchery will be operated to include natural production enhancement strategies for chum and coho in the Elochoman River, Skamokawa Creek, and coastal tributaries. The Elochoman River Hatchery will continue to support fall Chinook, coho, and summer and winter steelhead fisheries with hatchery releases in the Elochoman Watershed, and also facilitate Gray River early coho. This plan adds six new conservation programs at the Elochoman Hatchery facility (Table D-18).

Table D-18. A summary of conservation and harvest strategies with potential implementation through Elochoman River Hatchery programs.

		Stock
Natural Production Enhancement	Supplementation	Eloch/Skam Coho ✓
		Eloch/Skam Coho ✓
		Coastal Trib Coho ✓
		Coastal Trib Chum ✓
	Hatch/Nat Conservation ¹ Isolation	Elochoman Fall Chinook
		Elochoman Winter Steelhead ²
Broodstock development	Elochoman late Coho ✓	
	Eloch/Skam Chum ✓	
	Elochoman Late Winter Steelhead	
Fishery Enhancement	In-basin releases (final rearing at Elochoman)	Elochoman Early Coho
		Elochoman Late Coho
		Elochoman Fall Chinook
		Elochoman Winter Steelhead
		Lewis River Summer Steelhead
	Out of Basin Releases (final rearing at Elochoman)	Steamboast Slough Net Pens: Grays River Early Coho
		Coweeman River: Elochoman Winter Steelhead

¹ May include integrated and/or isolated strategy over time.

² Isolation occurs in the upper watershed upstream of the Elochoman Hatchery.

✓ Denotes new program

Hatchery Measures and Actions

Hatchery strategies and measures are focused on evaluating and reducing biological risks consistent with the conservation strategies identified for each natural population. Artificial production programs within Elochoman River facilities have been evaluated in detail through the WDFW Benefit-Risk Assessment Procedure (BRAP) relative to risks to natural populations. The BRAP results were utilized to inform the development of these program actions specific to the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed (Table D-19). The subbasin plan hatchery recovery actions were developed in coordination with WDFW and at the same time as the Hatchery and Genetic Management Plans (HGMP) were developed by WDFW for each hatchery program. As a result, the hatchery actions represented in this document will provide direction for specific actions which will be detailed in the HGMPs submitted by WDFW for public review and for NMFS approval. It is expected that the HGMPs and these recovery actions will be

complimentary and provide a coordinated strategy for the Elochoman River hatchery programs. Further explanation of specific strategies and measures for hatcheries can be found in Volume I.

Table D-19. Potential hatchery implementation actions in the Elochoman Subbasin.

Activity	Action	Hatchery Program Addressed	Natural Populations Addressed	Limiting Factors Addressed	Threats Addressed	Expected Outcome
<p>Unique conservation strategy is developed for Elochoman fall Chinook based on status of natural population and biological relationship between natural and hatchery populations. Options may include integration and/or segregation strategies over time as developed to meet recovery objectives. Measures may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliberate and consistent infusion of natural produced adults into the hatchery program. • Control proportions of hatchery and natural fish on the spawning grounds and in the hatchery. • Matrix system developed to determine annual distribution of wild and hatchery adults based on biological relationship and annual abundance 	<p>**Conservation management strategy implemented for fall Chinook natural and hatchery production.</p> <p>**Eliminate outside basin transfers of fall Chinook eggs or fry for release into the Elochoman basin</p>	Elochoman Hatchery fall Chinook	Elochoman fall Chinook	Domestication Diversity Abundance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-breeding • Non-local genetic traits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased genetic diversity in natural and hatchery populations • Improved productivity and increased abundance in the natural produced fall Chinook population • Hatchery production is managed consistent with natural population recovery objectives and to provide harvest opportunity.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to mass mark steelhead and coho hatchery releases to provide the means to identify hatchery fish for selective fisheries and to distinguish between hatchery and wild fish in the Elochoman Basin. • Establish a mass marking program for fall Chinook to enable selective fishing options and to 	<p>*Adipose fin-clip mark hatchery released coho and steelhead.</p> <p>**Adipose fin-clip mark hatchery released fall Chinook</p>	Elochoman Hatchery coho, steelhead, and fall Chinook.	<p>Elochoman winter and summer steelhead.</p> <p>Elochoman coho</p> <p>Elochoman fall Chinook</p>	Domestication, Diversity, Abundance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-breeding • Harvest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain lower harvest impacts for natural Elochoman coho and steelhead compared to hatchery production • Provide the opportunity to develop fishing regulations which accomplish a lower harvest impact for wild Elochoman fall Chinook

Activity	Action	Hatchery Program Addressed	Natural Populations Addressed	Limiting Factors Addressed	Threats Addressed	Expected Outcome
accomplish action 1.						compared to Elochoman Hatchery fall Chinook.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a coho brood stock using the latest (December-January) arriving late hatchery coho. Utilize production from the existing programs and new late program to supplement wild production in coastal tributaries and for harvest. Develop a chum brood stock utilizing natural returns to Skamokawa Creek or other appropriate coastal populations dependent on assessment of genetic similarity. Utilize broodstock for supplementation and risk management. 	<p>**Elochoman Hatchery facilities (including Beaver Creek) utilized for supplementation and enhancement of natural coho and chum populations</p>	<p>Elochoman Hatchery late coho, and space for chum.</p>	<p>Coastal coho; Coastal chum (Excluding the Grays and Chinook river populations)</p>	<p>Abundance, Spatial distribution</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low numbers of natural spawners Ecologically appropriate natural brood stock 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of a hatchery brood stock similar to the late returning historical populations in the coastal region. Improve abundance and distribution of natural produced coho. Establish an appropriate chum brood stock to supplement and manage risks to extreme low abundance of local populations. Increase abundance and distribution of coastal chum populations.

Activity	Action	Hatchery Program Addressed	Natural Populations Addressed	Limiting Factors Addressed	Threats Addressed	Expected Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hatchery produced steelhead, coho, and fall Chinook will be scheduled for release during the time when the maximum numbers of fish are smolted and prepared to emigrate rapidly. Juvenile rearing strategies will be implemented to provide a fish growth schedule which coincides with an optimum release time for hatchery production success and to minimize time spent in the Elochoman 	<p>*Juvenile release strategies to minimize impacts to natural populations</p>	Elochoman Hatchery steelhead, coho, and fall Chinook	Elochoman fall Chinook, chum, and coho	Predation, Competition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hatchery smolt residence time in the Elochoman River. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal residence time of hatchery released juvenile resulting in reduced ecological interactions between hatchery and wild juvenile. Displacement of natural fall Chinook from preferred habitat by larger hatchery fall Chinook will be minimized. Improved survival of wild juveniles, resulting in increased productivity and abundance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Elochoman tidewater weir will be evaluated and adjusted if necessary to enable efficient collection of target fish and release/or passage of non-target fish. Adequate function of diversion weir at the hatchery site to enable efficient collection of broodstock and control mix of hatchery and wild steelhead and coho in upper watershed. Hatchery effluent discharge complies with NPDES permit monitoring requirements. Fish health monitored and treated as per co-managers fish health policy. 	<p>*Evaluate facility operations</p>	All species	All species	Access, Habitat quality,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fish barriers, water quality, In-take screens 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to implement integrated hatchery and natural brood stock programs by efficient collection systems. Access to natural spawning habitats for natural returning fish Hatchery fish disease controlled and water quality standards upheld to avoid impact to habitat quality in the Elochoman River downstream of the hatchery.

Activity	Action	Hatchery Program Addressed	Natural Populations Addressed	Limiting Factors Addressed	Threats Addressed	Expected Outcome
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain and repair Elochoman Hatchery in-take screens. 						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elochoman Hatchery in-take screens are maintained, repaired, or replaced to minimize impacts to wild juvenile salmonids.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research, monitoring , and evaluation of performance of the above actions in relation to expected outcomes Performance standards developed for each actions with measurable criteria to determine success or failure Adaptive Management applied to adjust or change actions as necessary 	** Monitoring and evaluation, adaptive management	All species	All species	Hatchery production performance, Natural production performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear standards for performance and adequate monitoring programs to evaluate actions. Adaptive management strategy reacts to information and provides clear path for adjustment or change to meet performance standard

* Extension or improvement of existing actions-may require additional funding

** New action-will likely require additional funding

D.5.7. Harvest

Fisheries are both an impact that reduces fish numbers and an objective of recovery. The long-term vision is to restore healthy, harvestable natural salmonid populations in many areas of the lower Columbia basin. The near-term strategy involves reducing fishery impacts on natural populations to ameliorate extinction risks until a combination of actions can restore natural population productivity to levels where increased fishing may resume. The regional strategy for interim reductions in fishery impacts involves: 1) elimination of directed fisheries on weak natural populations, 2) regulation of mixed stock fisheries for healthy hatchery and natural populations to limit and minimize indirect impacts on natural populations, 3) scaling of allowable indirect impacts for consistency with recovery, 4) annual abundance-based management to provide added protection in years of low abundance while allowing greater fishing opportunity consistent with recovery in years with much higher abundance, and 5) mass marking of hatchery fish for identification and selective fisheries.

Actions to address harvest impacts are generally focused at a regional level to cover fishery impacts accrued to lower Columbia salmon as they migrate along the Pacific Coast and through the mainstem Columbia River. Fisheries are no longer directed at weak natural populations but incidentally catch these fish while targeting healthy wild and hatchery stocks. Subbasin fisheries affecting natural populations have been largely eliminated. Fishery management has shifted from a focus on maximum sustainable harvest of the strong stocks to ensuring protection of the weak stocks. Weak stock protections often preclude access to large numbers of otherwise harvestable fish in strong stocks.

Fishery impact limits to protect ESA-listed weak populations are generally based on risk assessments that identify points where fisheries do not pose jeopardy to the continued persistence of a listed group of fish. In many cases, these assessments identify the point where additional fishery reductions provide little reduction in extinction risks. A population may continue to be at significant risk of extinction but those risks are no longer substantially affected by the specified fishing levels. Often, no level of fishery reduction will be adequate to meet naturally-spawning population escapement goals related to population viability. The elimination of harvest will not in itself lead to the recovery of a population. However, prudent and careful management of harvest can help close the gap in a coordinated effort to achieve recovery.

Fishery actions specific to the subbasins are addressed through the Washington State Fish and Wildlife sport fishing regulatory process. This public process includes an annual review focused on emergency type regulatory changes and a comprehensive review of sport fishing regulations which occurs every two years. This regulatory process includes development of fishing rules through the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) which are focused on protecting weak stock populations while providing appropriate access to harvestable populations. The actions consider the specific circumstances in each area of each subbasin and respond with rules that fit the relative risk to the weak populations in a given time and area of the subbasin. Following is a general summary of the fishery actions specific to the Elochoman/Skamokawa watershed (Table D-20). More complete details can be found in the WDFW Sport Fishing Rules Pamphlet.

Table D-20. Summary of regulatory and protective fishery actions in the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watersheds

Species	General Fishing Actions	Explanation	Other Protective Fishing Actions	Explanation
Fall Chinook	Open for fall Chinook in the Elochoman	Hatchery fish are produced for harvest. Hatchery fish are not mass marked	Night closures, gear restrictions, and closures near traps	Protection of fall Chinook in areas of high concentration
chum	Closed to retention	Protects natural chum. Hatchery chum are not produced for harvest	Skamokawa Creek closed to all salmon	Further protects chum in Skamokawa Creek. Hatchery salmon are not released in Skamokawa Creek
coho	Retain only adipose fin-clip marked coho	Selective fishery for hatchery coho, unmarked wild coho must be released	Upper Elochoman , small tributaries, and Skamokawa Creek closed to salmon	Protects wild spawners. Hatchery coho released in lower Elochoman and not in Skamokawa Creek.
Winter steelhead	Retain only adipose fin-clip marked steelhead	Selective fishery for hatchery steelhead, unmarked wild steelhead must be released	Steelhead and trout fishing closed in the spring and minimum size restrictions in affect	Spring closure Protects adult wild steelhead during spawning and minimum size protects juvenile steelhead

Regional actions cover species from multiple watersheds which share the same migration routes and timing, resulting in similar fishery exposure. Regional strategies and measures for harvest are detailed in Volume I. A number of regional strategies for harvest involve implementation of measures within specific subbasins. In-basin fishery management is generally applicable to steelhead and salmon while regional management is more applicable to salmon. Harvest actions with significant application to the Elochoman Subbasin populations are summarized in the following table:

Table D-21. Regional harvest actions with significant application to the Elochoman/Skamokawa Watershed populations.

Action	Description	Responsible Parties	Programs	Comments
	Monitor chum handle rate in winter steelhead and late coho tributary sport fisheries.	WDFW	Columbia Compact	State agencies would include chum incidental handle assessments as part of their annual tributary sport fishery sampling plan.
	Develop a mass marking plan for hatchery tule Chinook for tributary harvest management and for naturally-spawning escapement monitoring.	WDFW, NMFS, USFWS, Col. Tribes	U.S. Congress, Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission	Provides the opportunity to implement selective tributary sport fishing regulations in the Elochoman watershed. Recent legislation passed by Congress mandates marking of all Chinook, coho, and steelhead produced in federally funded hatcheries that are intended for harvest. Details for implementation are currently under development by WDFW, ODFW, treaty Indian tribes, and federal agencies.
	Monitor and evaluate commercial and sport impacts to naturally-spawning steelhead in salmon and hatchery steelhead target fisheries.	WDFW, ODFW	Columbia Compact, BPA Fish and Wildlife Program	Includes monitoring of naturally-spawning steelhead encounter rates in fisheries and refinement of long-term catch and release handling mortality estimates. Would include assessment of the current monitoring programs and determine their adequacy in formulating naturally-spawning steelhead incidental mortality estimates.
	Continue to improve gear and regulations to minimize incidental impacts to naturally-spawning steelhead.	WDFW, ODFW	Columbia Compact, BPA Fish and Wildlife Program	Regulatory agencies should continue to refine gear, handle and release methods, and seasonal options to minimize mortality of naturally-spawning steelhead in commercial and sport fisheries.
	Maintain selective sport fisheries in ocean, Columbia River, and tributaries and monitor naturally-spawning stock impacts.	WDFW, NMFS, ODFW, USFWS	PFMC, Columbia Compact, BPA Fish and Wildlife Program, WDFW Creel	Mass marking of lower Columbia River coho and steelhead has enabled successful ocean and freshwater selective fisheries to be implemented since 1998. Marking programs should be continued and fisheries monitored to provide improved estimates of naturally-spawning salmon and steelhead release mortality.

D.5.8. Hydropower

No dams or hydropower facilities exist in the Elochoman/Skamokawa watershed; hence, no in-basin hydropower actions are identified. Elochoman/Skamokawa River anadromous fish populations will benefit from regional hydropower measures recovery measures and actions identified in regional plans to address habitat effects in the mainstem and estuary.

D.5.9. Mainstem and Estuary Habitat

Elochoman/Skamokawa anadromous fish populations will also benefit from regional recovery strategies and measures identified to address habitat conditions and threats in the Columbia River mainstem and estuary. Regional recovery plan strategies involve: 1) avoiding large scale habitat changes where risks are known or uncertain, 2) mitigating small-scale local habitat impacts to ensure no net loss, 3) protecting functioning habitats while restoring impaired habitats to functional conditions, 4) striving to understand, protect, and restore habitat-forming processes, 5) moving habitat conditions in the direction of the historical template which is presumed to be more consistent with restoring viable populations, and 6) improving understanding of salmonids habitats use in the Columbia River mainstem and estuary and their response to habitat changes. A series of specific measures are detailed in the regional plan for each of these strategies.

D.5.10. Ecological Interactions

For the purposes of this plan, ecological interactions refer to the relationships of salmon and steelhead with other elements of the ecosystem. Regional strategies and measures pertaining to exotic or non-native species, effects of salmon on system productivity, and native predators of salmon are detailed and discussed at length in Volume I and are not reprised at length in each subbasin plan. Strategies include 1) avoiding, eliminating introductions of new exotic species and managing effects of existing exotic species, 2) recognizing the significance of salmon to the productivity of other species and the salmon themselves, and 3) managing predation by selected species while also maintaining a viable balance of predator populations. A series of specific measures are detailed in the regional plan for each of these strategies. Implementation will occur at the regional and subbasin scale.

D.6. References

- Arp, A.H., J.H. Rose, S.K. Olhausen. 1971. Contribution of Columbia River hatcheries to harvest of 1963 brood fall Chinook salmon. Nation Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Portland, OR.
- Beamish, R.J. and D.R. Bouillon. 1993. Pacific salmon production trends in relation to climate. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science 50:1002-1016.
- Bryant, F.G. 1949. A survey of the Columbia River and its tributaries with special reference to its fishery resources--Part II Washington streams from the mouth of the Columbia to and including the Klickitat River (Area I). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Special Science Report 62:110.
- Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. 1970. Contribution of Columbia River hatcheries to harvest of 1962 brood fall Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Portland, OR.
- Caldwell, B., J. Shedd, H. Beecher. 1999. Washougal River fish habitat analysis using the instream flow incremental methodology and the toe-width method for WRIs 25, 26, 28, and 29. Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE), V: 99-153 Open File.
- Fiscus, H. 1991. 1990 chum escapement to Columbia River tributaries. Washington Department of Fisheries (WDF).
- Grant, S., J. Hard, R. Iwamoto, R., O. Johnson, R. Kope, C. Mahnken, M. Schiewe, W. Waknitz, R. Waples, J. Williams. 1999. Status review update for chum salmon from Hood Canal summer-run and Columbia River ESU's. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).
- Hare, S.R., N.J. Mantua and R.C. Francis. 1999. Inverse production regimes: Alaska and West Coast Pacific salmon. Fisheries 24(1):6-14.
- Harlan, K. 1999. Washington Columbia River and tributary stream survey sampling results, 1998. Washington Department of fish and Wildlife (WDFW). Columbia River Progress Report 99-15, Vancouver, WA.
- Hopley, C. Jr. 1980. Cowlitz spring Chinook rearing density study. Washington Department of Fisheries (WDF), Salmon Culture Division.
- Hymer, J. 1993. Estimating the natural spawning chum population in the Grays River Basin, 1944-1991. Washington Department of Fisheries (WDF), Columbia River Laboratory Progress Report 93-17, Battle Ground, WA.
- Hymer, J., R. Pettit, M. Wastel, P. Hahn, K. Hatch. 1992. Stock summary reports for Columbia River anadromous salmonids, Volume III: Washington subbasins below McNary Dam. Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), Portland, OR.
- Keller, K. 1999. 1998 Columbia River chum return. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), Columbia River Progress Report 99-8, Vancouver, WA.
- Lawson, P.W. 1993. Cycles in ocean productivity, trends in habitat quality, and the restoration of salmon runs in Oregon. Fisheries 18(8):6-10.
- LeFleur, C. 1987. Columbia River and tributary stream survey sampling results, 1986. Washington Department of Fisheries (WDF), Progress Report 87-8, Battle Ground, WA.
- LeFleur, C. 1988. Columbia River and tributary stream survey sampling results, 1987. Washington Department of Fisheries (WDF), Progress Report, 88-17, Battle Ground, WA.

- Leider, S. 1997. Status of sea-run cutthroat trout in Washington. Oregon Chapter, American Fisheries Society. In: J.D. Hall, P.A. Bisson, and R.E. Gresswell (eds) Sea-run cutthroat trout: biology, management, and future conservation. pp. 68-76. Corvallis, OR.
- Lewis County GIS (Geographic Information Systems). 2000. Grays-Elochoman and Cowlitz Rivers Watershed Planning WRIAs 25 and 26 – Watershed Management Plan.
- Lisle, T., A. Lehre, H. Martinson, D. Meyer, K. Nolan, R. Smith. 1982. Stream channel adjustments after the 1980 Mount St. Helens eruptions Proceedings of a symposium on erosion control in volcanic areas. Proceedings of a symposium on erosion control in volcanic areas. Seattle, WA.
- Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB) 2001. Level 1 Watershed Technical Assessment for WRIAs 25 and 26. Prepared by Economic and Engineering Services for the LCFRB. Longview, Washington.
- Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (LCFRB). 2004. Grays-Elochoman and Cowlitz Rivers Watershed Planning - WRIAs 25 and 26. Watershed Management Plan. September 2004 DRAFT.
- Ludwig, P. 1992. Middle Valley Drainage of Skamokawa Creek, Washington, Wahkiakum County. Wahkiakum Conservation District. Unpublished report.
- Marcot, B.G., W.E. McConnaha, P.H. Whitney, T.A. O’Neil, P.J. Paquet, L. Mobrand, G.R. Blair, L.C. Lestelle, K.M. Malone and K.E. Jenkins. 2002. A multi-species framework approach for the Columbia River Basin
- Marriott, D. et. al. . 2002. Lower Columbia River and Columbia River Estuary Subbasin Summary. Northwest Power Planning Council.
- McKinnell, S.M., C.C. Wood, D.T. Rutherford, K.D. Hyatt and D.W. Welch. 2001. The demise of Owikeno Lake sockeye salmon. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 21:774-791.
- Mikkelsen, N. 1991. Escapement reports for Columbia River hatcheries, all species, from 1960-1990. Washington Department of Fisheries (WDF).
- National Research Council (NRC). 1992. Restoration of aquatic systems. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., USA.
- National Research Council (NRC). 1996. Upstream: Salmon and society in the Pacific Northwest. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.
- Pyper, B.J., F.J. Mueter, R.M. Peterman, D.J. Blackbourn and C.C. Wood. 2001. Spatial convariation in survival rates of Northeast Pacific pink salmon (*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*). Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 58:1501-1515.
- Roni, P., T.J. Beechie, R.E. Bilby, F.E. Leonetti, M.M. Pollock and G.R. Pess. 2002. A review of stream restoration techniques and a hierarchical strategy for prioritizing restoration in Pacific Northwest Watersheds. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 22:1-20. American Fisheries Society.
- Rothfus, L.O., W.D. Ward, E. Jewell. 1957. Grays River steelhead trout population study, December 1955 through April 1956. Washington Department of Fisheries (WDF).
- Schuett-Hames, J. 2000. Germany Creek Photo Points and Channel Stability Evaluation: 1990-2000. Washington State Department of Ecology. Publication No. 00-10-038. November 2000.
- Tracy, H.B., C.E. Stockley. 1967. 1966 Report of Lower Columbia River tributary fall Chinook salmon stream population study. Washington Department of Fisheries (WDF).

- Wade, G. 2001. Salmon and Steelhead habitat Limiting Factors, Water Resource Inventory Area 25. Washington State Conservation Commission. Water Resource Inventory Area 25.
- Wade, G. 2002. Salmon and steelhead habitat limiting factors, WRIA 25 (Grays-Elochoman). Washington Department of Ecology.
- Wahle, R.J., A.H. Arp, A.H., S.K. Olhausen. 1972. Contribution of Columbia River hatcheries to harvest of 1964 brood fall Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Economic Feasibility Report Vol:2, Portland, OR.
- Wahle, R.J., R.R. Vreeland. 1978. Bioeconomic contribution of Columbia River hatchery fall Chinook salmon, 1961 through 1964. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Fishery Bulletin 1978(1).
- Wahle, R.J., R.R. Vreeland, R.H. Lander. 1973. Bioeconomic contribution of Columbia River hatchery coho salmon, 1965 and 1966 broods, to the Pacific salmon fisheries. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Portland, OR.
- Wahle, R.J., R.R. Vreeland, R.H. Lander. 1974. Bioeconomic contribution of Columbia River hatchery coho salmon, 1965 and 1966 broods, to the Pacific Salmon Fisheries. Fishery Bulletin 72(1).
- Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE). 1998. Final 1998 List of Threatened and Impaired Water Bodies - Section 303(d) list. WDOE Water Quality Program. Olympia, WA.
- Washington Department of Ecology (WDOE) 2004. 2002/2004. Draft 303(d) List of threatened and impaired water bodies .
- Washington Department of Fisheries (WDF). 1990. Elochoman River Subbasin Salmon and Steelhead Production Plan. Columbia Basin System Planning. Northwest Power Planning Council.
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). 1996. Lower Columbia River WDFW hatchery records. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW).
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). 1997. Preliminary stock status update for steelhead in the Lower Columbia River. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), Vancouver, WA.
- Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). 1996. North Elochoman Watershed Analysis.
- Waterstrat, Janet. 1994. Inventory of Watersheds Wahkiakum County. Wahkiakum Conservation District. (unpublished report).
- Wendler, H.O., E.H. LeMier, L.O. Rothfus, E.L. Preston, W.D. Ward, R.E. Birtchet. 1956. Columbia River Progress Report, January through April, 1956. Washington Department of Fisheries (WDF).
- Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC). 2003. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Organization - National Climatic Data Center. URL: <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/index.html>.
- Woodard, B. 1997. Columbia River Tributary sport Harvest for 1994 and 1995. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), Battle Ground, WA.
- Worlund, D.D., R.J. Wahle, P.D. Zimmer. 1969. Contribution of Columbia River hatcheries to harvest of fall Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). Fishery Bulletin 67(2).