

Okanogan County Office of Planning and Development
 Water Resources Division
 123 North 5th Avenue Room 110
 Okanogan, WA 98840

Your March 2005 edition of
Fish Lines

MARCH MEETING SCHEDULE

2005	
March 2, 2005	RRS Staff Meeting—Douglas County Public Services Building, E. Wenatchee, WA 9:00am—3:00pm
March 10, 2005	HCC Meeting—Douglas County Public Services Building, E. Wenatchee, WA 9:00am—3:00pm
March 17, 2005	HCC Meeting—Douglas County Public Services Building, E. Wenatchee, WA 9:00am—2:00pm
March 17, 2005	Advisory Committee Mtg—Okanogan County Board of Commissioners Hearing Rm, Okanogan WA 6:30pm—8:30pm
March 23, 2005	UCSRB Board Meeting—Douglas County Public Services Building, E. Wenatchee, WA 1:00pm—5:00pm

PROJECT MILESTONES

2005	
Early April*	Public meetings: Present final draft of regional salmon recovery plan
March 31-April 29*	Comment period: Final draft of regional salmon recovery plan
June 30	Plan submitted to Washington State
* Dates subject to revision.	
The schedule for completion of the final draft is under review to ensure it includes as much information as possible.	
Monthly Okanogan County Regional Salmon Recovery Planning Advisory Committee meetings through June, 2005	

Fish Lines

A newsletter providing information about regional salmon recovery planning in Okanogan County.

Volume I Issue 6

February 2005

IN THIS ISSUE . . .

- *Economic benefits of salmon recovery*
- *Washington Legislature eyes salmon recovery*

ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF SALMON RECOVERY

Salmon recovery is widely perceived as beneficial to the environment. But what about the economy? Efforts to recover ESA-listed species—spring Chinook, steelhead, and bull trout—are costing a lot. A new report suggests recovery could pay off for rural communities.

Unlike many endangered species, salmon are a valuable commodity. A bill currently being considered by Washington’s legislature states that “These [endangered species] listings threaten the sport, commercial, and tribal fishing industries as well as the economic well-being and vitality of vast areas of the state.” Commercial fishing has long been an economic mainstay in many rural Washington communities—primarily in western Washington. Sport fishing may be of greater interest in the eastern part of the state. As salmonid populations recover, sport fisheries may be revived and expanded—and business people and communities may reap the benefits, in the form of increased local spending by anglers.

The Potential Economic Impact of Restored Salmon and Steelhead Fishing in Idaho, written by Idaho economist Don Reading, forecasts substantial economic gains for rural Idaho communities as a result of recovery. Dr. Reading’s study analyzes the potential economic impact of a fully recovered salmon and steelhead fishery in Idaho. His report states that “the benefit of a restored salmon and steelhead fishery to Idaho’s economy could reach \$544 million annually.”

Some analysts have questioned the accuracy of Dr. Reading’s estimates; like most researchers, he used models and made assumptions in order to forecast future conditions. Most people do agree that recovering salmon and steelhead to harvestable levels will increase angler spending and create jobs. Anglers spend money on bait, tackle, equipment, guiding and outfitting, and food and lodging in places they visit. Many of those expenditures are made in river communities and directly benefit those communities.



Indirect benefits accrue, as well. Indirect benefits are economic impacts of angler spending in a community. For instance, a business owner may hire a new employee to meet growing demands for products or services; a newly-hired worker will have more money to spend, benefiting other local businesses. Indirect benefits are calculated by applying standard economic multipliers to direct expenditures.

(please continue this article on page 2)

Okanogan County Office of Planning and Development

Water Resources Division

Working to balance the needs of economy, salmon and the community in the Upper Columbia regional salmon recovery planning process.

Okanogan County Board of County Commissioners
 Andrew Lampe, District 1
 Bud Hover, District 2
 Mary Lou Peterson, District 3

Okanogan County personnel
 Julie E. Pyper, Coordinator
 Sandy Cox, Assistant

123 North 5th Avenue Room 110
 Okanogan, WA 98840
 Telephone: (509) 422.7113
 Fax: (509) 422.7349
 Email: ocsr@co.okanogan.wa.us
 Website: www.okanogancounty.org/
 Water

Consultant: Highlands Associates
 Kurt Danison
 (509) 422.5030
 kdanison@ncidata.com

Sandra Strieby
 (509) 997.2576
 sandra@mymethow.com

Sheila Harrison
 (509) 422.5030
 sharrison@ncidata.com

For information about regional salmon recovery planning in Chelan and Douglas counties contact:

Chelan County: Mike Kaputa
 (509) 667.6584

Douglas County: Chuck Jones
 (509) 884.7173

ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF SALMON RECOVERY (continued from page 1)

Save Our Wild Salmon (SOS), a nationwide coalition of conservation organizations, commercial and sport fishing associations, businesses, river groups, and taxpayer advocates, used the numbers in Dr. Reading's report to estimate economic benefits from salmon recovery in Oregon and Washington. SOS's estimate of benefits includes more than \$1 billion and 9,400 jobs in Washington. Speaking to the *Columbia Basin Bulletin*, SOS spokeswoman Vicki Paris said "There's the potential for more economic benefit than all of the recovery efforts cost now."



SOS's estimates are just that. Research specific to eastern Washington would be necessary to understand just how recovery would benefit communities in Okanogan County. There seems little doubt, though, that sport fisheries on Chinook salmon and steelhead have the potential to be economically beneficial.



The *Columbia Basin Bulletin* quotes Trey Carskadon, Oregon businessman and president of the Northwest Sportfishing Industry Association: "Even the historically modest salmon and steelhead returns that we saw in 2001 meant more than \$1.9 billion to our region... If annually harvestable runs were to be re-established, the boost throughout our economy would be tremendous, with major business and job growth in a cluster of industries, including boat building, outdoor gear, outfitting, restaurants and hotels."



In his report on potential economic impacts of recovery, Dr. Reading argues that about 60% of the economic gain would benefit river communities in Idaho. The rest would benefit other communities in the Upper Columbia region and statewide, through spending by residents of river communities and benefits to businesses outside the area that serve anglers, such as equipment dealers and manufacturers.

Fish recovery provides a means of strengthening and diversifying the economy. SOS reports that "The sportfishing industry is a \$3.5 billion business in the Northwest supporting some 36,000 full time jobs." The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service estimates that between 1991 and 1996, nearly 10,000 sportfishing industry jobs were lost. Fish recovery will probably mean the return of at least some of those jobs, and it may also lead to the creation of new ones.



From IAC's Assessment of Outdoor Recreation, October 2002, Page 107

Age group	0-9	10-19	20-34	35-49	50-65	65+	Totals
Bank fishing, fresh water	35,405	38,401	58,879	64,106	32,398	35,032	264,221
Private boat fishing, fresh water	26,822	29,971	53,359	64,106	30,435	32,029	236,722
Guide/charter fishing, fresh water	*	*	1,840	4,007	982	1,001	7,830

Numbers of people by age group estimated to take part in recreational fishing by the setting indicated
 All numbers are estimates based on a statewide survey of randomly-selected individuals 1999-2000
 Numbers are plus or minus 5% with a 95% confidence interval
 * Insufficient samples were submitted

WASHINGTON LEGISLATURE EYES SALMON RECOVERY

The State Legislature is considering two bills to revise Washington's Salmon Recovery law. The bill is intended to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of salmon recovery work by providing for coordination among the various state agencies involved in recovery efforts.

In 1998 the legislature passed the Salmon Recovery Act (ESHB 2496), creating Washington's Salmon Recovery law—Chapter 77.85 in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW). The act was meant to keep responsibility for managing Washington's natural resources—including fish populations listed under the Endangered Species Act—in the hands of the state rather than allowing the federal government to take on the job.

It established a framework for salmon recovery in the state and authorized the designation of local Lead Entities to coordinate acceptance and review of applications for salmon habitat restoration and protection project funding. Proposed projects are prioritized by a local Citizens' Committee. Okanogan County Water Resources and the Colville Confederated Tribes have partnered to serve as the lead entity for the Methow and Okanogan subbasins.

In the years since passage of the Salmon Recovery Act, individuals and organizations throughout the state have developed and implemented dozens of salmon recovery projects. In spite of all the work that has been done, salmon and steelhead populations remain threatened or endangered. The aims of the bill now being considered are better coordination at the regional level, including coordination with watershed planning efforts; and better scientific oversight and monitoring.

The bill, Senate Bill (SB) 5610, provides for creation of salmon recovery regions and recognition by the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO) of regional salmon recovery organizations "for the purpose of developing and implementing regional recovery plans." It also directs the GSRO and the Department of Ecology to make recommendations for improving coordination of salmon recovery, watershed, and related plans that have been prepared or are being prepared within a given watershed or group of watersheds (for instance, the six watersheds that compose the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Region).

The bill also provides for creation of a forum to oversee watershed health monitoring, with a focus on salmon recovery. Monitoring—evaluating the effectiveness of salmon recovery actions—is important so that all parties know what is working and what it not. Those actions that are not achieving the desired results can be discontinued, and projects that are effective can be replicated.

The second bill, HCR 4406, would establish a joint select legislative task force to review watershed health and salmon recovery plans. The task force would comprise representatives of the house of representatives economic development, agriculture, and trade committee, natural resources, ecology, and parks committee, and capital budget committee; and of the senate water, energy, and environment committee, natural resources, ocean, and recreation committee, and ways and means committee. The bill also calls for establishment of an advisory committee, comprising representatives of the departments of ecology and fish and wildlife, the salmon recovery funding board, the governor's office, a watershed planning group, a lead entity, regional salmon recovery group, the federal fisheries service, and federally recognized Indian tribes. The job of the task force would be to evaluate and make recommendations to the legislature regarding the implementation of watershed health and salmon recovery plans.

Together, the two bills would provide the means for the legislature to evaluate watershed and salmon recovery in the state and revise the processes by which that work is done to better achieve the objectives of recovery, delisting, and watershed health.

For More information on these bills please visit these websites:

ESHB 2496: <http://66.102.7.104/search?q=cache:PtP89dCFr-QJ:www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/eap/wrias/assessments/wria11/Chapter1.pdf+ESHB+>

SB 5610: <http://www.leg.wa.gov/wsladm/billinfo1/dspBillSummary.cfm?billnumber=5610&year=2005>

HCR 4406: <http://www.leg.wa.gov/wsladm/billinfo1/dspBillSummary.cfm?billnumber=4406&year=2005>

