



Hood Canal Coordinating Council Suite 1224 17791 Fjord Dr. N.E. Poulsbo, WA 98370-8481 Executive Director Scott Brewer (360) 531-0575 sbrewer@hccc.wa.gov www.hccc.wa.gov

Region Overview

Geography

The Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Region is nested within the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region for Chinook and steelhead. The Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Region is also a separate salmon recovery region for Hood Canal and Eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. It includes parts of Jefferson, Mason, Clallam, and Kitsap Counties.

Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIA)

All or parts of Kitsap (15), Skokomish-Dosewallips (16), Quilcene-Snow (17), and Elwha-Dungeness (18) and part of Shelton (14)

Federally Recognized Tribes

Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe, Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe, Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe, Skokomish Indian Tribe, Suquamish Tribe

Salmon Recovery Plan

Table 1. Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Region Recovery Plan

Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Plan	
Regional Organization	Hood Canal Coordinating Council, composed of Jefferson,
	Kitsap, and Mason Counties and the Port Gamble S'Klallam and
	Skokomish Tribes
Plan Timeframe	10-30 years
Actions Identified to Implement Plan	296
Estimated Cost	\$130 million
Status	NOAA-Fisheries formally adopted the recovery plan for Hood
	Canal and Eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon
	in May 2007.
Implementation Schedule Status	The Hood Canal Coordinating Council and its plan
	implementation partners are using an implementation
	schedule with a 3-year timeframe and with more detailed
	information on recovery plan actions and costs.
Web Information	Hood Canal Coordinating Council Web Site
	Habitat Work Schedule

Endangered Species Act Listings

Table 2. Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Region Listed Species

Species Listed	Listed As	Date Listed	
Hood Canal Summer Chum	Threatened	March 25, 1999	
Puget Sound Bull Trout	Threatened	November 1999	

Region and Lead Entities

The Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC) is the regional recovery organization for Hood Canal and eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca summer chum salmon. The Puget Sound Partnership serves as the regional recovery organization for Puget Sound Chinook salmon and steelhead trout. HCCC is one of two lead entities in the region covering the area encompassed by Mason, Kitsap, and Jefferson Counties. The North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon covers the area of the region within Clallam County.

Regional Area Summary Questions and Responses

Describe the process and criteria used to develop allocations across lead entities or watersheds within the region?

The Hood Canal summer chum salmon evolutionarily significant unit (ESU) is composed of two populations, Hood Canal and eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca. Within the geographic area supporting each population, is several watersheds with subpopulations of Hood Canal summer chum. Recovery efforts of the eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca population are implemented by two lead entities (LE), namely the Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC) LE and the North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon (NOPLE). Recovery efforts of the Hood Canal population are supported by the HCCC LE. Both lead entities implement recovery efforts for other salmonid species as well. HCCC is the LE for the subpopulations of Puget Sound Chinook (Skokomish, Mid-Hood Canal), Coastal-Puget Sound bull trout, and Puget Sound steelhead.

The Hood Canal Coordinating Council Board of Directors approved the regional salmon recovery prioritization guidance, *Guidance for Prioritizing Salmonid Stocks, Issues, and Actions for the Hood Canal Coordinating Council*. The Guidance focuses salmon recovery project development and evaluation to substantiate and assure funding is directed toward efforts that make the greatest impact feasible toward salmon recovery in the region. Region-wide, project sponsors submitted their highest priority projects for salmon recovery through the HCCC LE process. Technical evaluation included assessing the alignment of the proposed projects with prioritization guidance.

The Citizens Advisory Group evaluation of the proposed priority salmon recovery projects utilized HCCC Board of Director allocation guidance for distribution of lead entity funding across the Hood Canal region by addressing; Hood Canal summer chum (35%), Skokomish and/or Mid-Hood Canal stocks of Puget Sound Chinook (35%), nearshore restoration (10%), and assessments (10%). These allocation breakouts are representative of how funding in allocated to the region through the Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration allocation formula as it applies to Hood Canal.

The regional Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) each had active participants and appointed membership representation from the North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon (NOPLE).

How was the regional technical review conducted?

The HCCC Board of Directors charged the Technical Advisory Group (TAG), composed of appointed members, representative of local, regional, state, federal, and tribal partners, to serve as advisory to the HCCC Citizens Committee and staff, conducting a regional evaluation of salmon recovery projects. Habitat proposals are accepted from watersheds across the entire ESU including summer chum restoration and protection projects submitted to the HCCC LE in the overlapped salmon recovery region with NOPLE.

After an independent, reach-scale scoring of each project is conducted by the HCCC TAG members, the proposed project scores are compiled, normalized, and tested for statistical significance. The regional-scale technical evaluation of the projects is then conducted by the TAG within the ranking meeting. The resulting list is forwarded on to the Citizens Advisory Group for further evaluation and then recommendation to the full Citizens Committee consisting of the HCCC Board of Directors and the Citizens Advisory Group.

Independent technical reviews were conducted by the SRFB Review Panel in which two members attended site visits with HCCC TAG and CAG members, all of which provided comments (written and/or verbal) to project sponsors before final submittal of applications were due.

What criteria were used for the regional technical review?

The HCCC Technical Advisory Group reviews according to the following criteria:

- Benefit to Salmon
- Certainty of Success
- Cost Appropriateness

Reach-Scale Scoring Criteria:

Benefit to Salmon

• Priority Stocks (28%)

What is the priority level of the highest priority salmonid stock that would benefit from the proposed project?

• Priority Issues (14%)

What is the relative importance of the issue (or the priority of that issue) affecting the performance of the stock that a proposed project aims to positively affect by its implementation?

• Priority Actions (14%)

What is the relative importance of the action corresponding to a proposed project in its potential for redressing the targeted issue that affects the stock of interest?

Certainty of Success

Do the project merits adequately and logically contribute to the issue affecting the targeted stock while demonstrating the project readiness for funding?

Project Scope (20%)

- Does the project design adequately address the targeted issue affecting the stock?
- o Is the project scope and scale appropriate to meet its goals and objectives?
- Are objectives well defined and can they be achieved?
- Does the project goal and objectives remain consistent with best available science?
- o Is there adequate longevity of benefit from this project?

• Sequencing and Planning Efforts (12%)

- o Is the project a component of a collaborative watershed planning effort, or is it integrated or associated with other salmon recovery projects and assessments in the watershed?
- Is the project sequenced appropriately for the watershed conditions and independent of other actions being taken first?

 Are the objectives to be implemented within the project scope in the correct sequence?

• Implementation Readiness and Support (8%)

- Is there an adequate level of project proponent and their partners' experience and capability?
- Are the actions scheduled, funded, and ready to take place with few or no known constraints to successful implementation?

Cost Effectiveness

• Cost Effectiveness (4%)

Does the project expense appear consistent with the scope of work with costs and effort sufficiently detailed in the proposal to justify the requested spending level?

• Cost/Benefit (no score - TAG narrative for CAG evaluation)

Does the project have a low cost relative to the predicted benefits?

Who completed the review (name, affiliation, and expertise) and are they part of the regional organization or independent?

The regional and reach-scale technical reviews were conducted by the HCCC Technical Advisory Group, an HCCC Board of Director appointed group charged with serving as advisory to the HCCC Citizens Committee (consists of HCCC Board of Directors and HCCC Citizens Advisory group) and staff and charged with the technical evaluation of salmon recovery projects.

Table 3: Technical Advisory Group

TAG Member Name	Expertise	Member Affiliation
Kathlene Barnhart	Geomorphologist, Project Manager	Kitsap County
Dave Tucker	Engineer	Kitsap County
Hans Daubenberger	Habitat & Marine Biologist, Research &	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe
	Monitory Program Manager	
Abby Welch	Fin Fish Management Biologist	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe
Randy Lumper	Environmental Planner	Skokomish Tribe
Matt Kowalski	Steelhead Biologist	Skokomish Tribe
Eric Carlsen	Engineer	North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity
Chris Waldbillig	Hood Canal Lead Habitat Biologist	WA Fish and Wildlife Service
Marc McHenry	Fish Biologist	US Forest Service
Carrie Cook-Tabor	Fish Biologist	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Jody Walters	Salmon Habitat Biologist	NOAA Fisheries

Were there any projects submitted to the SRFB for funding that were not specifically identified in the regional implementation plan or habitat work schedule? (If so, please provide justification for including these projects to the list of projects recommended to the SRFB for funding. If the projects were identified in the regional implementation plan or strategy but considered a low priority or in a low priority area, please provide justification.)

All forwarded projects in 2015 are consistent with the salmon recovery plans, 3-year work program and regional salmon recovery prioritization guidance, *Guidance for Prioritizing Salmonid Stocks, Issues, and Actions for the Hood Canal Coordinating Council.* Of the 16 projects proposed for SRFB or PSAR funding, 14 address highest priority stocks in the region and submitted on the HCCC list for SRFB or PSAR funding and one project is seeking Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) SRFB funding. An additional two projects, addressing moderate priority stocks, have been submitted for IMW SRFB funding separate from the regular SRFB or PSAR allocation. All projects submitted for IMW SRFB funding have been identified in the Hood Canal IMW Complex Treatment Plan.

How did your regional review consider whether a project:

Provides benefit to high priority stocks for the purpose of salmon recovery or sustainability? In addition to limiting factors analysis, SaSI, and SSHIAP¹, what stock assessment work has been done to date to further characterize the status of salmonid species in the region?

The past few years have seen significant advances in stock assessments, recovery planning, and project prioritization for both Chinook and summer chum salmon. Skokomish Chinook have undergone both a full stock assessment of various races of Chinook and potential for successful recovery of that watershed, with a plan that now prioritizes spring Chinook reintroduction and resulting habitat improvements for that species. The Hood Canal Coordinating Council and partners have updated the summer chum salmon viability analysis (including downscaling to subpopulation levels), assessed habitat progress to date from past project and program-level investments, compared that to emerging goals for each subpopulation, and created a new 10-year habitat conceptual project list that will lead us to recovery. Work is in progress to further refine the analyses and provide recommendations for future funding rounds.

2015 SRFB Funding Report

¹SaSI = Salmon and Steelhead Stock Inventory; SSHIAP=Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Inventory and Assessment Program

Stock, issue, and action prioritization was conducted in 2014 in order to further guide the HCCC Board of Directors and the TAG in lead entity process and decision-making. The HCCC Board of Directors approved the prioritization as guidance in March of 2015. Criteria considered in the stock evaluation included:

- Stock status (expected or known)
- Role in Species Abundance
- Role in Species Diversity (also considers spatial structure and effects of asynchrony)
- Certainty of knowledge about status and limiting factors
- Certainty of success with focused actions (may take into account knowledge of limiting factors and evidence for past success)
- Ecological significance (considers benefits to ecosystem, e.g. added nutrients and/or food resources with timing of presence)
- Biological uniqueness
- Tribal cultural significance
- Non-tribal social significance
- Economic significance

The resulting list was incorporated in the 2015 project evaluation process with mandatory criteria for all SRFB and PSAR project proposals to primarily benefit at least one of the priority species in the region. Refinement of stocks and strategies prioritization is continuing to advise and improve the Hood Canal salmon recovery process.

Addresses cost-effectiveness?

The TAG uses "cost appropriateness" as one of its three major factors in independently scoring each project with the Citizens Committee, consisting of the HCCC Board of Directors and HCCC Citizens Advisory Group, reviewing project cost issues and regional funding levels. The cost-effectiveness criteria assesses whether or not the project is expensive relative to other projects, that expense is justified, funding it would affect funding of other good projects, and appropriateness for these types of funds.

The Technical Advisory Group assessed the project cost related to the predicted benefits of implementing the project. This evaluation results in a short narrative for Citizen Committee consideration.

Both the TAG and Citizens Advisory Group considered project timing and sequencing as a type of cost effectiveness. Additionally, there is a 15 percent match requirement of SRFB and PSAR funded projects. Although we do not award points or rankings based on whether the sponsor provided more than the required match, many projects have substantial match funding emphasizing the high priority of the projects.

Local Review Processes

Provide project evaluation criteria and documentation of your local Citizens Advisory Group and Technical Advisory Group ratings for each project, including explanations for differences between the two group's ratings.

The Hood Canal Coordinating Council Board of Directors approved the regional salmon recovery prioritization guidance, *Guidance for Prioritizing Salmonid Stocks, Issues, and Actions for the Hood Canal Coordinating Council*. The Guidance guides salmon recovery project development and evaluation. Evaluation criteria carries this guidance a step further by asking four overarching questions about a proposed project:

- 1. What is the priority level of the highest priority salmonid stock that would benefit from the proposed project?
- 2. What is the relative importance of the issue (or the priority of that issue) affecting the performance of the stock that a proposed project aims to positively affect by its implementation?
- 3. What is the relative importance of the action corresponding to a proposed project in its potential for redressing the targeted issue that affects the stock of interest?
- 4. Do the project merits adequately and logically contribute to the issue affecting the targeted stock while demonstrating the project readiness for funding?

These questions led to the following Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Scoring Criteria:

- Benefit to Salmon: primary stock priority, priority of primary issue affecting stock, priority of primary action addressing issue.
- **Certainty of Success:** adequate and logical project scope, sequencing, and planning efforts, implementation readiness and support.
- **Cost Effectiveness:** justified project expense, and benefit relative to cost.

The Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) considered the project list according to the HCCC Board of Director <u>Guidance</u> utilizing TAG recommendations, funding source eligibility, HCCC allocation structure guidance, cost relative to benefit, and community support.

HCCC allocation structure guidance is to fund high priority salmon recovery projects by distribution of funding toward: 35% Hood Canal Summer Chum habitats, 35% Chinook habitats, 10% nearshore habitats, and 10% assessment projects.

The HCCC Citizens Committee, comprised of the HCCC Board of Directors and the CAG, met to approve the ranked project list in August 2015. The final list for 2015 is consistent with the technically ranked list recommended earlier in the process.

Identify your local technical review team (include expertise, names, and affiliations of members.

The local technical review is conducted as a preliminary step in the regional technical review process. The local & regional technical review team is described in this report under regional technical evaluation (above).

Explain how and when the SRFB Review Panel participated in your local process, if applicable.

SRFB Review Panel members and RCO grants managers participated in field reviews and provided comments on pre-applications and final applications. The RCO grants manager, Mike Ramsey, also was instrumental in implementing the process and ensuring alignment with RCO processes and protocols.

Explain how multi-year implementation plans or habitat work schedules were used to develop project lists.

Project sponsors presented their highest priority projects for salmon recovery as defined by the priorities in: the Hood Canal & Eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca Summer Chum Salmon Recovery Plan, the Mid-Hood Canal Chinook Recovery Plan, the Skokomish Chinook Recovery Plan, and the *Guidance for Prioritizing Salmonid Stocks, Issues, and Actions for the Hood Canal Coordinating Council*. Proposed projects are listed on the 2015 3-Year Work Program in which each project is linked to the recovery plan strategy it addresses. TAG members then assessed each project's alignment with prioritization stocks issues and actions as it relates to salmon recovery in the Hood Canal region. This review determined qualifying proposals for the HCCC Lead Entity grant round process.

Explain how comments of technical, citizen, and policy reviews were addressed in finalizing the project list. Were there any issues about projects on the list and how were those resolved?

TAG and CAG provided comments on proposals during the pre-application phase and incorporated into project refinement prior to applications being submitted. Opportunities for project feedback was given during site visits, presentation & evaluation meetings, written comments, and/or sub-group meetings. The SRFB Review Panel also provided technical comments during the pre-application phase that were addressed in the final application attached in PRISM. Robust project reviews by the TAG and CAG throughout the evaluation process yielded several recommendations for improvement that were incorporated into final project descriptions resulting in increased certainty of success in the implementation of proposed salmon recovery projects.

The HCCC Citizens Committee, comprised of the HCCC Board of Directors and the Citizens Advisory Group, conducted the policy review and adopted the ranked list as recommended by the Citizens Advisory Group.

Table 4: Hood Canal Coordinating Council Ranked Habitat Project List

2015 Hood (2015 Hood Canal Coordinating Council Ranked Habitat Project List According to HCCC Allocation Guidance												
Priority Order	Proposed Project Name	Hood Canal Summer Chum		Chinook	N	earshore	As	sessment					
1	SF Skokomish LWD Enhancement Phase 3			\$224,692									
2	Sequim Bay Shoreline Restoration - Dawley Phase					\$400,221							
3	Upper SF Skokomish Channel / Floodplain Assessment			\$305,213									
4	Salmon Creek - W. Uncas Bridge Construction	\$763,300											
5	Lower Mainstem Skokomish LWD Design at HWY 101			\$265,302									
6	Skokomish Valley Rd Realignment Conceptual Design			\$362,990									
7	* Snow Creek Uncas Preserve Phase 2	\$150,979											
8	** Big Quilcene River Floodplain Key Pieces	\$361,580											
9	Weaver Creek Reconnection			\$199,574									
10	Hood Canal Bridge Impact Assessment							\$385,994					
11	Hood Canal Summer Chum Nearshore Habitat Use Assessment							\$396,400					
12	*** Lower Big Quilcene River Design - phase 2	\$200,000											
13	*** Duckabush River Estuary Restoration Planning			\$226,515									
14	****Lower Big Beef Creek Restoration Ph 2 - IMW	\$450,361											
Total	Project List Funding Request by Category	\$1,926,220		\$1,584,286		\$400,221		\$782,394					
HCCC	Lead Entity Allocation Guidance by Category	35% \$1,820,794	35%	\$1,820,794	10%	\$520,227	10%	\$520,227					
НССС	Project Funding by Category	\$1,475,859		\$1,584,286		\$400,221		\$782,394					

^{*}Snow Creek Uncas Preserve Phase 2 conditioned if funded: If the parking lot is constructed then it shall adhere to Western Washington Stormwater Design Manual and be submitted to the Lead Entity Advisory Groups for review and approval. Or, the sponsor may choose to not construct the parking and the element may be removed from the project scope.

^{**}Big Quilcene River Floodplain Key Pieces conditioned if funded: If the acquisition of the primary properties cannot go forward, the sponsors have to submit the scope, budget, and justification for the secondary properties (options) to the Lead Entity Advisory Groups for approval.

^{***}Lower Big Quilcene River Design - Phase 2 & Duckabush River Estuary Restoration Planning conditioned if funded: If match is not achieved, proposal must come back to Lead Entity Advisory Groups for approval.

^{****}Lower Big Beef Creek Restoration Ph2 - IMW qualifies for SRFB funding through the HCCC Lead Entity only if it is not funded through the IMW funding source.

Table 5: Projects

				3 C.	3 C.	3 C.	3 D.	3 E.	3 F.	3 G.	3 I.
Rank	Project #	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Primary Fish Stock Benefited	Name of Listed Species	Other Species Benefiting from this Project	Preserves High Quality Habitat	Priority in Recovery Plan or Strategy (list page)	Match %	Sponsor Record of SRFB Project Implementation	Listed in Action Agenda
1	15-1206	SF Skokomish LWD Enhancement Phase 3	Mason Conservation District	Puget Sound Chinook	Puget Sound Chinook, Puget Sound Steelhead	bull trout	N/A	From Skokomish M&AM Results Chain "Restore upper watershed conditions in South Fork and major tributaries"; substrategy "Increase woody debris and log jam density"	85	66 total SRFB Projects; 14 active, 28 completed	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp
2	15-1051	Sequim Bay Shoreline Restoration - Dawley Phase	North Olympic Salmon Coalition	Hood Canal Summer Chum	Hood Canal Summer Chum, Puget Sound Steelhead	Coho, cutthroat, sandlance, surf smelt	N/A	Restoration of the Sequim Bay shore will provide the best way to restore the estuarine-marine waters for the Jimmycomelately population. Ch7,p2 Hood Canal Summer Chum Recovery Plan, 2005.	15	37 projects; 6 active, 22 completed	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp

				3 C.	3 C.	3 C.	3 D.	3 E.	3 F.	3 G.	3 I.
Rank	Project #	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Primary Fish Stock Benefited	Name of Listed Species	Other Species Benefiting from this Project	Preserves High Quality Habitat	Priority in Recovery Plan or Strategy (list page)	Match %	Sponsor Record of SRFB Project Implementation	Listed in Action Agenda
3	<u>15-1196</u>	Upper SF Skokomish Channel / Floodplain Assessment	Mason Conservation District	Puget Sound Chinook	Puget Sound Chinook, Puget Sound Steelhead, Puget Sound Chinook	Steelhead, bull trout, cutthroat, rainbow	N/A	From Skokomish M&AM Results Chain "Restore upper watershed conditions in South Fork and major tributaries"; substrategy "Increase woody debris and log jam density"	15	66 total SRFB Projects; 14 active, 28 completed	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp
4	15-1192	Salmon Creek - W. Uncas Bridge Construction	Jefferson County Public Works	Hood Canal Summer Chum	Hood Canal Summer Chum, Puget Sound Steelhead	Coho, cutthroat	N/A	HC Summer Chum Recovery Plan, Ch7, p2 Protection, restoration and maintenance of the Jimmycomelately and Salmn/Snow Creek waterseds are of paramount importance.	15	7 projects; 1 active, 5 completed	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp
5	15-1205	Lower Mainstem Skokomish LWD Design at HWY 101	Mason Conservation District	Puget Sound Chinook	Puget Sound Chinook, Puget Sound Steelhead	Bull trout, Coho, chum, pink sockeye , rainbow, cutthroat	N/A	From Skokomish M&AM Results Chain "Restore lower floodplain conditions"; substrategy "Construct ELJs and install log jams to restore channel	15	66 total SRFB Projects; 14 active, 28 completed	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp

				3 C.	3 C.	3 C.	3 D.	3 E.	3 F.	3 G.	3 I.
Rank	Project #	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Primary Fish Stock Benefited	Name of Listed Species	Other Species Benefiting from this Project	Preserves High Quality Habitat	Priority in Recovery Plan or Strategy (list page)	Match %	Sponsor Record of SRFB Project Implementation	Listed in Action Agenda
								complexity and sediment processes"			
6	15-1195	Skokomish Valley Rd Realignment Conceptual Design	Mason Conservation District	Puget Sound Chinook	Puget Sound Chinook, Puget Sound Steelhead	Bull trout, Coho, chum, pink, sockeye, rainbow, cutthroat	N/A	From Skokomish M&AM Results Chains "Restore lower floodplain conditions"	15	66 total SRFB Projects; 14 active, 28 completed	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp
7	15-1200	Snow Creek Uncas Preserve Phase 2	Jefferson Land Trust	Hood Canal Summer Chum	Hood Canal Summer Chum, Puget Sound Steelhead	Coho, cutthroat	Yes, 10.6 acres including .31 miles of stream bank protection, 3.7 acres riparian, 5.96 acres uplands	HC Summer Chum Recovery Plan, Ch7, p2 Protection, restoration and maintenance of the Jimmycomelately and Salmn/Snow Creek waterseds are of paramount importance.	27	18 projects; 6 active, 8 completed	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp
8	15-1189	Big Quilcene River Floodplain Key Pieces	Jefferson County	Hood Canal Summer Chum	Hood Canal Summer Chum, Puget Sound Steelhead, Puget Sound Chinook	Coho, chum, cutthroat	Yes, 0.08 miles of stream bank protected, 1.56 acres riparian,	HC Summer Chum Recovery Plan, Ch8, p24 Restore sinuosity in the Big Quilcene R in the historical tidally influence ares, remove dikes.	15	15 projects; 3 active, 7 completed	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp

Appendix J– Regional Summaries
Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Region

				3 C.	3 C .	3 C.	3 D.	3 E.	3 F.	3 G.	3 I.
Rank	Project #	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Primary Fish Stock Benefited	Name of Listed Species	Other Species Benefiting from this Project	Preserves High Quality Habitat	Priority in Recovery Plan or Strategy (list page)	Match %	Sponsor Record of SRFB Project Implementation	Listed in Action Agenda
9	15-1197	Weaver Creek Reconnection	Mason Conservation District	Puget Sound Chinook	Puget Sound Chinook, Puget Sound Steelhead	Bull trout, chum, Coho, pink, rainbow, cutthroat	N/A	Skokomish Chinook M&AM draft framework, p107 Remove impediments to meander, avulsion, and channel connectivity (LFLOOD2)	43	66 total SRFB Projects; 14 active, 28 completed	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp
10	15-1191	Hood Canal Bridge Impact Assessment	Long Live the Kings	Puget Sound Steelhead	Puget Sound Steelhead, Puget Sound Chinook, Hood Canal Summer Chum	Coho, chum, pink	N/A	Mid-Hood Canal M&AM draft framework, p78 Identify and Address Impacts of Hood Canal Bridge.	18	11 projects; 2 active, 5 completed	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp
11	15-1202	Hood Canal Summer Chum Nearshore Habitat Use Assessment	Wild Fish Conservency	Hood Canal Summer Chum	Hood Canal Summer Chum	chum	N/A	Identified as a gap; Ranked #2 in Hood Canal preliminary prioritized actions list	15	76 projects; 4 active, 46 complete	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp

				3 C.	3 C.	3 C.	3 D.	3 E.	3 F.	3 G.	3 I.
Rank	Project #	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Primary Fish Stock Benefited	Name of Listed Species	Other Species Benefiting from this Project	Preserves High Quality Habitat	Priority in Recovery Plan or Strategy (list page)	Match %	Sponsor Record of SRFB Project Implementation	Listed in Action Agenda
12	15-1204	Lower Big Quilcene River Design - phase 2	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group	Hood Canal Summer Chum	Hood Canal Summer Chum, Puget Sound Steelhead, Puget Sound Chinook	Coho	N/A	HC Summer Chum Recovery Plan, Ch8, p24 Restore sinuosity in the Big Quilcene R in the historical tidally influence ares, remove dikes, remove artificially aggraded delta cone.	76	79 projects; 6 active, 48 completed	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp
13	15-1190	Duckabush River Estuary Restoration Planning	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group	Puget Sound Chinook	Puget Sound Chinook, Hood Canal Summer Chum, Puget Sound Steelhead	Coho, Pink, chum	N/A	HC Summer Chum Recovery Plan, Ch9, p32 restore tidal connectivity, reconnect northern distributary channel.	51	79 projects; 6 active, 48 completed	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp
14/ IMW	15-1203	Lower Big Beef Creek Restoration Ph 2 - IMW	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group	Hood Canal Summer Chum	Hood Canal Summer Chum, Puget Sound Steelhead	Coho, chum, cutthroat	N/A	HC Summer Chum Recovery Plan, Ch12, p253- 255-UW Research Station; Big Beef Cr Preservation; Remove UW Service Road & Fill; Intensively Monitored Watershed Plan:	15	79 projects; 6 active, 48 completed	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp

Appendix J– Regional Summaries

				3 C .	3 C .	3 C .	3 D.	3 E.	3 F.	3 G.	3 I.
Rank	Project #	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Primary Fish Stock Benefited	Name of Listed Species	Other Species Benefiting from this Project	Preserves High Quality Habitat	Priority in Recovery Plan or Strategy (list page)	Match %	Sponsor Record of SRFB Project Implementation	Listed in Action Agenda
								p17-B Beef Cr. Control sediment delivery/routing, temperature, low summer discharge			
IMW	15-1194	Seabeck Ck IMW Acquisition and Estuary Restoration	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group	Puget Sound Steelhead	Puget Sound Steelhead	Coho, chum, cutthroat	Yes, 0.91 acres estuarine wetlands, 0.42 miles of stream bank protection	Intensively Monitored Watershed treatment	0	79 projects; 6 active, 48 completed	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp
IMW	15-1193	Seabeck Creek IMW Restoration	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group	Puget Sound Steelhead	Puget Sound Steelhead	Coho, chum, cutthroat	N/A	Intensively Monitored Watershed treatment	3	79 projects; 6 active, 48 completed	NTA B.1.1 - 3ywp