

APPENDIX E. SCORING SPREADSHEET

Project			SPP Presence and Reach Potential						Population/Reach		Pro/Access/Rest		PAR		Restoration		Access			Overall BTF		Certainty	Assumptions/Notes
No.	ID	Description	Affected Reaches	Tier	SPP	Pop Class	Pop Score	SRP	SRP Score	Rating	Score	Project Type/ Multi-SPP Benefits	Rating	Score	Habitat Units	Effectiv Factor	Quant Factor	Qual Factor	Passage Factor	Rating	Score	Rating	
1	KRL0.0	Low Water Fish Passage	Kalama 1 A tidal	4	WIST SUST FACH SPCH COHO CHUM OUT	P P P P C C P	3 3 3 3 2 2	L L L L L L M	1 1 1 1 1 1	M	4 4 4 4 3 3	Access to blocked habitats	M	10.00			10.0	10.0	0.1	M	32.00	L	Building log jams or piling and excavate channel to increase depth for passage. High uncertainty in achieving goals; treatment options to increase depth would likely be short term due to natural deposition area just downstream of constricted area and incised floodplain. Passage improvement is L, access is blocked for juveniles intermittently on a seasonal basis and is not blocked in all years. Habitat quantity is H; assumes all upstream mainstem reaches in subbasin are affected. Habitat quality is H; the average of upstream Kalama mainstem tier ratings is 3.64. Population/Reach Rating is elevated from L to M, because of benefit to out-of-basin stocks
2	KRL0.1	Port Tidal and Backwater Channels	Kalama 1 A tidal	4	WIST SUST FACH SPCH COHO CHUM OUT	P P P P C C P	3 3 3 3 2 2	L L L L L L M	1 1 1 1 1 1	M	4 4 4 4 3 3	Off channel/side channel habitat	H	1.95	1	0.65				M	23.95	M	Extend and enhance existing tidal channels Can't ID Habitat Units (HUs) until project better defined.; default value of 1 assigned EF of .65 is due to tidal influence Certainty score based on documentation of existing fish use Estuary benefit to out-of-basin stocks addresses estuary management action CRE-10 Population/Reach Rating is elevated from L to M, because of benefit to out-of-basin stocks
3	KRR0.7	WDFW Tidal and Groundwater Channels	Kalama 1 A tidal	4	WIST SUST FACH SPCH COHO CHUM OUT	P P P P C C P	3 3 3 3 2 2	L L L L L L M	1 1 1 1 1 1	M	4 4 4 4 3 3	Off channel/side channel habitat	H	11.40	4.75	0.8				M	33.40	H	T4 reach, but affects T1 and T2 reaches upstream, benefiting WIST and SUST, COHO and CHUM Road on site that if flooded would be opened up; currently a dike there Effectiveness = 0.8, because of tidal influence Certainty high due to both groundwater and tidal exchange and documented fish use. Should add area opened up by flooding road onto HU for the Off-Channel Habitat HU. Estuary benefit to out-of-basin stocks addresses estuary management action CRE-10 Population/Reach Rating is elevated from L to M, because of benefit to out-of-basin stocks
4	KRL1.4	Groundwater Channel	Kalama 1 A tidal	4	WIST SUST FACH SPCH COHO CHUM OUT	P P P P C C P	3 3 3 3 2 2	L L L L L L M	1 1 1 1 1 1	M	4 4 4 4 3 3	Off channel/side channel habitat	H	7.80	2.6	1				M	29.80	M	Certainty would be high, except that data are needed on groundwater and substrate. Estuary benefit to out-of-basin stocks addresses estuary management action CRE-10 Population/Reach Rating is elevated from L to M, because of benefit to out-of-basin stocks
5	KRR1.8	Active Side Channel	Kalama 1 B tidal	3	WIST SUST FACH SPCH COHO CHUM OUT	P P P P C C P	3 3 3 3 2 2	L L L L M L M	1 1 1 1 2 1	M	4 4 4 4 4 3	Off channel/side channel habitat	H	0.96	0.4	0.8				M	23.96	L	Needs additional field data Assume this is the break between reach Kalama 1a and 1b tidal Off channel hab with wood in it, no GW benefits Assume 200' for HU EF = 0.8 because has potential for stranding fish Certainty score based on lack of floodplain connection and incised channel Estuary benefit to out-of-basin stocks addresses estuary management action CRE-10 and CRE-9 Population/Reach Rating is elevated from L to M, because of benefit to out-of-basin stocks
6	SC0.5	Spencer Creek Riparian and LWD	Spencer Creek 1	2	WIST SUST COHO CHUM	P P C C	3 3 2 2	L L H L	1 1 3 1	M	4 4 5 3	Riparian restoration	H	1.44	0.6	0.8				M	17.44	M	Assume 300' for HU EF=.8 because of uncertainty on summer water temps Certainty score M due to low flows in the summer; project would primarily provide fall, winter and spring habitat
7	SC1.8	Fish Passage Culvert	Spencer Creek 2	4	COHO CHUM	C C	2 2	L L	1 1	L	3 3	Access to blocked habitats	M	1.90			1.0	2.0	1.0	L	7.90	H	6-yr plan identifies this as mile 1.34, perhaps because mouth of Spencer Ck incorrectly identified in 6-year plan. We believe it should actually be 1.8 HU: If culvert is really at 1.8 (not 1.34), then length is really 0.2 Passage improvement will be H, Habitat Qual is L Certainty H because fish passage standards would be met

Project			SPP Presence and Reach Potential							Population/Reach		Pro/Access/Rest		PAR		Restoration		Access			Overall BTF		Certainty	Assumptions/Notes
No.	ID	Description	Affected Reaches	Tier	SPP	Pop Class	Pop Score	SRP	SRP Score	Rating	Score	Project Type/ Multi-SPP Benefits	Rating	Score	Habitat Units	Effectiv Factor	Quant Factor	Qual Factor	Passage Factor	Rating	Score	Rating		
8	KRR2.1	GW Channel System private ownership	Kalama 2 A	1	WIST SUST FACH SPCH COHO CHUM	P P P P C C	3 3 3 3 2 2	L L H L L H	1 1 3 1 1 3	1 1 3 1 1 3	H	4 4 6 4 3 5 26	Off channel/side channel habitat	H	16.80	7	0.8				H	42.80	M	This project is entirely on private land and abuts Project KRR 2.2 on POK ownership. EF 0.8 because don't know where it would enter creek HU = 3500' Certainty M because landowner has not yet been contacted, however significant off channel areas identified; with landowner willingness certainty would increase.
9	KRR2.2	Port of Kalama GW Channel System	Kalama 2 A	1	WIST SUST FACH SPCH COHO CHUM	P P P P C C	3 3 3 3 2 2	L L H L L H	1 1 3 1 1 3	1 1 3 1 1 3	H	4 4 6 4 3 5 26	Off channel/side channel habitat	H	17.40	5.8	1				H	43.40	H	This project is completely on POK land and abuts Project KRR2.1. EF = 0.75 because there is more uncertainty about keeping acceptable temperatures with an open field and lack of shading. HU = 2900' Certainty score based on verified groundwater supply and connection to surface flow.
10	KRL2.2	Pipeline Removal and LWD	Kalama 2 A	1	WIST SUST FACH SPCH COHO CHUM	P P P P C C	3 3 3 3 2 2	L L H L L H	1 1 3 1 1 3	1 1 3 1 1 3	H	4 4 6 4 3 5 26	Stream channel hab. Structure and bank s	H	3.00	1	1				H	29.00	M	HU = 500' May be contingent on rip rap removal on opposite bank Concerns regarding public safety: river floaters Certainty score based on restoring floodplain function
11	KRR2.4	Riprap Removal/Floodplain Reconnection--Port of Kalama	Kalama 2 A	1	WIST SUST FACH SPCH COHO CHUM	P P P P C C	3 3 3 3 2 2	L L H L L H	1 1 3 1 1 3	1 1 3 1 1 3	H	4 4 6 4 3 5 26	Stream channel hab. Structure and bank s	H	3.00	1	1				H	29.00	H	Needs additional field data Certainty score based on restoration of floodplain processes.
12	KRL2.5	Ledgett Groundwater Channel	Kalama 2 A	1	WIST SUST FACH SPCH COHO CHUM	P P P P C C	3 3 3 3 2 2	L L H L L H	1 1 3 1 1 3	1 1 3 1 1 3	H	4 4 6 4 3 5 26	Off channel/side channel habitat	H	21.00	7	1				H	47.00	H	Certainty score based on confirmed presence of groundwater which will supply all the habitat downstream