2024-2026 Four-Year Work Plan









North Olympic Peninsula

Lead Entity for Salmon

Table of Contents

Introduction **3**

Membership **5**

List of Ranked 2026 Work Plan Narratives **8**

2026 Narrative Ranking Workbook **16**

Capital Scoring Criteria **71**

Non-Capital Scoring Criteria **73**


Project Narratives **78**

Cover photos:

Indian Creek is a very important, highly productive salmon-bearing tributary to the Elwha River. Indian Creek provides slower moving water and protected habitat which is particularly important place of refuge for salmon to escape winter high flows. The Elwha River and its tributaries are home to all five native species of Pacific Salmon including Chinook, Coho, Pink, Chum and Sockeye along with Steelhead, Bull Trout, Cutthroat and Rainbow Trout.

The smaller photos left to right, include Project Sponsor Jamie Michel, with the Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe; speaking with members of the North Olympic Lead Entity for Salmon and Salmon Recovery Funding Board's Review Team. In the middle photo, Project Sponsor Randy Johnson with the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe talks with SRFB Review Panel Member Michelle Cramer and Coleman Byrnes with the Lead Entity's Technical Team about protection efforts in the Lower Dungeness. In the last photo on the right, Project Sponsor Jacob Stone with Forterra discusses conservation efforts along Indian Creek. These photos were all taken during site visits in March of 2026.

** No new or updated projects were added to the 2026 Four-Year Work Plan.*



North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon
Clallam County Courthouse
223 E. Fourth Street, # 5 Port Angeles, WA 98362
360/417-2326

This is the 2026 Four-Year Work Plan for the North Olympic Lead Entity for Salmon. The Lead Entity is a watershed consortium working to advance salmon restoration and protection from Blyn to Clallam County's east side, across the Strait of Juan de Fuca to Cape Flattery and Neah Bay. This includes the saltwater nearshore of the Strait of Juan de Fuca which borders our region, as well as all rivers and water bodies which empty into the Strait. Lead Entity Members include representatives from the Jamestown S'Klallam, Lower Elwha Klallam, and Makah Tribes, Clallam County, the cities of Port Angeles and Sequim along with citizens and non-profits.

The Work Plan is used as a roadmap of work needed over the next four or more years to restore and protect habitat and recover salmon populations on the North Olympic Peninsula. It is a way to breathe life into goals from the various recovery plans and strategies which guide our work. This Work Plan includes both capital and non-capital projects, activities and programs to implement restoration of ecosystems and recovery of both listed and non-listed salmon species in our many watersheds. Even here on the Peninsula, our salmon species are still a shadow of their former selves. For example, previous returns of endangered salmon populations in major North Olympic rivers saw returns estimated in the tens of thousands, where now only a few hundred or a few thousand endangered, wild origin salmon return to spawn.

Salmon species across the Peninsula have been impacted by 150 years of habitat destruction, including construction of dikes and levees, loss of floodplains for farming and development, river channelization, legacy logging practices, removal of riparian buffers and log jams from rivers and streams, overharvest, increasing human population impacts, etc. Some of this damage and habitat destruction continues to this day. It is important to note that these changes cannot be overturned overnight because recovery takes time and involves many factors. The average salmon life cycle lasts three to five years which includes significant time in the ocean traveling great distances and over numerous national and international borders. In addition, climate change also now regularly takes a toll on salmon and steelhead and many more such impacts are unfortunately anticipated.

This Work Plan is required by the Puget Sound Partnership, our regional salmon recovery partner. They look to us to work collaboratively with our local restoration partners – the Tribes, Cities, and County, along with local

non-profits such as the North Olympic Salmon Coalition and North Olympic Land Trust, among others; to help advance this work. The Work Plan is a fluid, living document. It is updated almost every year, with a call in late summer for new project concepts and updated project narratives. Those new project concepts and significantly changed narratives are scored by the Lead Entity's Technical Review Team, then those projects are added into the list as a result of their ranking. This is a tremendous undertaking involving lots of time, thought and effort. This update was highly unusual in that there were no new project concepts or significantly updated proposals submitted in late 2025 for the 2026 Four-Year Work Plan. I attribute that to the fact there was still significant restoration project funding as a result of federal investments that happened between 2020-2024, including the bi-partisan Infrastructure Bill, along with increased state support for riparian work.

In late 2024, the Technical Review Team scored all 52 project concepts for the 2025 Work Plan. That scoring and an analysis of those results is included here since that list has been carried over given no new projects to include in 2026.

Any projects seeking grants from the Salmon Recovery Funding Board or the Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration fund must be on the Four-Year Work Plan and must rank above the cut-off line established by the Lead Entity's Citizens/Policy Team known as the Lead Entity Group. That cut-off line was established after a low ranking project in a non-priority watershed applied during a slow year with limited projects and received funding. This was problematic as it was considered non-strategic as it was work in a low-ranking watershed with limited salmon potential. Because of the amount of restoration work needed, and the limited funding available, we need to be able to show that we are advancing restoration projects critically-needed for salmon recovery in high priority watersheds. Sometimes the line is drawn higher on the list, forcing project sponsors to work on high priority projects. That can provide challenges because phased work is already underway in a fair number of highly-ranked Work Plan projects. Drawing the line lower on the list allows project sponsors greater leeway to advance more projects as well as accessing funding from a variety of sources. The Coordinator can also write Letters of Support and as time allows, help seek additional funding for projects above the line.

Some of the projects on the Work Plan are underway in one phase or another. Others are concepts only and have not begun. Some may never get underway. Projects can only advance with a willing landowner, a project sponsor, local support, funding, plus review and approval from funding sources. Local Restoration Practitioners and Project Sponsors could not come close to advancing all projects within our Four-Year Work Plan without significant additional funding and the increased capacity needed to develop and implement these projects.

Still, this vetted and ranked Work Plan is a well thought-out and organized way to prioritize projects needed across our expansive landscape and numerous varying watersheds. It helps guide development of projects and actions needed to implement salmon restoration and recovery and the investments needed to make that happen.

If you have questions or need more information about our work, please do not hesitate to reach out.

Cheryl Baumann

Cheryl Baumann, Coordinator
North Olympic Lead Entity for Salmon
Cheryl.Baumann@clallamcountywa.gov
360-417-2326

2026 Lead Entity Group Membership (Citizen & Policy Team)

1. **Rebecca Mahan,** Clallam County; Senior Habitat Biologist
   Chase O'Neil (Alt.), Clallam County, Habitat Biologist
2. **Hansi Hals,** Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe; Natural Resources Director
   Robert Knapp (Alt.), JamestownS'KlallamTribe; Environmental Planning Director
3. **Raymond Moses,** Elwha S'Klallam Tribe; Project Biologist
   Mike McHenry (Alt.), Elwha S'Klallam Tribe; Habitat Biologist
4. **Courtney Bornsworth,** City of Port Angeles; Natural Resources Associate Planner & Grants Administrator
5. **Stephanie Martin,** Makah Tribe; Habitat Division Manager
6. **Tom Riepe,** MPA; Citizen, Retired Police Chief & Port Angeles Area Resident
7. **Karen Teig,** Citizen, Retired NOAA Biologist; Sequim Area Resident
8. **Meggan Uecker,** City of Sequim Public Works; Resource Analyst

2026 Technical Review Group Membership

1. **Dave Allen,** Botanist & Nursery Owner
2. **Mike Auger,** North Olympic Land Trust; Conservation Director
3. **Nate Roberts,** North Olympic Salmon Coalition; Stewardship Coordinator
   Sarah Doyle (Alt.) North Olympic Salmon Coalition; Executive Director
4. **Steve Barclay**, Citizen Salmon Advocate & Natural Resources Manager (Retired)
5. **Coleman Byrnes, Citizen,** Streamkeepers; Citizen Salmon Advocate
6. **Eric Carlsen**, Citizen & Former DNR & Restoration Planner (Retired)
7. **Keith Denton,** Fisheries Biologist & Consultant
8. **Garrett Foster**, Makah Tribe Watershed Scientist
9. **Owen French**, Citizen Salmon Advocate with Riparian Experience
10. **Sean Halberg**, Mechanical & Design Engineer
11. **LaTrisha Suggs,** Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe; Habitat Restoration Planner
    Chris Burns (Alt.) Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe; Fisheries Technician**,**
12. **Ray Kirk,** Citizen, MBA; Retired Chemical Engineer
13. **Rebecca Mahan,** Clallam County; Senior Habitat Biologist
    Chase O'Neil (Alt.), Clallam County DCD; MRC Coordinator & Habitat Biologist
14. **Jamie Michel,** Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe; Habitat Manager
    Mike McHenry, (Alt.), Lower Elwha Klallm Tribe; Habitat Biologist
15. **Ian Miller,** Ph.D; Washington Sea Grant; Coastal Hazards Specialist
16. **Jim Walton,** Ph.D; Citizen, Retired Peninsula College Fisheries & Centralia College President.
17. **Kim Williams** Clallam Conservation District; Executive Director
    Meghan Adamire (Alt.), Clallam Conservation District; Conservation Planner
18. **Danielle Zitomer**, WA Department of Fish & Wildlife; Area Habitat Biologist
    Kendall Kohler (Alt.), WDFW Area Habitat Biologist

Lead Entity Staff

Cheryl Baumann, Coordinator

Lead Entity Support

Shannon Weaver, Technical Support

This report is a result of the collaborative work of the North Olympic Lead Entity for Salmon, its members, stakeholders, consultant and staff. It builds on work created by Walter Pearson, PhD of Peapod Research and Sam Gibboney of ISE Consultants.

For more information on this document or salmon recovery involving the North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon, please contact Coordinator Shannon Weaver at shannon.weaver@clallamcountywa.gov or by calling 360-417-2326.

For additional information on local salmon recovery efforts go to our website at:
https://restoringolympicpeninsulasalmon.org/
AND
The {l·fŸ2ý wŠŏ2ØŠ№è t2№ŭl·f online at
https://srp.rco.wa.gov/
(click on 'Lead Entities', and then 'North Olympic Peninsula LE for Salmon')

For restoration projects you can visit on the North Olympic Peninsula and elsewhere in Puget Sound go to:
http://salmontrails.org/watershed/north-olympic/

North Olympic Peninsula LE for Salmon

Date: 08-31-2026

Ranking Work Plan Narratives

Work Book Constructed by:

WH Pearson 1/17/2011

Peapod Research for

North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon

Data Entered; Review & Normalization by: 02/05/2024

Cheryl Baumann, Lara Kawal & Shannon Weaver

For North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date: 8-31-2026

Projects Listed in Rank Order

Rank	Project ID	Title	Category	Weighted Mean Score	Normalized Score
1	**09092.2**	**Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration**	Capital	174.23	0.842
2	**09030.1**	**Dungeness River Riparian Habitat Protection**	Capital	166.77	0.806
3	**22003**	**Dungeness Bay Shoreline Restoration**	Capital	166.04	0.802
4	**16103.1**	**Indian Creek Habitat Restoration Project**	Capital	165.71	0.801
5	**09029.2**	**Dungeness River Large Wood Restoration**	Capital	165.69	0.801
6	**09055.2**	**Elwha Estuary Conservation and Restoration**	Capital	164.53	0.795
7	**09091.1**	**Dungeness River Instream Flow Restoration-Irrigation Efficiencies**	Capital	162.13	0.783
8	**13102**	**Little River LWD Project**	Capital	161.79	0.782
9	**09016.3**	**Elwha River Engineered Log Jams**	Capital	161.22	0.779
10	**22005**	**Monitoring Dungeness Floodplain Changes**	**Non-Capital**	126.31	0.773
11	**09032.1**	**Dungeness Drift Cell Conservation**	Capital	159.63	0.771
12	**09031.3**	**Dungeness River Riparian Restoration**	Capital	159.51	0.771
13	**09009.1**	**Pysht River Salt Marsh Estuary Restoration Project**	Capital	157.25	0.760
14	**16102**	**Morse Creek Acquisition & Restoration**	Capital	154.32	0.746
15	**12098.2**	**Dungeness River Instream Flow Restoration-Storage**	Capital	153.90	0.744
16	**09093**	**North Sequim Bay Drift Cell Conservation Project**	Capital	153.18	0.740
17	**14106**	**Elwha Acquisition and Restoration Project**	Capital	152.78	0.738
18	**12096**	**WRIA 19 Priority Acquisitions**	Capital	152.70	0.738
19	**11088.3**	**Ennis Creek Fish Passage Barrier Removal**	Capital	152.32	0.736
20	**13101.1**	**Lower Hoko Acquisition and Restoration Project**	Capital	150.08	0.725
21	**11085.2**	**South Fork Pysht River Watershed Wood Restoration**	Capital	148.30	0.717
22	**19105.1**	**Upper Cowan Ranch ELJ Project**	Capital	148.22	0.716
23	**14107**	**Sequim Bay Shoreline Restoration**	Capital	147.93	0.715
Rank	**Project ID**	**Title**	**Category**	**Weighted Mean Score**	**Normalized Score**

24	**09013**	**Lower Salt Creek Restoration and Protection**	Capital	147.68	0.714
25	**11087**	**Elwha River Revegetation Project**	Capital	147.42	0.712
26	**19104**	**Lyre River Habitat Restoration Project**	Capital	146.36	0.707
27	**23002**	**Port Angeles Harbor/ Tributaries Conservation and Restoration**	Capital	146.20	0.706
28	**09053**	**Clallam Watertype Inventory and Assessment**	**Non-Capital**	114.76	0.702
29	**10079**	**Lower Morse Creek Feasibility Study**	Capital	144.02	0.696
30	**09086.1**	**Pysht Floodplain Acquisition and Restoration**	Capital	143.40	0.693
31	**09001.2**	**Little Hoko River Large Wood Restoration Project**	Capital	143.02	0.691
32	**11084**	**Upper Hoko LWD Restoration Project**	Capital	142.77	0.690
33	**22004**	**Ediz Hook Drift Cell Feasibility**	Capital	138.97	0.672
34	**19102**	**Hoko Culvert #80001279 Replacement**	Capital	136.91	0.662
35	**16104**	**Elwha Hot Springs Road Restoration**	Capital	136.53	0.660
36	**10080.3**	**Lyre River Protection and Restoration**	Capital	134.36	0.649
37	**09026**	**Morse Creek Property Acquisition**	Capital	133.90	0.647
38	**09015.1**	**Kreaman Creek, Trib. To Salt Creek**	Capital	133.04	0.643
39	**09027.2**	**Siebert Creek Ecosystem Protection Project**	Capital	131.84	0.637
40	**22001**	**Wright's Creek Fish Passage Project**	Capital	130.84	0.632
41	**09003**	**WRIA 19 Riparian Restoration**	Capital	130.70	0.632
42	**21001**	**Expansion of Shipwreck Point NRCA**	Capital	130.65	0.631
43	**11090.1**	**Siebert Creek Large Wood Restoration: Old Olympic Highway to Highway 101**	Capital	129.65	0.626
44	**22002**	**Hoko Tributary Fish Passage Correction: Culvert #80001331**	Capital	129.43	0.625
45	**10078.1**	**McDonald Creek Large Wood Restoration**	Capital	127.74	0.617
46	**11094**	**Chicken Coop Road Culvert Replacement Project**	Capital	123.37	0.596
47	**19101**	**WRIA 19 Fish Passage Corrections on Joyce-Piedmont Road**	Capital	122.28	0.591
Projects ranked 47 & up are eligible to apply for SRFB/PSAR funding					
48	**23001**	**Butler Creek Fish Passage Design and Construction**	Capital	118.75	0.574
49	**09015**	**Salt Creek Final Fish Passage Corrections Project**	Capital	117.14	0.566
50	**09021**	**Valley Creek Restoration Phase 3**	Capital	116.22	0.562
Rank	**Project ID**	**Title**	**Category**	**Weighted Mean Score**	**Normalized Score**

51	**09004.1**	**Hoko Watershed Instream LWD Restoration Project**	Capital	109.21	0.528
52	**09005**	**Sekiu Mainstem (RM 2-5) LWD Restoration**	Capital	105.97	0.512

Funded Projects/ Not Ranked but included in work plan

Project ID	Title	Category
19103.1	**Johnson Creek, Triple Culverts Replacement**	Capital
09011	**Twin River Acquisition**	Capital
09039.2	**McDonald Creek Barrier Removal and Channel Restoration**	Capital

55 total projects on the work plan (52 scored & ranked & 3 incorporated by reference) 53 total projects on the work plan (Priority line drawn after project 48)

2 new roject Concepts Added

23001 Butler Creek Fish Passage

23002 PA Harbor Work Plan New

12 Projects Updated

09092.2 Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration

09029.2 Dungeness River Large Wood Restoration

09031.3 Dungeness River Riparian Restoration

12098.2 Dungeness Instream Flow Restoration – Storage

11087 Elwha River Revegetation Project

11088.3 Ennis Creek Fish Passage

11084 Hoko LWD Restoration Project

13102 Little River LWD

11085.2 South Fork Pysht River LWD

19105.1 Upper Cowan Ranch

12096 WRIA 19 Priority Acquisitions

1 Project Moved to the 7 Year Work Plan

09005 Sekiu Mainstem LWD Restoration

3 Funded Projects which are still incorporated within work plan but No longer Scored or in the Ranking

19703.1 Johnson Creek Triple Culverts

09039.2 McDonald Creek Barrier Removal


09011. Twins Acquisition

N. Olympic LE Workplan Project Proposal Scoring & Ranking Assessment

Date:

Rank	Normalized Score	Rank	Normalized Score
1	0.842	29	0.696
2	0.806	30	0.693
3	0.802	31	0.691
4	0.801	32	0.690
5	0.801	33	0.672
6	0.795	34	0.662
7	0.783	35	0.660
8	0.782	36	0.649
9	0.779	37	0.647
10	0.773	38	0.643
11	0.771	39	0.637
12	0.771	40	0.632
13	0.760	41	0.632
14	0.746	42	0.631
15	0.744	43	0.626
16	0.740	44	0.625
17	0.738	45	0.617
18	0.738	46	0.596
19	0.736	47	0.591
20	0.725	48	0.574
21	0.717	49	0.566
22	0.716	50	0.562
23	0.715	51	0.528
24	0.714	52	0.512
25	0.712		
26	0.707		
27	0.706		
28	0.702		

Projects ranked 47 & up are eligible to apply for SRFB/PSAR funding.



N. Olympic LE Workplan Proposals		Date:	
		CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)	
Assessment of Work Plan Projects (Listed West to East)			
		Assessment	
ID	Title	Scorer(s) Outside 2 Std Deviations?	CoV% Flags for Specific Criteria?
21001	Expansion of Shipwreck Point NRCA	0	Yes (Criteria 3, 5 & 8)
12096	WRIA 19 Priority Acquisitions	1	Yes (Criterion 5)
19102	Hoko Culvert #80001279 Replacement	1	Yes (Criterion 5)
19103.1	Johnson Creek, Triple Culverts Replacement	Not Scored *	Not Scored *
09001.2	Little Hoko River Large Wood Restoration Project	0	Yes (Criteria 5 & 7)
22001	Wright's Creek Fish Passage Project	1	Yes (Criteria 5 & 7)
22002	Hoko Tributary Fish Passage Correction: Culvert #80001331	1	Yes (Criteria 5 & 7)
19105.1	Upper Cowan Ranch ELJ Project	0	Yes (Criterion 5)
09004.1	Hoko Watershed Instream LWD Restoration Project	1	Yes (Criteria 5, 7, 10 & 12)
11084	Upper Hoko LWD Restoration Project	1	Yes (Criteria 5 & 7)
13101.1	Lower Hoko Acquisition and Restoration Project	1	Yes (Criterion 5)
09005	Sekiu Mainstem (RM 2-5) LWD Restoration	1	Yes (Criteria 5, 7, 10 & 12)
09003	WRIA 19 Riparian Restoration	1	Yes (Criteria 5 & 7)
11085.2	South Fork Pysht River Watershed Wood Restoration	1	Yes (Criteria 5 & 7)
09086.1	Pysht Floodplain Acquisition and Restoration	1	Yes (Criterion 5)
09009.1	Pysht River Salt Marsh Estuary Restoration Project	1	Yes (Criterion 5)
23001	Butler Creek Fish Passage Design and Construction	0	Yes (Criteria 5 & 7)
09011	Twin River Acquisition	Not Scored *	Not Scored *
10080.3	Lyre River Protection and Restoration	0	Yes (Criteria 5, 8 & 12)
ID	Title	Scorer(s) Outside 2 Std Deviations?	CoV% Flags for Specific Criteria?
19104	Lyre River Habitat Restoration Project	0	Yes (Criteria 5 & 7)

19101	**WRIA 19 Fish Passage Corrections on Joyce-Piedmont Road**	1	Yes (Criteria 5 & 7)
ID	**Title**	**Scorer(s) Outside 2 Std Deviations?**	**CoV% Flags for Specific Criteria?**
09013	**Lower Salt Creek Restoration and Protection**	0	None
09015	**Salt Creek Final Fish Passage Corrections Project**	1	Yes (Criteria 5 & 7)
09015.1	**Kreaman Creek, Trib. To Salt Creek**	1	Yes (Criteria 5 & 7)
14106	**Elwha Acquisition and Restoration Project**	1	None
09016.3	**Elwha River Engineered Log Jams**	1	Yes (Criterion 7)
11087	**Elwha River Revegetation Project**	1	Yes (Criterion 7)
09055.2	**Elwha Estuary Conservation and Restoration**	0	Yes (Criterion 12)
13102	**Little River LWD Project**	0	Yes (Criterion 7)
16103.1	**Indian Creek Habitat Restoration Project**	1	None
16104	**Elwha Hot Springs Road Restoration**	1	Yes (Criteria 7 & 12)
22004	**Ediz Hook Drift Cell Feasibility**	0	Yes (Criterion 7)
23002	**Port Angeles Harbor/ Tributaries Conservation and Restoration**	0	Yes (Criterion 7)
09021	**Valley Creek Restoration Phase 3**	0	Yes (Criteria 5 & 7)
11088.3	**Ennis Creek Fish Passage Barrier Removal**	0	Yes (Criterion 7)
09026	**Morse Creek Property Acquisition**	1	None
16102	**Morse Creek Acquisition & Restoration**	1	None
10079	**Lower Morse Creek Feasibility Study**	0	Yes (Criteria 7 & 12)
09027.2	**Siebert Creek Ecosystem Protection Project**	1	Yes (Criteria 5, 8 & 12)
11090.1	**Siebert Creek Large Wood Restoration: Old Olympic Highway to Highway 101**	1	Yes (Criterion 7)
10078.1	**McDonald Creek Large Wood Restoration**	1	Yes (Criterion 7)
09039.2	**McDonald Creek Barrier Removal and Channel Restoration**	Not Scored *	Not Scored *
22003	**Dungeness Bay Shoreline Restoration**	1	None
22005	**Monitoring Dungeness Floodplain Changes**	0	Yes (Criterion 6)
09029.2	**Dungeness River Large Wood Restoration**	1	Yes (Criterion 7)
09030.1	**Dungeness River Riparian Habitat Protection**	1	None
09031.3	**Dungeness River Riparian Restoration**	0	Yes (Criterion 7)
ID	**Title**	**Scorer(s) Outside 2 Std Deviations?**	**CoV% Flags for Specific Criteria?**
09032.1	**Dungeness Drift Cell Conservation**	1	Yes (Criterion 8)
09091.1	**Dungeness River Instream Flow Restoration-Irrigation Efficiencies**	0	Yes (Criterion 7)

12098.2	**Dungeness River Instream Flow Restoration-Storage**	0	Yes (Criterion 7)
ID	**Title**	**Scorer(s) Outside 2 Std Deviations?**	**CoV% Flags for Specific Criteria?**
09092.2	**Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration**	1	None
14107	**Sequim Bay Shoreline Restoration**	0	None
ID	**Title**	**Scorer(s) Outside 2 Std Deviations?**	**CoV% Flags for Specific Criteria?**
09093	**North Sequim Bay Drift Cell Conservation Project**	0	Yes (Criterion 8)
11094	**Chicken Coop Road Culvert Replacement Project**	0	Yes (Criterion 7)
09053	**Clallam Watertype Inventory and Assessment**	0	Yes (Criteria 1, 6 & 8)

Not Scored* Indicates project is currently funded and has been scored in previously work plans. They are still incorporated by reference as part of this Work Plan.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Expansion of Shipwreck Point NRCA

21001

Overall Weighted Score

130.65

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.3
SD of all Scores:	0.8
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.7
Mean - 2 X:	1.6
Mean + 2 X:	5.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	2.96	13.74	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	NS	3.0	1.0	2.5	2.0	NS	4.0	4.5	3.5	4.0	1.0	4.0	4.0	3.000	4.08	12.23	40.2%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.0	NS	5.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	NS	2.0	4.5	0.5	4.0	1.0	4.0	4.0	2.583	2.88	7.45	62.2%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	NS	3.0	2.0	2.0	1.5	NS	2.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	2.750	2.81	7.72	49.9%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.5	NS	5.0	1.0	1.0	1.5	NS	2.0	4.0	1.0	4.0	1.0	3.0	4.5	2.375	3.65	8.68	68.4%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.5	NS	3.5	5.0	2.0	2.0	NS	3.0	4.0	1.0	4.0	1.0	4.0	4.5	3.042	3.27	9.94	44.0%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	NS	4.0	5.0	2.0	3.0	NS	3.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.5	3.708	4.12	15.26	26.6%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	NS	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	NS	2.0	4.0	1.0	3.0	0.0	4.5	1.0	2.333	4.04	9.42	55.1%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.0	NS	2.5	5.0	2.5	3.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	4.5	4.0	3.375	3.88	13.11	29.7%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	NS	3.5	4.5	2.5	3.0	NS	2.0	2.5	4.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	3.125	3.62	11.30	27.4%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	NS	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	NS	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.250	3.23	13.73	22.7%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	NS	3.0	5.0	1.5	3.0	NS	5.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	0.5	2.833	2.85	8.06	47.2%
	Mean	2.47	4.64	3.68	3.51	2.30	2.55	4.64	3.14	4.09	2.97	3.80	1.72	4.14	3.64	**Overall Weighted Score**		**130.65**	
	CoV	37.3%	#DIV/0!	28.3%	50.6%	39.0%	38.8%	#DIV/0!	39.0%	20.2%	56.7%	17.6%	78.4%	11.9%	39.6%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
Fairly straight forward nearshore protection project - high community priority, which makes sense, but perhaps not for fish recovery (i.e. scoring can't reflect that community priority)

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Mean of all Scores:	3.8
SD of all Scores:	0.8
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.7
Mean - 2 X:	2.0
Mean + 2 X:	5.5

WRIA 19 Priority Acquisition

12096

Overall Weighted Score

152.70

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	2.96	13.74	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.0	NS	4.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	NS	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	5.0	4.5	3.833	4.08	15.63	32.6%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.0	NS	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	NS	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	5.0	4.0	3.750	2.88	10.82	32.4%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	NS	4.0	5.0	3.0	2.0	NS	3.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	1.5	4.5	4.0	3.542	2.81	9.94	34.3%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.5	NS	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	NS	2.0	4.5	0.0	4.0	2.0	4.5	3.5	2.500	3.65	9.13	57.8%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.0	NS	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	NS	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	0.5	4.5	5.0	4.042	3.27	13.21	33.1%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	NS	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	NS	3.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	4.5	4.375	4.12	18.00	20.7%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.0	NS	3.0	2.0	1.0	3.0	NS	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	1.0	5.0	1.0	2.708	4.04	10.94	48.8%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.5	NS	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.0	NS	3.5	5.0	4.0	5.0	1.0	5.0	4.0	3.875	3.88	15.05	31.7%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	NS	4.5	5.0	4.5	3.0	NS	2.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	4.5	3.0	3.875	3.62	14.01	30.2%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	NS	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	NS	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	5.0	5.0	4.417	3.23	14.27	24.5%
12	Project Readiness	2.0	NS	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	NS	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.0	0.5	3.0	1.0	2.792	2.85	7.95	42.1%
	Mean	2.43	4.64	4.05	4.22	3.76	2.97	4.64	3.55	4.64	4.09	4.47	1.84	4.64	3.68	**Overall Weighted Score**		**152.70**	
	CoV	39.3%	#DIV/0!	23.4%	28.4%	34.0%	26.2%	#DIV/0!	24.8%	13.1%	35.7%	17.5%	62.1%	12.2%	37.5%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N				

Comments

Restoration not described, but assuming some restoration would be part of this. Otherwise high score except for no ESA listed species.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Hoko Culvert #80001279 Replacement

19102

Overall Weighted Score

136.91

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.3
SD of all Scores:	0.3
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.7
Mean - 2 X:	2.6
Mean + 2 X:	4.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	2.96	10.35	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	4.0	NS	5.0	NS	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.042	4.08	16.48	14.4%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.5	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	3.583	2.88	10.34	17.7%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	3.0	NS	5.0	NS	4.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.625	2.81	10.18	17.8%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	0.0	NS	0.0	NS	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.417	3.65	1.52	239.1%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.5	4.0	NS	5.0	NS	3.0	3.5	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.5	3.875	3.27	12.67	21.4%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	3.0	NS	1.0	NS	3.0	0.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	4.5	0.0	2.542	4.12	10.46	59.6%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.5	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	3.0	4.5	4.5	3.0	3.792	4.04	15.31	15.4%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.5	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	4.0	2.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.5	4.5	4.0	3.833	3.88	14.89	20.3%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	NS	3.0	NS	3.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.5	4.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.125	3.62	11.30	16.9%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.0	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.167	3.23	13.46	17.2%
12	Project Readiness	3.0	4.0	NS	5.0	NS	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	2.5	4.0	3.0	3.500	2.85	9.96	23.6%
	Mean	2.96	3.04	3.49	3.62	3.49	3.33	2.83	3.17	3.71	3.75	2.96	3.21	4.17	3.25	**Overall Weighted Score**		**136.91**	
	CoV	34.9%	34.7%	#DIV/0!	44.5%	#DIV/0!	18.5%	52.3%	35.2%	37.5%	37.1%	37.1%	36.1%	14.8%	49.7%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Johnson Creek, Triple Culverts Replacement

19103.1 Don't Score

Overall Weighted Score

#DIV/0!

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	#DIV/0!
SD of all Scores:	#DIV/0!
2 X SD of all Scores:	#DIV/0!
Mean - 2 X:	#DIV/0!
Mean + 2 X:	#DIV/0!

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority															#DIV/0!	2.96	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)															#DIV/0!	4.08	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
3	Addresses stock status and trends															#DIV/0!	2.88	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
4	Addresses progress toward recovery															#DIV/0!	2.81	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock															#DIV/0!	3.65	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
6	Addresses other stocks															#DIV/0!	3.27	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat															#DIV/0!	4.12	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
8	Restores formerly productive habitat															#DIV/0!	4.04	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions															#DIV/0!	3.88	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
10	Spatial Scale of Influence															#DIV/0!	3.62	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
11	Temporal Scale of Influence															#DIV/0!	3.23	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
12	Project Readiness															#DIV/0!	2.85	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
	Mean	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	**Overall Weighted Score**		**#DIV/0!**	
	CoV	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!				

Outside 2 Standard Deviations? #DIV/0! #DIV/0! #DIV/0! #DIV/0! #DIV/0! #DIV/0! #DIV/0! #DIV/0! #DIV/0! #DIV/0! #DIV/0! #DIV/0! #DIV/0! #DIV/0!

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Mean of all Scores:	3.4
SD of all Scores:	0.3
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.6
Mean - 2 X:	2.7
Mean + 2 X:	4.1

Little Hoko River Large Wood Restoration Project

9001.2

Overall Weighted Score

143.02

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	2.96	10.35	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	NS	3.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	4.154	4.08	16.93	17.3%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	NS	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.654	2.88	10.54	16.2%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	NS	4.0	4.0	3.5	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.846	2.81	10.80	20.1%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	NS	3.5	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.731	3.65	2.67	173.6%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	3.5	3.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.038	3.27	13.20	19.9%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	NS	3.5	0.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	2.769	4.12	11.40	61.5%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	NS	4.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.115	4.04	16.62	18.0%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.5	3.0	4.5	3.0	NS	4.5	3.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	4.115	3.88	15.99	17.3%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	NS	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.231	3.62	11.68	13.6%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	NS	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.885	3.23	12.55	16.7%
12	Project Readiness	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	NS	3.0	2.5	3.5	3.0	5.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	3.615	2.85	10.29	18.0%
	Mean	3.00	3.04	3.50	3.71	3.49	3.50	2.96	3.29	3.87	4.08	3.29	3.42	3.92	3.54	**Overall Weighted Score**		**143.02**	
	CoV	33.3%	34.7%	43.9%	38.3%	#DIV/0!	16.1%	37.1%	33.9%	37.0%	36.5%	34.6%	32.9%	17.9%	49.8%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Wright's Creek fish Passage Project

22001

Overall Weighted Score

130.84

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.1
SD of all Scores:	0.5
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.1
Mean - 2 X:	2.0
Mean + 2 X:	4.2

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	2.96	10.35	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.5	4.0	NS	5.0	NS	3.5	3.5	3.5	4.5	NS	3.0	4.0	4.5	3.0	3.818	4.08	15.57	16.8%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	3.5	3.0	3.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	3.167	2.88	9.13	35.8%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	3.0	NS	5.0	NS	4.0	3.5	3.0	4.0	NS	3.0	3.5	4.5	4.0	3.682	2.81	10.34	18.5%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	0.0	NS	0.0	NS	4.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	NS	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.818	3.65	2.99	179.8%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.5	4.0	NS	5.0	NS	4.5	2.5	3.0	5.0	NS	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.773	3.27	12.33	21.7%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	3.0	NS	1.0	NS	3.0	0.0	3.0	4.0	NS	2.0	4.0	4.5	0.0	2.455	4.12	10.10	63.4%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	3.0	NS	5.0	NS	4.5	2.5	4.0	4.0	NS	3.0	3.5	4.5	2.5	3.545	4.04	14.32	25.6%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.5	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	4.5	3.0	3.0	4.5	NS	3.0	4.0	4.5	3.0	3.636	3.88	14.13	18.5%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	NS	2.0	NS	3.0	3.5	2.5	2.0	NS	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.636	3.62	9.53	19.1%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.0	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	NS	3.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	3.864	3.23	12.48	18.4%
12	Project Readiness	3.5	4.0	NS	5.0	NS	3.5	2.0	3.5	2.0	NS	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	3.364	2.85	9.57	25.8%
	Mean	2.96	3.04	3.49	3.62	3.49	3.71	2.75	3.00	3.54	1.75	2.62	3.25	4.00	2.83	**Overall Weighted Score**		**130.84**	
	CoV	34.9%	34.7%	#DIV/0!	47.5%	#DIV/0!	15.7%	39.1%	34.8%	41.9%	141.4%	35.5%	34.4%	15.1%	52.9%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Mean of all Scores:	3.2
SD of all Scores:	0.3
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.7
Mean - 2 X:	2.5
Mean + 2 X:	3.9

Hoko Tributary Fish Passage Correction: Culvert #80001331

22002

Overall Weighted Score

129.43

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	2.96	10.35	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	4.0	NS	5.0	NS	3.0	3.5	3.0	4.5	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.5	3.5	3.667	4.08	14.95	19.6%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	3.0	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	3.417	2.88	9.86	16.3%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.5	3.0	NS	5.0	NS	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.5	4.0	3.542	2.81	9.94	19.5%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	0.0	NS	0.0	NS	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.583	3.65	2.13	185.8%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.5	4.0	NS	5.0	NS	3.0	3.5	3.0	4.5	5.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.833	3.27	12.53	18.7%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	3.0	NS	1.0	NS	3.0	0.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	2.458	4.12	10.12	58.5%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	3.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.5	3.0	3.375	4.04	13.63	16.9%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.5	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	3.0	3.5	3.0	4.5	3.5	3.0	4.0	4.5	3.0	3.542	3.88	13.76	16.4%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	NS	2.0	NS	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.5	3.0	3.0	2.708	3.62	9.79	20.0%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.0	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	3.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	3.917	3.23	12.65	17.9%
12	Project Readiness	3.0	4.0	NS	5.0	NS	3.0	2.5	3.5	2.0	5.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.417	2.85	9.72	26.4%
	Mean	2.92	3.04	3.49	3.54	3.49	2.96	3.00	2.87	3.50	3.25	2.62	3.29	3.96	3.00	**Overall Weighted Score**		**129.43**	
	CoV	34.9%	34.7%	#DIV/0!	47.2%	#DIV/0!	11.3%	37.6%	35.7%	41.3%	39.1%	35.5%	32.7%	14.7%	50.8%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Upper Cowan Ranch ELJ Project

19105.1

Overall Weighted Score

148.22

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.5
SD of all Scores:	0.3
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.7
Mean - 2 X:	2.8
Mean + 2 X:	4.3

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	2.96	10.35	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	4.0	NS	5.0	NS	3.5	4.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	4.292	4.08	17.50	15.3%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.5	3.0	NS	5.0	NS	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.833	2.88	11.06	17.9%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	3.0	NS	5.0	NS	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.5	4.0	3.5	4.5	4.0	3.875	2.81	10.88	15.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	0.0	NS	0.0	NS	3.5	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.708	3.65	2.59	186.7%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.5	4.0	NS	5.0	NS	3.5	3.5	3.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	4.042	3.27	13.21	17.1%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.0	3.0	NS	2.0	NS	3.5	2.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	0.0	3.208	4.12	13.20	45.3%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.5	5.0	5.0	4.042	4.04	16.32	17.9%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.5	3.0	NS	5.0	NS	3.5	3.5	3.5	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	4.125	3.88	16.02	18.0%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.667	3.62	13.26	13.4%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	4.000	3.23	12.92	16.0%
12	Project Readiness	3.5	4.0	NS	5.0	NS	3.5	3.0	4.0	2.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	3.833	2.85	10.91	17.0%
	Mean	2.87	3.04	3.49	3.96	3.49	3.50	3.50	3.37	3.83	4.08	3.54	3.42	4.33	3.67	**Overall Weighted Score**		**148.22**	
	CoV	34.9%	34.7%	#DIV/0!	39.0%	#DIV/0!	6.1%	20.2%	33.5%	37.9%	35.0%	32.7%	32.3%	15.0%	48.4%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Mean of all Scores:	2.6
SD of all Scores:	0.8
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.6
Mean - 2 X:	1.0
Mean + 2 X:	4.3

Hoko Watershed Instream LWD Restoration Project

9004.1

Overall Weighted Score

109.21

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	2.96	10.35	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.5	3.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.5	2.5	1.0	3.679	4.08	15.00	29.5%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	2.0	3.5	4.0	1.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	0.0	4.0	3.179	2.88	9.17	42.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	3.5	3.5	1.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	3.071	2.81	8.62	41.3%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.393	3.65	1.44	265.0%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	1.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	3.000	3.27	9.81	38.7%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	1.0	3.0	5.0	2.0	4.0	1.0	0.0	1.893	4.12	7.79	84.3%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	2.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	1.0	1.0	3.179	4.04	12.84	36.8%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.5	3.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	3.5	4.0	2.0	3.5	0.0	4.0	4.0	1.0	1.0	2.679	3.88	10.41	48.9%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	0.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	2.536	3.62	9.17	62.6%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	1.5	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.5	0.0	5.0	3.143	3.23	10.15	49.3%
12	Project Readiness	2.0	4.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	3.5	3.5	0.0	0.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.571	2.85	4.47	98.2%
	Mean	2.33	3.04	3.00	2.62	1.96	3.54	3.33	1.71	2.96	3.29	3.37	3.42	0.83	1.71	**Overall Weighted Score**		**109.21**	
	CoV	39.1%	34.7%	49.7%	60.3%	69.2%	4.1%	36.4%	71.1%	62.6%	59.2%	36.4%	34.1%	136.1%	109.1%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Upper Hoko LWD Restoration Project

11084

Overall Weighted Score

142.77

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.47
SD of all Scores:	0.31
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.63
Mean - 2 X:	2.84
Mean + 2 X:	4.10

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	2.96	10.35	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	NS	3.5	4.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.231	4.08	17.25	14.2%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	NS	3.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	3.808	2.88	10.98	14.7%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.5	3.0	4.5	4.0	NS	3.0	4.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	3.846	2.81	10.80	20.8%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	NS	3.5	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.654	3.65	2.39	195.9%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	NS	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.5	4.038	3.27	13.20	12.8%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	3.0	1.0	1.0	NS	3.0	0.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	2.538	4.12	10.45	59.9%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.5	3.0	4.5	4.0	NS	3.5	4.0	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	4.077	4.04	16.46	14.9%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	NS	3.5	3.5	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.923	3.88	15.24	13.6%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	NS	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	3.808	3.62	13.77	17.4%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	5.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.5	3.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	3.962	3.23	12.80	19.6%
12	Project Readiness	2.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	NS	3.5	2.5	4.0	2.0	5.0	4.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.192	2.85	9.09	27.5%
	Mean	2.71	3.04	3.58	3.37	3.49	3.46	3.37	3.62	3.71	4.00	3.54	3.33	3.79	3.50	**Overall Weighted Score**		**142.77**	
	CoV	36.5%	34.7%	43.3%	42.4%	#DIV/0!	7.4%	39.0%	32.8%	39.2%	35.0%	32.7%	35.2%	22.8%	49.5%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Lower Hoko Acquisition and Restoration Project

13101.1

Overall Weighted Score

150.08

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.6
SD of all Scores:	0.4
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.8
Mean - 2 X:	2.7
Mean + 2 X:	4.4

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	2.96	10.35	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	4.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.038	4.08	16.46	16.3%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.5	3.0	NS	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	3.5	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.885	2.88	11.21	13.0%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	3.0	NS	5.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.846	2.81	10.80	17.9%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	0.0	NS	0.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.769	3.65	2.81	160.6%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.5	4.0	NS	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.269	3.27	13.96	15.6%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	3.0	NS	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	3.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.115	4.12	16.94	21.1%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	3.0	NS	3.0	1.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.5	4.5	5.0	3.731	4.04	15.07	29.3%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.5	3.0	NS	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.5	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.077	3.88	15.84	17.9%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	NS	5.0	4.0	4.5	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.5	3.808	3.62	13.77	19.7%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	NS	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.308	3.23	13.92	19.3%
12	Project Readiness	2.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.0	4.0	2.5	3.5	2.5	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	2.0	3.154	2.85	8.98	23.7%
	Mean	2.62	3.04	3.49	3.96	3.62	4.04	3.25	3.67	4.00	3.71	3.54	3.58	4.17	3.92	**Overall Weighted Score**		**150.08**	
	CoV	36.4%	34.7%	#DIV/0!	37.5%	33.9%	13.4%	16.7%	32.6%	37.3%	37.9%	32.7%	34.1%	14.8%	38.8%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Sekiu Mainstem (RM 2-5) LWD Restoration

9005

Overall Weighted Score

105.97

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	2.5
SD of all Scores:	0.8
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.6
Mean - 2 X:	0.9
Mean + 2 X:	4.2

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.831	2.96	8.38	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	3.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	4.5	3.0	4.0	3.5	1.0	1.0	3.143	4.08	12.81	37.1%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	3.0	5.0	4.0	2.0	2.5	3.5	2.0	4.0	2.5	4.0	3.0	0.0	4.0	3.000	2.88	8.65	41.3%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.5	4.0	3.5	0.0	4.0	3.071	2.81	8.62	37.2%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	3.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.143	3.65	4.18	149.0%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	0.0	4.0	2.5	4.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	2.929	3.27	9.57	49.1%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	3.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	1.607	4.12	6.61	78.3%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.5	4.0	4.0	1.0	1.0	3.143	4.04	12.69	36.6%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	2.5	4.0	4.0	1.0	1.0	2.929	3.88	11.38	36.6%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	0.0	0.0	2.286	3.62	8.26	58.0%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	5.0	4.0	2.0	3.5	2.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	0.0	5.0	3.321	3.23	10.73	42.0%
12	Project Readiness	1.5	3.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.429	2.85	4.07	84.5%
	Mean	2.44	3.07	3.86	3.24	1.99	2.74	2.40	2.07	3.15	2.40	3.28	3.11	0.57	1.65	**Overall Weighted Score**		**105.97**	
	CoV	37.2%	9.7%	34.4%	47.8%	67.4%	19.7%	43.0%	66.2%	50.8%	33.8%	37.2%	33.8%	151.0%	109.8%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

WRIA 19 Riparian Rstoration

9003

Overall Weighted Score

130.70

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.2
SD of all Scores:	0.6
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.3
Mean - 2 X:	1.8
Mean + 2 X:	4.6

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	2.96	10.35	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	NS	NS	3.0	3.5	2.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	2.0	4.5	3.583	4.08	14.61	26.5%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	NS	NS	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.5	0.0	4.0	3.000	2.88	8.65	45.5%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	NS	NS	5.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	0.0	4.0	3.292	2.81	9.24	41.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	NS	NS	1.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.083	3.65	3.96	149.7%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.5	NS	NS	5.0	2.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	1.0	4.0	3.500	3.27	11.44	32.2%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	NS	NS	2.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	3.5	4.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	2.250	4.12	9.26	79.6%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	NS	NS	4.0	2.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	4.5	3.5	4.0	4.0	1.0	4.0	3.333	4.04	13.46	30.9%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.5	NS	NS	5.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.792	3.88	14.73	21.4%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.0	NS	NS	5.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.5	4.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.583	3.62	12.96	23.7%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.5	NS	NS	5.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	5.0	5.0	3.958	3.23	12.79	22.5%
12	Project Readiness	2.0	NS	NS	5.0	3.0	3.5	1.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	2.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.250	2.85	9.25	36.8%
	Mean	2.46	3.49	3.49	3.87	2.42	3.29	2.67	2.96	4.62	3.79	3.29	3.42	1.92	3.42	**Overall Weighted Score**		**130.70**	
	CoV	37.2%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	35.7%	40.3%	20.9%	42.5%	35.6%	10.5%	34.0%	36.9%	33.5%	94.9%	47.9%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

South Fork Pysht River Watershed Wood Restoration

11085.2

Overall Weighted Score

148.30

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.5
SD of all Scores:	0.2
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.5
Mean - 2 X:	3.0
Mean + 2 X:	4.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	2.96	10.35	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.115	4.08	16.78	12.3%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	NS	3.0	3.5	3.5	4.5	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.769	2.88	10.87	15.9%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	NS	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.885	2.81	10.91	10.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	4.0	1.5	1.0	NS	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	1.500	3.65	5.48	96.2%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.038	3.27	13.20	12.8%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.0	2.5	1.0	1.0	NS	3.5	0.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	0.0	2.577	4.12	10.61	60.8%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	NS	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.115	4.04	16.62	10.1%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	NS	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.038	3.88	15.69	7.9%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	4.0	3.5	5.0	NS	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	3.0	4.5	3.962	3.62	14.32	17.4%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	NS	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.115	3.23	13.30	15.8%
12	Project Readiness	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	3.577	2.85	10.18	17.9%
	Mean	2.96	3.83	3.83	3.71	3.49	3.46	3.29	3.67	3.96	3.79	3.54	3.71	3.75	3.29	**Overall Weighted Score**		**148.30**	
	CoV	33.4%	11.6%	34.0%	36.6%	#DIV/0!	13.0%	35.7%	16.8%	16.6%	34.9%	32.7%	34.2%	13.3%	51.6%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Pysht Floodplain Acquisition and Restoration

9086.1

Overall Weighted Score

143.40

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.4
SD of all Scores:	0.4
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.8
Mean - 2 X:	2.5
Mean + 2 X:	4.3

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	3.494	2.96	10.35	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	NS	4.5	3.0	4.0	3.0	NS	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	3.875	4.08	15.80	19.2%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	NS	5.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	NS	3.5	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	3.875	2.88	11.18	24.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	NS	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	NS	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.875	2.81	10.88	15.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	NS	1.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	NS	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.792	3.65	2.89	160.4%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.0	NS	4.5	5.0	5.0	3.0	NS	3.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.958	3.27	12.94	18.2%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.0	NS	4.5	5.0	5.0	3.5	NS	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.042	4.12	16.63	17.9%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	NS	4.0	1.0	1.0	3.5	NS	3.5	4.5	3.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	1.0	2.875	4.04	11.61	45.2%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	NS	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	NS	3.5	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.5	5.0	4.0	4.125	3.88	16.02	18.7%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	NS	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	NS	3.5	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.750	3.62	13.56	17.5%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	1.5	NS	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	NS	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.208	3.23	13.60	25.6%
12	Project Readiness	0.5	NS	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	NS	3.0	2.0	4.0	1.0	2.5	3.0	4.0	2.792	2.85	7.95	40.7%
	Mean	2.37	3.49	3.96	3.62	3.21	3.33	3.49	3.21	3.92	3.96	3.29	3.17	4.04	3.58	**Overall Weighted Score**		**143.40**	
	CoV	46.7%	#DIV/0!	27.7%	46.0%	45.8%	17.3%	#DIV/0!	33.5%	25.4%	35.9%	41.2%	37.1%	17.1%	42.4%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Pysht River Salt Marsh Estuary Restoratin Project

9009.1

Overall Weighted Score

157.25

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.8
SD of all Scores:	0.5
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.1
Mean - 2 X:	2.7
Mean + 2 X:	5.0

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	2.96	13.74	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	3.5	4.5	3.0	NS	3.0	4.5	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.192	4.08	17.09	21.0%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	NS	2.0	4.0	3.5	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	3.846	2.88	11.09	24.0%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	NS	2.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.923	2.81	11.01	20.0%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.5	3.5	5.0	1.0	NS	2.0	3.5	2.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	3.0	2.500	3.65	9.13	69.8%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	NS	3.0	3.5	3.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	3.846	3.27	12.57	20.1%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.0	2.5	1.0	0.0	NS	3.5	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	2.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.346	4.12	13.77	47.0%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	NS	3.5	3.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	1.0	3.923	4.04	15.84	31.2%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	NS	4.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.269	3.88	16.58	17.6%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.0	NS	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.846	3.62	13.91	20.1%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	NS	4.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.423	3.23	14.29	20.0%
12	Project Readiness	1.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	NS	4.0	2.5	4.0	2.0	3.5	2.0	2.5	2.0	4.0	2.885	2.85	8.21	33.3%
	Mean	2.55	3.30	3.93	3.30	4.64	3.34	3.93	3.93	4.43	4.01	4.47	3.89	4.51	3.84	**Overall Weighted Score**		**157.25**	
	CoV	41.4%	16.0%	28.3%	46.2%	#DIV/0!	25.5%	17.3%	19.7%	22.0%	34.2%	25.9%	37.4%	19.5%	26.4%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Butler Creek Fish Passage Design and Construction

23001

Overall Weighted Score

118.75

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.1
SD of all Scores:	0.8
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.7
Mean - 2 X:	1.3
Mean + 2 X:	4.9

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	2.96	13.74	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.5	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	2.0	2.0	3.0	4.5	3.5	3.0	3.5	5.0	3.0	3.333	4.08	13.59	26.6%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	3.0	NS	3.0	NS	2.0	1.5	2.5	4.0	0.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	2.667	2.88	7.69	44.0%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	3.0	NS	5.0	NS	2.0	2.5	3.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.125	2.81	8.77	41.0%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.5	0.0	NS	1.0	NS	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.542	3.65	1.98	182.3%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.0	3.5	NS	5.0	NS	2.0	2.5	3.5	4.5	0.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.167	3.27	10.35	40.6%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	2.0	NS	2.0	NS	2.0	0.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	4.0	0.0	2.042	4.12	8.40	63.1%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	3.0	NS	5.0	NS	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	3.083	4.04	12.45	29.2%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.5	3.5	NS	5.0	NS	2.0	3.5	3.5	4.5	2.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.375	3.88	13.11	27.6%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	2.5	NS	4.0	NS	2.0	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.5	4.0	3.5	4.0	2.5	2.958	3.62	10.70	25.4%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	2.5	NS	5.0	NS	2.0	2.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.542	3.23	11.44	31.5%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	3.0	NS	4.0	NS	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	2.292	2.85	6.52	32.8%
	Mean	2.84	2.80	4.64	3.97	4.64	2.22	2.14	2.89	3.68	1.89	2.89	2.76	3.89	2.80	**Overall Weighted Score**		**118.75**	
	CoV	32.9%	39.1%	#DIV/0!	33.4%	#DIV/0!	34.3%	61.1%	39.8%	38.4%	83.5%	46.2%	44.7%	19.4%	59.6%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Twin River Acquisition

9011 don't score

Overall Weighted Score

#DIV/0!

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	#DIV/0!
SD of all Scores:	#DIV/0!
2 X SD of all Scores:	#DIV/0!
Mean - 2 X:	#DIV/0!
Mean + 2 X:	#DIV/0!

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best													Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority															#DIV/0!	2.96	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)															#DIV/0!	4.08	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
3	Addresses stock status and trends															#DIV/0!	2.88	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
4	Addresses progress toward recovery															#DIV/0!	2.81	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock															#DIV/0!	3.65	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
6	Addresses other stocks															#DIV/0!	3.27	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat															#DIV/0!	4.12	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
8	Restores formerly productive habitat															#DIV/0!	4.04	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions															#DIV/0!	3.88	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
10	Spatial Scale of Influence															#DIV/0!	3.62	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
11	Temporal Scale of Influence															#DIV/0!	3.23	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
12	Project Readiness															#DIV/0!	2.85	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
	Mean	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	**Overall Weighted Score**		**#DIV/0!**	
	CoV	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Lyre River Protection and Restoration

10080.3

Overall Weighted Score

134.36

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.2
SD of all Scores:	0.6
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.2
Mean - 2 X:	2.0
Mean + 2 X:	4.4

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	2.96	9.46	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	NS	4.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	NS	3.5	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.250	4.08	13.25	27.4%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	NS	4.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	2.5	4.0	4.0	3.333	2.88	9.62	20.6%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	NS	3.5	5.0	2.0	3.0	NS	3.5	4.5	3.5	3.5	2.0	5.0	4.0	3.542	2.81	9.94	27.9%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	NS	0.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	NS	0.0	3.0	2.0	4.5	2.0	3.0	3.0	1.875	3.65	6.85	82.1%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.0	NS	4.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	NS	2.0	5.0	4.0	2.5	2.0	4.0	4.0	3.292	3.27	10.76	30.7%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.0	NS	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.5	NS	3.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	4.125	4.12	16.98	17.2%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	NS	1.0	1.0	1.0	4.0	NS	2.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	1.0	2.667	4.04	10.77	64.1%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	NS	3.5	5.0	3.0	4.0	NS	3.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	1.0	5.0	4.0	3.833	3.88	14.89	31.6%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	NS	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	NS	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	2.0	3.292	3.62	11.90	27.8%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.5	NS	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	NS	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.375	3.23	14.13	20.2%
12	Project Readiness	2.0	NS	2.0	2.0	1.0	3.0	NS	2.5	2.0	3.0	0.0	1.5	4.5	1.0	2.042	2.85	5.81	56.7%
	Mean	2.52	3.19	3.10	3.18	2.43	3.47	3.19	2.77	3.97	3.81	3.68	2.27	4.35	3.27	**Overall Weighted Score**		**134.36**	
	CoV	34.4%	#DIV/0!	46.1%	53.3%	41.4%	16.4%	#DIV/0!	38.4%	24.5%	26.8%	39.6%	35.4%	16.5%	39.4%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Lyre River Habitat Restoration Project
19104

Overall Weighted Score
146.36

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.5
SD of all Scores:	0.5
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.9
Mean - 2 X:	2.5
Mean + 2 X:	4.5

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	3.193	2.96	9.46	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	NS	2.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.923	4.08	15.99	21.4%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	NS	2.5	3.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.731	2.88	10.76	17.8%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	NS	3.0	3.5	4.5	4.5	3.5	5.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	3.962	2.81	11.12	20.9%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	3.5	0.0	1.0	NS	3.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	1.654	3.65	6.04	111.3%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	NS	3.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.077	3.27	13.33	17.9%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	2.5	1.0	2.0	NS	4.0	0.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	0.0	3.038	4.12	12.50	60.6%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	NS	2.5	4.0	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.5	3.5	3.5	4.0	3.923	4.04	15.84	19.4%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	NS	3.5	4.0	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.231	3.88	16.43	15.0%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	NS	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	3.0	4.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.654	3.62	13.21	14.1%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	3.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.231	3.23	13.67	22.4%
12	Project Readiness	2.0	4.0	2.5	5.0	NS	3.0	2.5	4.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.808	2.85	7.99	42.7%
	Mean	2.56	3.56	3.47	3.85	3.19	3.06	3.14	3.81	4.02	3.89	4.27	3.02	4.10	3.22	**Overall Weighted Score**		**146.36**	
	CoV	34.2%	13.5%	44.7%	34.5%	#DIV/0!	14.8%	37.2%	33.6%	24.5%	38.6%	33.7%	34.0%	18.1%	50.1%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

The workplan write up is fine but the project description is not. Including information about a prior acquisition muddies the intent here which is restoration, not acquisition. This could prove problematic and should be clarified.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

WRIA 19 Fish Passage Corrections on Joyce-Piedmont Road

19101

Overall Weighted Score

122.28

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	2.9
SD of all Scores:	0.5
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.0
Mean - 2 X:	1.9
Mean + 2 X:	3.9

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	2.96	4.64	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	3.0	3.5	5.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.750	4.08	15.29	20.8%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	3.000	2.88	8.65	24.5%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.5	3.0	3.5	5.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	2.5	3.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	3.679	2.81	10.33	18.2%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.821	3.65	3.00	181.2%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.0	3.0	3.5	5.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	4.5	4.5	3.5	3.571	3.27	11.68	21.9%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	1.5	0.0	1.0	2.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	2.0	4.0	4.5	0.0	2.107	4.12	8.67	76.3%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	2.5	2.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.607	4.04	14.57	25.0%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.679	3.88	14.29	19.7%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.5	2.5	2.5	2.0	4.0	4.0	2.5	2.964	3.62	10.72	20.4%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.5	3.5	2.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.000	3.23	12.92	24.0%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	3.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	3.5	1.0	2.0	1.0	3.0	3.5	1.0	2.643	2.85	7.52	40.9%
	Mean	2.51	2.76	2.55	3.46	3.01	3.59	2.51	3.13	3.01	2.55	2.30	3.30	4.09	2.55	**Overall Weighted Score**		**122.28**	
	CoV	36.8%	20.7%	64.4%	51.1%	42.3%	19.1%	45.6%	38.9%	51.5%	57.5%	47.6%	39.3%	24.0%	62.7%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Lower Salt Creek Restoration and Protection

09013

Overall Weighted Score

147.68

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.3
SD of all Scores:	0.8
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.6
Mean - 2 X:	1.7
Mean + 2 X:	4.9

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.96	7.49	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	NS	NS	3.0	4.0	2.0	NS	4.5	5.0	4.0	5.0	2.0	4.0	3.5	3.591	4.08	14.64	30.4%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	NS	NS	4.0	4.0	2.0	NS	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.773	2.88	10.88	24.7%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.0	NS	NS	5.0	3.0	3.0	NS	4.5	4.5	3.0	5.0	2.0	4.5	4.0	3.682	2.81	10.34	30.5%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	NS	NS	2.0	3.0	3.0	NS	3.0	4.5	3.5	5.0	2.0	4.5	3.0	3.045	3.65	11.13	46.1%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.0	NS	NS	5.0	5.0	3.0	NS	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.5	3.0	4.136	3.27	13.52	23.0%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	NS	NS	5.0	5.0	2.5	NS	4.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.955	4.12	16.27	26.2%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	NS	NS	4.0	3.0	3.0	NS	4.5	4.5	4.0	5.0	2.5	5.0	2.5	3.682	4.04	14.87	27.3%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	NS	NS	5.0	4.0	3.0	NS	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.0	5.0	2.5	3.955	3.88	15.36	22.9%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.0	NS	NS	4.0	4.0	3.0	NS	4.5	3.5	3.0	5.0	2.5	4.0	3.0	3.500	3.62	12.65	25.6%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	NS	NS	4.0	5.0	3.0	NS	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	4.227	3.23	13.66	23.3%
12	Project Readiness	1.5	NS	NS	3.0	2.0	3.0	NS	3.5	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	1.0	2.409	2.85	6.86	31.9%
	Mean	2.25	2.53	2.53	3.88	3.71	2.75	2.53	3.96	4.21	3.79	4.54	2.50	4.25	3.09	**Overall Weighted Score**		**147.68**	
	CoV	37.3%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	26.9%	27.1%	14.4%	#DIV/0!	16.4%	19.1%	26.5%	21.1%	17.0%	19.0%	32.2%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Salt Creek Final Fish Passage Corrections Project

09015

Overall Weighted Score

117.14

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	2.8
SD of all Scores:	0.9
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.8
Mean - 2 X:	0.9
Mean + 2 X:	4.6

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.96	7.49	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	3.0	4.0	1.0	NS	3.0	3.5	0.0	4.5	3.5	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.154	4.08	12.86	43.6%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	NS	3.0	3.5	0.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.308	2.88	9.54	38.3%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.0	3.0	3.5	1.0	NS	3.0	3.5	0.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.923	2.81	8.21	44.6%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	3.0	0.5	0.0	NS	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	1.077	3.65	3.93	157.3%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	NS	3.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	5.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	3.308	3.27	10.81	41.6%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	2.0	0.0	0.0	NS	3.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	3.5	5.0	3.5	4.0	0.0	2.154	4.12	8.86	89.6%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	3.0	3.5	5.0	NS	3.5	2.5	0.0	4.5	3.0	5.0	3.5	4.5	3.0	3.346	4.04	13.51	39.7%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	NS	3.5	2.5	0.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.5	3.0	3.423	3.88	13.30	37.6%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	NS	3.0	2.5	0.0	3.0	2.5	5.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	2.962	3.62	10.71	39.9%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	NS	3.0	4.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	3.885	3.23	12.55	37.9%
12	Project Readiness	1.5	3.0	2.0	1.0	NS	3.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	1.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	1.0	1.885	2.85	5.36	49.8%
	Mean	2.25	2.88	3.09	2.88	2.53	3.00	2.54	0.21	3.54	2.75	4.50	2.67	3.67	2.79	**Overall Weighted Score**		**117.14**	
	CoV	37.3%	10.7%	50.2%	74.9%	#DIV/0!	9.9%	53.3%	346.4%	40.5%	48.0%	21.6%	35.1%	19.4%	58.8%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

The narrative says the projects should be completed by now. This was apparently not updated.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Kreaman Creek, Trib. To Salt Creek

9015.1

Overall Weighted Score

133.04

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.1
SD of all Scores:	0.4
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.9
Mean - 2 X:	2.2
Mean + 2 X:	4.0

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.96	7.49	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.5	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.885	4.08	15.84	15.9%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.0	NS	2.5	3.5	2.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.500	2.88	10.10	18.4%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	NS	3.5	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.615	2.81	10.15	16.1%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	NS	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	3.0	0.0	1.038	3.65	3.79	160.2%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	NS	3.5	2.5	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.5	3.5	4.5	4.0	3.615	3.27	11.82	17.1%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	NS	3.5	0.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	3.5	4.0	0.0	2.462	4.12	10.13	69.1%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	NS	3.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	4.5	3.0	3.731	4.04	15.07	17.0%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.5	3.0	4.5	5.0	NS	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.5	3.0	3.731	3.88	14.49	17.0%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	NS	3.5	3.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.154	3.62	11.40	15.0%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	NS	3.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	4.231	3.23	13.67	17.8%
12	Project Readiness	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	NS	3.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.192	2.85	9.09	23.5%
	Mean	3.00	2.92	3.09	3.38	2.53	3.21	2.71	2.92	3.38	3.21	4.29	2.96	3.88	2.96	**Overall Weighted Score**		**133.04**	
	CoV	34.0%	12.2%	52.5%	46.8%	#DIV/0!	12.2%	51.8%	36.4%	37.9%	38.4%	21.2%	34.1%	17.4%	52.1%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Elwha Acquistion and Restoration Project

14106

Overall Weighted Score

152.78

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.8
SD of all Scores:	1.2
2 X SD of all Scores:	2.4
Mean - 2 X:	1.4
Mean + 2 X:	6.3

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	2.96	14.81	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	NS	4.5	5.0	NS	4.0	4.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	5.0	3.750	4.08	15.29	40.8%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	NS	5.0	3.0	NS	3.5	4.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	4.5	5.0	3.708	2.88	10.70	42.8%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	NS	4.0	3.0	NS	3.5	3.5	0.0	5.0	3.5	4.0	2.0	4.5	4.0	3.333	2.81	9.36	39.1%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	NS	5.0	5.0	NS	3.5	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.5	5.0	5.0	4.042	3.65	14.77	37.8%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.0	NS	4.5	5.0	NS	3.5	3.5	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	3.792	3.27	12.40	39.5%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	NS	4.5	5.0	NS	4.0	4.5	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.5	3.833	4.12	15.78	37.4%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	NS	4.5	1.0	NS	4.0	2.5	0.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.5	3.250	4.04	13.13	46.6%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	NS	4.5	4.0	NS	4.0	2.5	0.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	5.0	3.583	3.88	13.92	41.6%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	NS	3.0	4.0	NS	4.5	3.5	0.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	2.0	3.0	4.5	3.417	3.62	12.35	41.8%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	NS	5.0	5.0	NS	4.5	4.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	5.0	5.0	4.042	3.23	13.06	39.6%
12	Project Readiness	2.0	NS	3.0	1.0	NS	3.5	3.5	0.0	3.0	4.0	1.5	2.0	3.0	4.0	2.542	2.85	7.23	49.2%
	Mean	2.75	5.00	4.38	3.83	5.00	3.96	3.79	0.42	4.79	4.71	4.08	2.67	4.21	4.71	**Overall Weighted Score**		**152.78**	
	CoV	28.5%	#DIV/0!	16.3%	39.8%	#DIV/0!	12.6%	21.4%	346.4%	12.2%	11.5%	22.7%	36.1%	16.4%	8.4%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

Not updated, no project proposed.

Hard to score.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Elwha River Engineered Log Jams

9016.3

Overall Weighted Score

161.22

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.9
SD of all Scores:	0.9
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.9
Mean - 2 X:	2.0
Mean + 2 X:	5.9

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	2.96	14.81	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	4.0	4.5	3.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	3.923	4.08	15.99	29.8%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	NS	3.0	3.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	3.962	2.88	11.43	31.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	NS	3.5	3.5	5.0	5.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	1.0	4.0	3.846	2.81	10.80	27.8%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	3.5	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	1.0	5.0	4.231	3.65	15.46	29.2%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	NS	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	4.038	3.27	13.20	30.9%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	4.0	1.0	1.0	NS	3.5	0.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	1.0	0.0	2.808	4.12	11.55	69.9%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	4.5	4.5	2.0	NS	3.0	3.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	1.0	5.0	3.885	4.04	15.69	34.9%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	NS	3.5	3.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	1.0	5.0	4.192	3.88	16.29	27.3%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	4.0	3.5	4.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	3.769	3.62	13.63	29.5%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	NS	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	4.0	1.0	5.0	3.808	3.23	12.30	29.1%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	4.0	2.0	5.0	NS	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	3.5	1.0	4.5	3.538	2.85	10.07	31.3%
	Mean	2.92	4.13	4.08	3.92	5.00	3.46	3.50	4.58	4.71	4.79	4.83	4.21	1.33	4.46	**Overall Weighted Score**		**161.22**	
	CoV	26.2%	7.5%	31.7%	35.2%	#DIV/0!	16.8%	35.0%	10.2%	11.5%	10.4%	6.7%	9.4%	86.6%	32.2%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N				

Comments

An updated and current project description is needed.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Elwha River Revegetation Project
11087

Overall Weighted Score
147.42

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.6
SD of all Scores:	1.3
2 X SD of all Scores:	2.6
Mean - 2 X:	1.0
Mean + 2 X:	6.3

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	2.96	14.81	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	NS	3.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	3.423	4.08	13.96	44.6%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	4.0	5.0	3.0	NS	3.0	3.5	0.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	3.500	2.88	10.10	45.6%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.5	4.0	3.5	5.0	NS	3.5	3.5	0.0	5.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	1.0	4.0	3.423	2.81	9.61	41.2%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	3.5	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	1.0	5.0	3.731	3.65	13.63	45.0%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	NS	3.5	4.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	3.692	3.27	12.07	45.1%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	4.0	0.0	3.0	NS	3.5	3.5	0.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	1.0	0.0	2.769	4.12	11.40	68.6%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	4.5	4.0	2.0	NS	3.0	2.5	0.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	1.0	4.5	3.346	4.04	13.51	47.8%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	NS	3.5	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	1.0	5.0	3.731	3.88	14.49	42.9%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.0	0.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	3.308	3.62	11.96	43.4%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.5	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	3.692	3.23	11.93	43.7%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	4.5	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	2.5	3.0	1.0	5.0	3.500	2.85	9.96	47.7%
	Mean	2.92	4.13	4.00	4.08	5.00	3.67	3.46	0.42	4.67	4.71	4.71	4.17	1.33	4.46	**Overall Weighted Score**		**147.42**	
	CoV	27.2%	7.5%	35.8%	26.5%	#DIV/0!	16.8%	19.0%	346.4%	9.5%	14.6%	16.0%	11.8%	86.6%	32.2%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

Not updated, no current project proposed.

No project description at all. Is this the "new" project?

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Elwha Estuary Conservation and Restoration

09055.2

Overall Weighted Score

164.53

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.9
SD of all Scores:	0.8
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.6
Mean - 2 X:	2.3
Mean + 2 X:	5.5

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	2.96	14.81	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	4.0	3.5	2.0	5.0	1.0	3.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	3.857	4.08	15.73	34.3%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	4.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.000	2.88	11.54	30.6%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	2.0	3.5	5.0	5.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.893	2.81	10.93	20.9%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	1.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.250	3.65	15.53	27.6%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	1.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.036	3.27	13.19	30.9%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	3.0	4.107	4.12	16.90	22.0%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.0	4.5	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.000	4.04	16.15	27.3%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.5	5.0	5.0	3.5	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.107	3.88	15.95	23.0%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	4.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	2.5	4.0	4.5	2.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.536	3.62	12.78	29.1%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.143	3.23	13.38	22.4%
12	Project Readiness	1.5	4.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	1.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	5.0	2.5	3.0	4.5	2.679	2.85	7.62	56.1%
	Mean	2.54	4.13	3.88	3.67	3.92	2.38	3.25	4.58	4.79	4.17	4.92	3.92	4.71	4.71	**Overall Weighted Score**		**164.53**	
	CoV	34.0%	7.5%	30.7%	37.4%	22.3%	51.7%	33.1%	10.2%	12.2%	33.3%	5.9%	16.2%	13.2%	13.2%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Little River LWD Project

13102

Overall Weighted Score

161.79

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.9
SD of all Scores:	0.5
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.1
Mean - 2 X:	2.8
Mean + 2 X:	5.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	2.96	14.81	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.5	4.0	4.0	1.0	NS	3.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.077	4.08	16.62	26.4%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.5	4.0	5.0	3.0	NS	3.5	2.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.115	2.88	11.87	19.9%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	NS	3.5	2.5	3.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.538	2.81	9.93	14.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	NS	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.5	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.154	3.65	15.18	22.2%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	NS	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.115	3.27	13.45	23.9%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.0	4.0	1.0	1.0	NS	3.5	0.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	0.0	3.038	4.12	12.50	61.7%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	4.5	4.5	2.0	NS	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	3.0	4.5	4.5	3.962	4.04	16.00	21.5%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	NS	4.0	3.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.385	3.88	17.03	14.1%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.5	4.0	3.0	3.0	NS	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.385	3.62	12.24	13.7%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.077	3.23	13.17	18.6%
12	Project Readiness	3.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	NS	4.0	1.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.154	2.85	8.98	27.8%
	Mean	3.17	4.13	3.92	3.25	5.00	3.54	3.00	4.04	4.13	4.50	4.63	4.08	4.33	4.21	**Overall Weighted Score**		**161.79**	
	CoV	22.7%	7.5%	33.5%	43.8%	#DIV/0!	16.4%	47.1%	16.2%	15.6%	20.1%	11.4%	14.6%	13.3%	34.9%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Indian Creek Habitat Restoration Project

16103.1

Overall Weighted Score

165.71

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	4.0
SD of all Scores:	0.5
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.0
Mean - 2 X:	3.0
Mean + 2 X:	5.0

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	2.96	14.81	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	NS	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	4.5	4.038	4.08	16.46	14.7%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	3.5	3.5	3.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.308	2.88	12.43	17.4%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	4.0	3.5	5.0	NS	3.5	3.5	5.0	4.5	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.000	2.81	11.23	15.3%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	NS	3.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.192	3.65	15.32	18.6%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	NS	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.192	3.27	13.71	19.8%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	4.0	1.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.5	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.5	4.5	0.0	3.538	4.12	14.56	42.6%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	NS	4.0	2.5	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.5	5.0	4.5	4.115	4.04	16.62	18.7%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	NS	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	2.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.077	3.88	15.84	18.6%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	4.0	2.5	4.0	NS	4.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	4.0	3.5	4.5	3.346	3.62	12.10	23.9%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	NS	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.231	3.23	13.67	15.0%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	4.0	2.0	4.0	NS	4.0	2.5	4.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.154	2.85	8.98	25.4%
	Mean	2.92	4.13	3.79	4.42	5.00	3.83	3.58	4.38	4.00	4.46	3.83	4.08	4.50	4.29	**Overall Weighted Score**		**165.71**	
	CoV	25.1%	7.5%	35.3%	11.7%	#DIV/0!	12.8%	20.5%	13.0%	25.0%	18.8%	24.5%	10.2%	14.2%	32.7%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Elwha Hot Springs Road Restoration

16104

Overall Weighted Score

136.53

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.4
SD of all Scores:	1.0
2 X SD of all Scores:	2.1
Mean - 2 X:	1.2
Mean + 2 X:	5.6

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	2.96	14.81	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	3.0	3.0	4.0	NS	4.0	2.5	3.5	2.0	4.0	4.5	3.5	0.0	4.0	3.115	4.08	12.70	38.3%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	3.0	5.0	3.0	NS	4.0	2.5	3.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.0	0.0	5.0	3.577	2.88	10.32	40.7%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	3.0	3.5	2.0	NS	4.0	2.5	4.0	4.0	2.0	3.5	4.0	0.0	4.0	3.000	2.81	8.42	39.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	3.0	5.0	5.0	NS	3.0	2.5	5.0	2.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	5.0	3.538	3.65	12.93	43.7%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	NS	3.5	2.5	3.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	5.0	3.192	3.27	10.44	43.6%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	NS	4.5	0.0	5.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.5	0.0	4.0	2.923	4.12	12.03	61.2%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	NS	4.5	2.5	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	0.0	4.0	3.308	4.04	13.36	36.8%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	3.0	3.5	5.0	NS	4.0	2.5	5.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	3.308	3.88	12.85	40.2%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	3.5	3.0	NS	4.5	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	3.5	4.0	0.0	3.0	2.769	3.62	10.01	43.4%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	NS	4.5	3.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	3.5	0.0	5.0	3.846	3.23	12.43	36.5%
12	Project Readiness	2.0	3.0	1.0	4.0	NS	3.0	2.0	3.0	1.0	4.0	2.0	2.5	0.0	1.0	2.192	2.85	6.24	55.5%
	Mean	2.71	3.17	3.58	3.92	5.00	4.04	2.54	4.04	2.83	3.83	4.00	3.92	0.42	4.08	**Overall Weighted Score**		**136.53**	
	CoV	29.9%	18.2%	38.9%	29.7%	#DIV/0!	15.3%	43.1%	22.7%	49.0%	31.1%	21.3%	15.2%	346.4%	28.5%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N				

Comments

This area is not suitable for a road. The Park can address its goals for access without a road here.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Ediz Hook Drift Cell Feasibility

22004

Overall Weighted Score

138.97

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.4
SD of all Scores:	0.8
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.6
Mean - 2 X:	1.8
Mean + 2 X:	5.0

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	2.96	13.74	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	3.5	4.0	3.0	NS	2.0	3.5	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.5	3.5	4.5	4.0	3.154	4.08	12.86	26.2%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	3.0	5.0	4.0	NS	1.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	3.308	2.88	9.54	36.8%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.0	3.5	3.0	5.0	NS	2.0	2.5	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	3.500	2.81	9.83	27.4%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	NS	2.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.615	3.65	13.21	31.5%
6	Addresses other stocks	1.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	NS	1.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.385	3.27	11.07	37.3%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.0	2.5	1.0	2.0	NS	1.0	0.0	2.0	3.5	3.5	3.5	4.5	5.0	0.0	2.346	4.12	9.66	68.2%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.0	3.0	4.5	3.0	NS	1.0	2.5	2.0	3.5	3.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	2.0	3.077	4.04	12.43	38.6%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	NS	2.0	3.5	2.0	3.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.500	3.88	13.60	30.3%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.0	3.0	2.0	5.0	NS	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.538	3.62	12.79	27.9%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.0	3.0	4.5	3.0	NS	2.0	2.5	2.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	3.731	3.23	12.05	35.3%
12	Project Readiness	1.5	3.5	3.0	4.0	NS	2.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	2.5	3.0	4.0	1.0	2.885	2.85	8.21	35.5%
	Mean	2.22	3.22	3.76	4.05	4.64	2.01	2.80	2.97	3.43	3.34	3.80	4.05	4.76	3.64	**Overall Weighted Score**		**138.97**	
	CoV	36.9%	16.5%	33.5%	26.2%	#DIV/0!	54.5%	41.3%	29.9%	26.0%	27.8%	20.1%	11.5%	6.9%	46.8%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Mean of all Scores:	3.7
SD of all Scores:	0.6
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.3
Mean - 2 X:	2.3
Mean + 2 X:	5.0

Port Angeles Harbor/ Tributaries Conservation and Restoration

23002

Overall Weighted Score

146.20

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	2.96	13.74	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	3.5	3.5	3.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	NS	5.0	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.583	4.08	14.61	18.7%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	3.0	5.0	3.0	NS	3.0	2.5	3.0	4.0	NS	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.667	2.88	10.58	26.2%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	NS	3.5	3.0	3.0	4.5	NS	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.833	2.81	10.76	22.5%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	NS	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	NS	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.875	3.65	14.16	25.9%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	NS	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.5	NS	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.833	3.27	12.53	23.8%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.0	2.5	2.0	4.0	NS	3.5	0.0	3.0	3.5	NS	5.0	4.5	1.0	0.0	2.583	4.12	10.63	63.8%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	3.5	3.5	3.0	NS	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.5	NS	5.0	3.5	1.0	2.0	3.125	4.04	12.62	31.4%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	NS	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.5	NS	5.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	3.667	3.88	14.24	22.8%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	2.5	5.0	NS	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	NS	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.708	3.62	13.41	22.6%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	NS	3.5	3.5	3.5	4.5	NS	5.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	3.875	3.23	12.52	19.2%
12	Project Readiness	1.5	3.0	2.0	1.0	NS	3.0	1.0	3.0	2.0	NS	3.5	4.0	1.0	2.0	2.250	2.85	6.40	45.9%
	Mean	2.64	3.18	3.64	3.97	4.64	3.47	2.84	3.59	3.68	4.64	4.84	4.01	2.97	3.80	**Overall Weighted Score**		**146.20**	
	CoV	31.5%	16.6%	29.7%	31.7%	#DIV/0!	13.8%	43.9%	15.0%	19.9%	#DIV/0!	9.0%	8.1%	46.2%	42.7%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

Overarching and nebulous. Needs assessment of specific actions and locations phased approach. Polluted environment. Given the cost/benefit - other undeveloped spot should be priority.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Valley Creek Restoration Phase 3

09021

Overall Weighted Score

116.22

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	2.8
SD of all Scores:	0.4
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.8
Mean - 2 X:	1.9
Mean + 2 X:	3.6

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	2.96	4.64	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	3.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.607	4.08	14.71	16.5%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	3.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.5	3.5	4.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	2.821	2.88	8.14	24.7%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	4.5	4.0	3.0	5.0	3.500	2.81	9.83	23.8%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	0.0	2.5	2.5	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.643	3.65	6.00	75.9%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.0	3.0	3.5	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	4.0	2.0	3.143	3.27	10.27	26.1%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	1.5	2.5	0.0	3.0	0.0	2.5	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	1.5	0.0	2.107	4.12	8.67	65.9%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.0	3.0	3.5	5.0	0.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	1.5	3.143	4.04	12.69	40.2%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.0	3.0	3.5	5.0	0.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	3.107	3.88	12.07	40.5%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.5	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.0	1.0	2.750	3.62	9.94	27.4%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.5	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.821	3.23	12.35	18.2%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	2.5	1.0	2.0	2.0	3.5	1.5	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.0	1.5	1.0	2.429	2.85	6.91	45.6%
	Mean	2.21	2.76	2.51	3.38	2.34	3.05	3.09	2.80	2.92	3.17	3.51	2.96	2.46	2.09	**Overall Weighted Score**		**116.22**	
	CoV	22.1%	15.8%	65.2%	47.5%	68.3%	18.6%	28.0%	31.5%	45.8%	23.2%	26.1%	43.8%	44.3%	68.2%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Ennis Creek Fish Passage Barrier Removal

11088.3

Overall Weighted Score

152.32

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.5
SD of all Scores:	0.6
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.2
Mean - 2 X:	2.2
Mean + 2 X:	4.8

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.530	2.96	7.49	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	NS	3.5	4.5	4.0	5.0	2.5	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	4.231	4.08	17.25	17.8%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	NS	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.5	2.5	4.5	3.5	5.0	4.5	3.769	2.88	10.87	20.0%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.5	3.5	3.5	5.0	NS	4.0	3.5	5.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.769	2.81	10.58	20.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	3.0	3.5	0.0	4.0	NS	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.308	3.65	12.09	37.3%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.5	3.0	4.5	5.0	NS	3.0	3.5	3.5	4.5	1.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.692	3.27	12.07	27.4%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	3.0	0.0	2.0	NS	4.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	2.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	0.0	2.808	4.12	11.55	66.1%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	NS	4.5	3.0	3.5	5.0	3.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.077	4.04	16.46	19.9%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	NS	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.5	3.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.077	3.88	15.84	18.6%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	NS	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	2.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.038	3.62	14.60	19.2%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.5	3.0	5.0	4.0	NS	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	2.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.192	3.23	13.54	19.8%
12	Project Readiness	3.5	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	4.5	1.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	1.5	3.500	2.85	9.96	31.9%
	Mean	3.04	3.25	3.34	4.29	2.53	3.67	3.00	3.79	4.29	2.54	4.42	4.00	4.29	3.71	**Overall Weighted Score**		**152.32**	
	CoV	12.9%	13.8%	51.2%	24.4%	#DIV/0!	17.6%	43.7%	15.2%	15.9%	22.9%	17.1%	14.9%	20.0%	42.3%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Morse Creek Property Acquisition
09026

Overall Weighted Score
133.90

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.3
SD of all Scores:	0.5
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.1
Mean - 2 X:	2.2
Mean + 2 X:	4.4

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	2.96	12.13	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	3.0	4.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.192	4.08	13.01	34.8%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	3.0	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.5	3.115	2.88	8.99	27.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	4.0	4.0	3.5	NS	3.0	3.5	4.5	3.269	2.81	9.18	22.2%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.0	3.0	5.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.0	4.5	3.385	3.65	12.37	29.0%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	NS	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.462	3.27	11.32	23.2%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	NS	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.577	4.12	14.72	18.8%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	3.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	NS	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.731	4.04	11.03	44.6%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.5	3.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	NS	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.231	3.88	12.55	22.4%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	1.5	2.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.0	3.0	NS	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.577	3.62	9.32	28.4%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	3.5	NS	3.5	3.0	5.0	3.769	3.23	12.18	23.4%
12	Project Readiness	2.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	2.0	3.5	NS	2.0	3.0	2.0	2.500	2.85	7.12	39.2%
	Mean	2.47	3.17	3.05	2.84	2.17	3.05	3.38	3.72	3.63	3.63	4.10	3.38	3.63	4.01	**Overall Weighted Score**		**133.90**	
	CoV	23.0%	12.9%	52.7%	44.9%	39.3%	19.6%	23.1%	10.9%	23.7%	15.8%	#DIV/0!	19.3%	13.5%	19.9%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

Proposal appears to be written in 2009 and needs updated.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Morse Creek Acquisition & Restoration

16102

Overall Weighted Score

154.32

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.8
SD of all Scores:	0.6
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.2
Mean - 2 X:	2.6
Mean + 2 X:	5.1

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	2.96	12.13	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	NS	3.5	5.0	NS	2.0	NS	4.0	5.0	NS	NS	3.5	5.0	4.0	3.889	4.08	15.85	26.3%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	NS	4.0	4.0	NS	2.0	NS	3.5	4.5	NS	NS	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.667	2.88	10.58	23.6%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	NS	3.5	5.0	NS	3.0	NS	4.0	4.0	NS	NS	2.5	4.0	4.5	3.667	2.81	10.29	23.6%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	NS	5.0	5.0	NS	2.0	NS	3.5	5.0	NS	NS	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.944	3.65	14.41	27.9%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.5	NS	4.0	5.0	NS	3.0	NS	3.0	5.0	NS	NS	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.889	3.27	12.71	23.0%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	NS	4.0	3.0	NS	3.0	NS	4.0	5.0	NS	NS	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.611	4.12	14.86	21.6%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.0	NS	1.0	5.0	NS	2.0	NS	3.0	5.0	NS	NS	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.278	4.04	13.24	42.5%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.5	NS	4.0	5.0	NS	3.0	NS	4.0	5.0	NS	NS	3.5	5.0	4.0	4.000	3.88	15.54	22.5%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.0	NS	3.0	4.0	NS	3.0	NS	3.5	4.5	NS	NS	3.0	5.0	4.0	3.556	3.62	12.85	25.8%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.5	NS	5.0	5.0	NS	3.0	NS	4.0	5.0	NS	NS	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.167	3.23	13.46	25.5%
12	Project Readiness	1.5	NS	2.0	3.0	NS	3.0	NS	4.0	4.0	NS	NS	2.0	5.0	2.0	2.944	2.85	8.38	40.2%
	Mean	2.51	4.10	3.59	4.42	4.10	2.76	4.10	3.72	4.67	4.10	4.10	3.34	4.42	4.09	**Overall Weighted Score**		**154.32**	
	CoV	24.9%	#DIV/0!	32.0%	17.8%	#DIV/0!	23.2%	#DIV/0!	10.9%	9.2%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	19.8%	11.5%	17.9%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

How old is this? Wasn't dam removed a few years ago?

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Lower Morse Creek Feasibility Study

10079

Overall Weighted Score

144.02

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.5
SD of all Scores:	0.6
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.2
Mean - 2 X:	2.3
Mean + 2 X:	4.8

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	2.96	12.13	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	NS	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.5	NS	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.750	4.08	15.29	17.5%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	NS	2.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.5	3.708	2.88	10.70	21.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	3.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	NS	2.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	2.5	4.0	4.5	3.792	2.81	10.65	24.8%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	NS	4.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.5	4.083	3.65	14.92	19.4%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	NS	3.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	NS	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.917	3.27	12.80	23.0%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.0	2.0	0.0	4.0	1.0	NS	0.0	3.5	4.0	2.0	NS	3.5	4.5	0.0	2.208	4.12	9.09	76.3%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	2.5	NS	2.0	4.5	5.0	3.5	NS	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.292	4.04	13.29	28.6%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.5	NS	2.5	5.0	4.5	3.0	NS	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.667	3.88	14.24	26.9%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	NS	3.0	3.5	4.5	2.0	NS	3.5	4.0	3.0	3.333	3.62	12.05	21.5%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	1.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	NS	3.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	NS	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.708	3.23	11.98	24.0%
12	Project Readiness	1.5	2.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	NS	1.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	NS	2.0	5.0	2.0	2.417	2.85	6.88	53.5%
	Mean	2.42	2.92	3.55	4.09	3.38	4.10	2.55	3.97	4.47	3.80	4.10	3.17	4.22	3.42	**Overall Weighted Score**		**144.02**	
	CoV	29.8%	18.2%	42.7%	16.3%	35.9%	#DIV/0!	45.1%	11.4%	12.9%	28.9%	#DIV/0!	18.6%	9.3%	39.4%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Siebert Creek Ecosystem Protection Project

09027.2

Overall Weighted Score

131.84

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.4
SD of all Scores:	1.2
2 X SD of all Scores:	2.4
Mean - 2 X:	0.9
Mean + 2 X:	5.8

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	2.96	13.74	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	NS	4.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	NS	3.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	4.5	3.125	4.08	12.74	45.3%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	NS	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	NS	3.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	3.5	4.5	2.875	2.88	8.29	45.8%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	NS	3.5	5.0	3.0	3.0	NS	3.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	1.5	4.5	4.5	3.292	2.81	9.24	45.1%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	NS	0.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	NS	3.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	3.5	4.5	2.708	3.65	9.90	67.5%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.0	NS	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	NS	3.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	4.5	3.375	3.27	11.03	43.4%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	NS	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.5	NS	3.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	5.0	4.0	3.500	4.12	14.40	41.8%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.0	NS	1.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	NS	2.0	4.5	0.0	4.0	1.0	4.0	4.0	2.458	4.04	9.93	61.0%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	NS	4.0	5.0	3.5	3.0	NS	3.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	4.0	3.375	3.88	13.11	46.0%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	NS	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	NS	3.0	3.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	4.5	4.0	2.958	3.62	10.70	39.1%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.0	NS	5.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	NS	4.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	2.0	5.0	5.0	3.750	3.23	12.12	44.2%
12	Project Readiness	2.0	NS	4.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	NS	1.0	3.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	5.0	2.0	2.333	2.85	6.64	58.7%
	Mean	2.59	4.64	3.30	3.89	3.43	3.01	4.64	2.97	4.59	0.39	3.80	1.84	4.39	4.18	**Overall Weighted Score**		**131.84**	
	CoV	28.4%	#DIV/0!	44.8%	36.6%	30.8%	22.2%	#DIV/0!	29.9%	16.6%	346.4%	17.6%	58.8%	13.1%	18.1%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N				

Comments

Old proposal.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Mean of all Scores:	3.0
SD of all Scores:	0.8
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.6
Mean - 2 X:	1.4
Mean + 2 X:	4.6

Siebert Creek Large Wood Restoration: Old Olympic Highway 101

11090.1

Overall Weighted Score

129.65

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	2.96	5.53	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	4.0	4.5	3.0	4.0	2.0	4.5	1.0	4.5	NS	4.0	3.5	5.0	4.0	3.615	4.08	14.74	31.0%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	4.0	2.5	4.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	1.0	4.5	NS	4.0	2.5	4.0	4.5	3.346	2.88	9.65	33.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	NS	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.654	2.81	10.26	27.0%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	4.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	4.0	NS	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.5	3.192	3.65	11.66	43.6%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	1.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.538	3.27	11.57	27.9%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	3.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	1.0	4.0	NS	2.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	2.038	4.12	8.39	75.2%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.5	1.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.423	4.04	13.82	30.3%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	1.0	4.0	NS	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	3.538	3.88	13.75	28.5%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.5	3.0	1.0	3.0	NS	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.923	3.62	10.57	24.0%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.5	1.0	4.5	NS	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.423	3.23	11.06	34.2%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	2.5	1.0	4.5	NS	4.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	3.038	2.85	8.65	33.9%
	Mean	2.41	3.70	3.11	3.66	3.41	2.66	3.16	1.07	3.99	1.87	3.49	3.16	3.66	3.28	**Overall Weighted Score**		**129.65**	
	CoV	12.8%	17.7%	49.3%	29.9%	38.9%	17.4%	38.8%	23.3%	20.8%	#DIV/0!	23.5%	24.3%	21.2%	43.2%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

Narrative says project should have been completed in 2018, no update given.

Old proposal. Supposed to be done when Highway 101 bridge was constructed.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

McDonald Creek Large Wood Restoration

10078.1

Overall Weighted Score

127.74

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.0
SD of all Scores:	0.7
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.5
Mean - 2 X:	1.4
Mean + 2 X:	4.5

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	1.867	2.96	5.53	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.5	3.0	4.5	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.5	1.0	4.5	NS	4.0	3.5	3.0	4.0	3.500	4.08	14.27	27.4%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	3.0	1.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	4.5	NS	4.0	2.0	4.0	4.5	3.269	2.88	9.43	35.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	1.0	5.0	NS	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.538	2.81	9.93	26.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	3.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	4.0	NS	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.5	3.038	3.65	11.10	44.3%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.5	3.0	3.5	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	1.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.423	3.27	11.19	28.5%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	2.5	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	1.0	4.0	NS	2.0	3.5	3.5	0.0	1.962	4.12	8.07	73.9%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	1.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.346	4.04	13.51	26.2%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.5	3.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	1.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.423	3.88	13.30	29.1%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.0	3.0	1.0	4.5	NS	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.385	3.62	12.24	28.4%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.0	3.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	1.0	4.5	NS	4.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	3.423	3.23	11.06	33.1%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	3.0	1.5	5.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	1.0	3.5	NS	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.846	2.85	8.10	33.9%
	Mean	2.61	2.86	2.95	3.82	3.28	3.07	3.07	1.07	4.03	1.87	3.41	3.03	3.49	3.41	**Overall Weighted Score**		**127.74**	
	CoV	17.3%	12.1%	57.0%	29.7%	38.5%	14.6%	38.9%	23.3%	19.5%	#DIV/0!	23.9%	21.2%	18.2%	40.4%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments
Narrative says project completed 2015. No update given.
Old proposal.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

McDonald Creek Barrier Removal and Channel Restoration

9039.2

Overall Weighted Score

#DIV/0!

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	#DIV/0!
SD of all Scores:	#DIV/0!
2 X SD of all Scores:	#DIV/0!
Mean - 2 X:	#DIV/0!
Mean + 2 X:	#DIV/0!

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority															#DIV/0!	2.96	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)															#DIV/0!	4.08	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
3	Addresses stock status and trends															#DIV/0!	2.88	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
4	Addresses progress toward recovery															#DIV/0!	2.81	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock															#DIV/0!	3.65	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
6	Addresses other stocks															#DIV/0!	3.27	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat															#DIV/0!	4.12	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
8	Restores formerly productive habitat															#DIV/0!	4.04	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions															#DIV/0!	3.88	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
10	Spatial Scale of Influence															#DIV/0!	3.62	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
11	Temporal Scale of Influence															#DIV/0!	3.23	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
12	Project Readiness															#DIV/0!	2.85	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
	Mean	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	**Overall Weighted Score**		**#DIV/0!**	
	CoV	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Dungeness Bay Shoreline Restoration

22003

Overall Weighted Score: 166.04

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	4.0
SD of all Scores:	0.7
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.4
Mean - 2 X:	2.6
Mean + 2 X:	5.5

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	2.96	13.74	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	1.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.923	4.08	15.99	27.9%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	1.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.000	2.88	11.54	30.2%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	4.0	3.5	5.0	4.0	2.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	NS	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.000	2.81	11.23	22.8%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	1.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	NS	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.115	3.65	15.04	25.8%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	1.5	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.923	3.27	12.83	27.9%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	2.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	NS	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.846	4.12	15.83	24.0%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	4.0	1.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	5.0	5.0	NS	5.0	2.5	4.0	4.5	3.731	4.04	15.07	30.8%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	3.0	3.5	5.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.5	5.0	5.0	4.308	3.88	16.73	18.7%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	4.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	NS	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	3.923	3.62	14.18	16.3%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	4.5	3.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	NS	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.269	3.23	13.79	18.3%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	1.5	4.5	4.0	NS	5.0	3.0	4.0	2.5	3.538	2.85	10.07	29.7%
	Mean	2.84	3.89	3.97	4.55	4.18	2.39	3.89	4.30	4.84	4.64	4.89	3.64	4.30	4.55	Overall Weighted Score		166.04	
	CoV	22.8%	10.3%	26.7%	14.4%	10.9%	45.0%	23.6%	9.4%	6.5%	#DIV/0!	6.1%	17.2%	10.6%	15.9%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

Old proposal. Didn't this happen?

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Dungeness River Large Wood Restoration

09029.2

Overall Weighted Score: **165.69**

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	4.0
SD of all Scores:	0.6
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.2
Mean - 2 X:	2.8
Mean + 2 X:	5.3

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	2.96	13.92	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	2.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	NS	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	4.308	4.08	17.56	19.3%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	NS	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.192	2.88	12.09	21.5%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	2.5	3.5	5.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.5	4.0	4.0	4.077	2.81	11.45	19.9%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	NS	4.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.269	3.65	15.60	16.3%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	4.5	4.5	NS	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.192	3.27	13.71	15.0%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	5.0	4.0	NS	5.0	4.5	5.0	0.0	2.885	4.12	11.87	62.6%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	2.0	3.5	5.0	4.5	NS	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	4.077	4.04	16.46	21.2%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	5.0	4.5	NS	5.0	3.5	5.0	4.5	4.115	3.88	15.99	17.3%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	NS	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	4.077	3.62	14.74	20.6%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	3.5	5.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	4.5	4.5	NS	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.923	3.23	12.67	24.3%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	4.0	3.0	5.0	3.5	3.0	2.0	5.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.385	2.85	9.63	29.0%
	Mean	3.18	3.93	4.10	4.31	3.93	2.81	3.27	4.81	4.52	4.70	4.85	3.93	4.43	4.14	**Overall Weighted Score**		**165.69**	
	CoV	17.0%	10.0%	29.1%	22.5%	21.3%	26.2%	38.4%	5.1%	6.8%	#DIV/0!	6.4%	11.3%	19.8%	34.3%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

More specifics about the science of how much wood is coming in & what's needed for the future would be helpful.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Dungeness River Riparian Habitat Protection

09030.1

Overall Weighted Score

166.77

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	4.1
SD of all Scores:	0.7
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.4
Mean - 2 X:	2.6
Mean + 2 X:	5.5

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	2.96	13.92	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	NS	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	NS	4.5	2.5	5.0	5.0	4.042	4.08	16.48	20.7%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	NS	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	NS	4.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.917	2.88	11.30	22.3%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	NS	4.5	5.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	5.0	2.0	4.0	4.5	3.875	2.81	10.88	25.9%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	3.0	NS	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	NS	4.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.250	3.65	15.53	17.0%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.0	NS	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	NS	4.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.000	3.27	13.08	20.6%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	NS	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	NS	4.5	2.0	4.5	4.5	4.292	4.12	17.66	23.5%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	NS	1.0	3.0	1.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	NS	4.5	2.0	4.5	4.0	3.250	4.04	13.13	41.2%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.5	NS	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	NS	4.5	1.5	4.5	5.0	4.042	3.88	15.70	26.6%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	NS	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	NS	4.0	2.0	5.0	5.0	4.042	3.62	14.61	22.0%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.5	NS	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.5	4.5	5.0	NS	3.5	2.0	5.0	5.0	4.167	3.23	13.46	25.8%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	NS	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	5.0	NS	3.5	2.0	5.0	5.0	3.875	2.85	11.03	29.7%
	Mean	2.89	4.70	4.39	4.64	3.89	3.68	3.60	4.18	4.93	4.70	4.35	2.56	4.52	4.81	**Overall Weighted Score**		**166.77**	
	CoV	21.5%	#DIV/0!	24.9%	13.9%	27.2%	15.4%	23.4%	6.6%	3.3%	#DIV/0!	10.4%	37.4%	9.5%	6.7%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Dungeness River Riparian Restoration

09031.3

Overall Weighted Score: 159.51

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	4.0
SD of all Scores:	0.7
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.5
Mean - 2 X:	2.4
Mean + 2 X:	5.6

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	2.96	13.92	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.5	4.0	NS	4.0	3.5	1.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	NS	4.5	NS	4.0	4.5	3.727	4.08	15.20	28.4%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	4.0	NS	4.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	NS	4.5	NS	4.0	5.0	3.636	2.88	10.49	32.6%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	4.0	NS	5.0	4.0	2.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	5.0	NS	4.0	5.0	4.000	2.81	11.23	25.6%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	4.0	NS	5.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	NS	4.5	NS	3.5	5.0	3.773	3.65	13.78	30.4%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.0	4.0	NS	5.0	2.5	2.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	4.5	NS	3.5	5.0	3.818	3.27	12.48	27.0%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	3.0	NS	4.0	3.5	3.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	NS	4.5	NS	5.0	0.0	3.136	4.12	12.91	55.7%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	4.0	NS	4.0	3.5	2.5	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	4.5	NS	5.0	4.0	3.864	4.04	15.60	21.7%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	4.0	NS	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	NS	4.5	NS	5.0	4.0	4.045	3.88	15.72	19.5%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	4.0	NS	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	4.5	NS	4.0	NS	5.0	4.5	3.909	3.62	14.13	21.3%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.5	3.5	NS	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.5	3.5	5.0	NS	5.0	NS	5.0	5.0	4.000	3.23	12.92	26.2%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	4.0	NS	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	5.0	NS	3.5	NS	5.0	5.0	3.909	2.85	11.13	27.3%
	Mean	2.85	3.93	4.70	4.64	3.56	2.52	2.97	3.97	4.93	4.70	4.47	4.70	4.47	4.31	Overall Weighted Score		159.51	
	CoV	23.3%	10.0%	#DIV/0!	10.4%	21.0%	40.3%	39.1%	7.5%	3.3%	#DIV/0!	9.0%	#DIV/0!	13.9%	32.7%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

What revegetation approaches will be taken? The Society of Ecological Restoration has good protocols.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Dungeness Drift Cell Conservation

09032.1

Overall Weighted Score

159.63

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.9
SD of all Scores:	0.8
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.6
Mean - 2 X:	2.2
Mean + 2 X:	5.5

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	2.96	13.74	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.5	3.692	4.08	15.05	31.5%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	4.0	5.0	3.0	3.0	1.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	NS	4.0	2.0	4.5	5.0	3.615	2.88	10.43	34.4%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	2.0	3.5	3.5	5.0	NS	5.0	3.0	4.5	4.5	3.846	2.81	10.80	24.5%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	5.0	3.5	5.0	NS	3.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.000	3.65	14.62	30.2%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	3.0	1.0	4.0	3.5	5.0	NS	3.5	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.846	3.27	12.57	29.7%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	NS	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.5	4.038	4.12	16.62	26.5%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	4.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.5	3.5	3.0	5.0	NS	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	2.769	4.04	11.18	64.9%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.5	5.0	5.0	NS	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	4.269	3.88	16.58	17.6%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	3.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	2.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.0	5.0	4.5	4.000	3.62	14.46	22.8%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	3.5	5.0	NS	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.077	3.23	13.17	22.9%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	3.0	3.0	1.5	4.0	5.0	NS	2.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.654	2.85	10.40	33.7%
	Mean	3.01	3.93	4.09	4.22	3.39	1.97	3.84	4.05	4.97	4.64	4.05	3.22	4.89	4.68	**Overall Weighted Score**		**159.63**	
	CoV	21.1%	9.7%	33.0%	30.2%	39.7%	60.2%	22.7%	17.2%	2.1%	#DIV/0!	20.9%	21.2%	4.3%	6.9%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

Conservation easements preferred regardless of who owns the land.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Mean of all Scores:	4.0
SD of all Scores:	0.7
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.5
Mean - 2 X:	2.4
Mean + 2 X:	5.5

Dungeness River Instream Flow Restoration-Irrigation Efficiencies

09091.1

Overall Weighted Score

162.13

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	2.96	13.92	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.0	4.0	3.5	5.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	3.5	5.0	5.0	4.0	NS	5.0	5.0	4.115	4.08	16.78	19.3%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	2.5	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	NS	5.0	5.0	4.000	2.88	11.54	26.5%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	2.5	4.5	5.0	4.0	5.0	NS	4.5	4.0	3.923	2.81	11.01	19.4%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	2.5	3.5	3.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	NS	5.0	5.0	4.269	3.65	15.60	21.2%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	NS	5.0	5.0	4.192	3.27	13.71	21.0%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	3.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	NS	5.0	4.0	3.038	4.12	12.50	62.5%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	4.0	3.0	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	NS	5.0	4.0	3.385	4.04	13.67	34.7%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	3.5	3.5	2.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	NS	5.0	4.5	4.000	3.88	15.54	23.9%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	NS	5.0	4.5	3.885	3.62	14.04	24.2%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.5	3.5	4.0	5.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	NS	5.0	5.0	4.154	3.23	13.42	20.5%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	3.0	1.5	4.0	4.5	3.0	3.5	NS	5.0	3.0	3.654	2.85	10.40	28.1%
	Mean	3.02	3.93	3.60	4.39	3.10	3.43	2.52	3.64	4.93	4.72	4.56	4.70	4.93	4.47	**Overall Weighted Score**		**162.13**	
	CoV	20.3%	10.0%	37.8%	20.2%	38.3%	19.4%	45.4%	17.5%	3.3%	13.1%	11.9%	#DIV/0!	3.3%	13.9%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

What are impacts? Loss of amphibians/aquatic veg. + animals in ditches use by waterfowl loss of groundwater recharge. How does this really translate? When water flows are very low in late summer irrigators face restrictions that won't change. Low flow thresholds are likely to occur most summers - will piping really save about 7cfs? when draws will be restricted anyway? Of course the water "savings" will be through the whole irrigation season. Will the "saved" water stay in the river or used for other commercial/residential uses?

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Dungeness River Instream Flow Restoration-Storage

12098.2

Overall Weighted Score

153.90

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.8
SD of all Scores:	0.8
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.7
Mean - 2 X:	2.1
Mean + 2 X:	5.6

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	2.96	13.92	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	4.0	3.5	5.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	NS	5.0	4.5	3.958	4.08	16.14	24.4%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	2.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	NS	5.0	4.5	3.917	2.88	11.30	27.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.0	3.5	2.5	3.5	5.0	4.0	NS	NS	5.0	4.5	3.625	2.81	10.18	25.7%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	NS	5.0	5.0	4.083	3.65	14.92	26.0%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	NS	NS	5.0	5.0	3.917	3.27	12.80	29.2%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	3.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	NS	5.0	4.0	3.042	4.12	12.52	66.7%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.5	2.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	NS	NS	5.0	4.0	3.250	4.04	13.13	40.2%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	1.0	3.5	2.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	NS	5.0	4.0	3.708	3.88	14.41	34.7%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.0	5.0	3.5	NS	NS	5.0	4.5	3.667	3.62	13.26	22.8%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.5	3.5	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	5.0	5.0	NS	NS	5.0	5.0	4.000	3.23	12.92	19.9%
12	Project Readiness	3.0	4.0	2.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	NS	NS	2.5	3.0	2.958	2.85	8.42	35.6%
	Mean	2.97	3.93	3.43	4.31	2.27	3.06	2.60	3.60	4.89	4.60	4.70	4.70	4.77	4.39	**Overall Weighted Score**		**153.90**	
	CoV	21.2%	10.0%	41.5%	22.5%	51.8%	29.3%	43.7%	16.4%	6.0%	15.3%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	15.1%	13.1%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

If reservoir size is reduced, is project still worth the investment? Explain prohibitions (if any) from using conserved water for other uses, ie.. commerical + residential. Describe impacts, such as reduction/loss and proposed mitigation of Corylus cornuta, Ribes lobbii, Heuchera chlorautha at proposed res. site. If water conservation was really important then new residential development would be capped.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration

9092.2

Overall Weighted Score

174.23

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	4.3
SD of all Scores:	0.5
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.1
Mean - 2 X:	3.1
Mean + 2 X:	5.4

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	4.699	2.96	13.92	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	NS	NS	5.0	5.0	4.409	4.08	17.98	15.9%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	NS	NS	5.0	5.0	4.273	2.88	12.33	19.1%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	NS	NS	5.0	5.0	4.227	2.81	11.87	17.0%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	NS	NS	NS	5.0	5.0	4.318	3.65	15.78	18.1%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	NS	NS	5.0	5.0	4.182	3.27	13.67	18.7%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	3.0	3.0	1.0	4.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	4.0	5.0	NS	NS	NS	5.0	4.0	3.636	4.12	14.97	30.2%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	NS	NS	5.0	5.0	4.409	4.04	17.81	16.7%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	3.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	NS	NS	5.0	5.0	4.273	3.88	16.60	16.0%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	NS	NS	5.0	5.0	4.273	3.62	15.45	16.0%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	3.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	NS	NS	NS	5.0	5.0	4.227	3.23	13.66	16.2%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	4.0	3.5	1.0	4.0	3.0	2.5	4.0	5.0	NS	NS	NS	5.0	5.0	3.591	2.85	10.22	35.1%
	Mean	3.14	3.93	4.31	4.47	4.22	3.56	3.68	4.14	4.97	4.70	4.70	4.70	4.97	4.89	**Overall Weighted Score**		**174.23**	
	CoV	17.0%	10.0%	26.0%	25.9%	9.8%	16.2%	14.3%	8.1%	1.7%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	1.7%	6.0%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

What portions "completed" What is remaining?

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Sequim Bay Shoreline Restoration

14107

Overall Weighted Score

147.93

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.7
SD of all Scores:	0.8
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.7
Mean - 2 X:	2.0
Mean + 2 X:	5.4

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	2.96	13.74	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	3.0	NS	2.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.0	5.0	4.5	3.417	4.08	13.93	35.8%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	3.5	NS	3.0	2.0	2.0	3.5	3.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.458	2.88	9.98	31.7%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	3.0	3.5	NS	4.0	2.0	3.0	3.5	1.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.417	2.81	9.59	33.5%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	3.0	NS	5.0	2.0	2.0	4.5	3.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.667	3.65	13.40	33.1%
6	Addresses other stocks	3.0	3.5	NS	5.0	2.0	2.0	3.5	3.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.667	3.27	11.99	31.0%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	3.0	NS	1.0	2.0	2.5	4.5	3.0	5.0	NS	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.375	4.12	13.89	36.9%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	3.0	3.5	NS	3.0	1.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.5	4.5	4.0	3.583	4.04	14.47	30.2%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.5	3.0	NS	4.0	1.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.625	3.88	14.08	31.2%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	NS	4.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	4.5	NS	5.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	3.500	3.62	12.65	20.2%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	NS	5.0	3.0	2.5	4.0	4.0	4.5	NS	5.0	3.0	4.5	5.0	3.833	3.23	12.38	25.7%
12	Project Readiness	2.5	4.0	NS	5.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	NS	3.0	3.0	3.5	1.0	2.750	2.85	7.83	47.5%
	Mean	2.84	3.39	4.64	3.80	2.05	2.72	3.80	3.14	4.72	4.64	4.80	3.34	4.09	4.22	**Overall Weighted Score**		**147.93**	
	CoV	21.6%	15.1%	#DIV/0!	34.5%	56.7%	27.7%	13.6%	31.1%	12.3%	#DIV/0!	12.0%	16.9%	12.9%	26.1%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

What portions "completed" What is remaining?

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

North Sequim Bay Drift Cell Conservation Project

09093

Overall Weighted Score

153.18

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	3.7
SD of all Scores:	0.8
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.6
Mean - 2 X:	2.1
Mean + 2 X:	5.4

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	4.639	2.96	13.74	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.5	3.0	3.5	1.0	3.0	1.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.385	4.08	13.80	41.4%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	3.5	5.0	2.0	3.0	1.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	3.538	2.88	10.21	36.2%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	3.5	3.5	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.5	2.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	3.231	2.81	9.07	31.3%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.808	3.65	13.91	34.6%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	3.0	1.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.0	3.0	5.0	3.577	3.27	11.69	35.1%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.5	3.0	4.5	1.0	5.0	3.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	NS	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.962	4.12	16.30	31.5%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	3.5	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	3.5	3.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.5	5.0	3.0	2.923	4.04	11.80	56.7%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	4.038	3.88	15.69	22.3%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	NS	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	3.923	3.62	14.18	21.4%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	2.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	NS	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.000	3.23	12.92	27.0%
12	Project Readiness	2.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	5.0	NS	3.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.462	2.85	9.85	28.6%
	Mean	2.55	3.39	3.93	3.47	3.39	2.18	3.89	3.39	4.97	4.64	4.84	3.47	4.14	4.59	**Overall Weighted Score**		**153.18**	
	CoV	27.2%	15.1%	34.4%	46.0%	39.7%	51.5%	19.4%	21.6%	2.1%	#DIV/0!	9.0%	16.3%	24.4%	13.8%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

Project proposal outlines a possible threat that could be addressed by regulation.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Chicken Coop Road Culvert Replacement Project

11094

Overall Weighted Score

123.37

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

Mean of all Scores:	2.7
SD of all Scores:	0.7
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.4
Mean - 2 X:	1.3
Mean + 2 X:	4.2

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	1.566	2.96	4.64	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	2.0	3.0	NS	1.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	4.5	NS	2.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.042	4.08	12.40	38.7%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	2.5	3.5	NS	5.0	3.0	2.5	2.0	3.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	3.292	2.88	9.50	25.5%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	2.5	3.5	NS	5.0	3.0	3.5	2.0	2.0	4.0	NS	3.5	3.0	4.0	4.5	3.375	2.81	9.48	27.6%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	2.5	3.0	NS	0.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.5	NS	4.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	2.792	3.65	10.20	42.1%
6	Addresses other stocks	2.0	3.5	NS	5.0	3.0	3.0	3.5	2.0	3.5	NS	4.0	3.0	4.0	1.0	3.125	3.27	10.22	34.2%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	2.0	3.0	NS	2.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.5	3.0	0.0	2.375	4.12	9.77	56.2%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	2.5	3.5	NS	2.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.0	4.0	NS	4.0	3.5	3.0	1.0	2.958	4.04	11.95	29.2%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	2.5	3.0	NS	5.0	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.0	4.0	NS	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	3.375	3.88	13.11	25.4%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	2.5	3.5	NS	4.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	NS	4.0	3.5	4.0	1.5	3.125	3.62	11.30	24.7%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	3.0	3.0	NS	4.0	2.0	2.5	3.5	3.0	5.0	NS	5.0	3.5	5.0	3.0	3.542	3.23	11.44	28.5%
12	Project Readiness	2.0	4.0	NS	5.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	NS	3.5	4.0	4.0	2.0	3.292	2.85	9.37	32.0%
	Mean	2.30	3.17	1.57	3.30	2.59	2.84	2.63	2.55	3.71	1.57	3.63	3.30	3.80	2.05	**Overall Weighted Score**		**123.37**	
	CoV	16.8%	18.9%	#DIV/0!	56.4%	39.1%	21.2%	27.9%	22.4%	24.3%	#DIV/0!	26.0%	20.4%	24.4%	65.3%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Mean of all Scores:	3.8
SD of all Scores:	0.7
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.4
Mean - 2 X:	2.4
Mean + 2 X:	5.2

Monitoring Dungeness Floodplain Changes

22005

Overall Weighted Score

126.31

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Advances robust harvestable stocks	2.5	4.0	4.5	3.0	3.5	NS	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	NS	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.955	3.47	13.73	19.1%
2	Advances implementation of recovery plans	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	NS	3.5	5.0	4.5	NS	NS	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.09	4.03	16.48	15.3%
3	Advances habitat protection and restoration	3.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	3.5	NS	3.5	5.0	5.0	NS	NS	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.18	4.42	18.47	16.3%
4	Advances recovery of ecosystem function	3.5	4.0	4.5	2.0	3.5	NS	3.5	5.0	5.0	NS	NS	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.95	4.31	17.03	21.5%
5	Advances ecosystem awareness	2.5	3.0	4.5	5.0	3.0	NS	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	NS	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.05	2.78	11.24	21.7%
6	Advances integration	3.0	3.5	3.5	1.0	3.0	NS	3.0	5.0	5.0	NS	NS	4.0	1.0	0.0	2.91	2.28	6.63	55.9%
7	Fulfills requirements of external agencies	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	2.5	NS	2.0	4.5	5.0	NS	NS	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.64	2.31	8.38	25.4%
8	Advances multi-agency funding strategy	3.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	2.5	NS	4.0	4.5	5.0	NS	NS	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.00	2.03	8.11	19.4%
9	Spatial scale of influence	2.5	3.5	4.0	3.0	2.5	NS	4.0	5.0	5.0	NS	NS	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.82	3.56	13.58	22.9%
10	Temporal scale of influence	2.5	3.5	5.0	3.0	2.0	NS	3.5	4.5	5.0	NS	NS	4.5	1.0	5.0	3.59	3.53	12.67	37.8%
	Mean	2.85	3.65	4.25	3.40	2.95		3.50	4.85	4.95			4.35	3.50	3.75	**Overall Weighted Score**		**126.31**	
	CoV	11.8%	9.2%	10.0%	39.7%	18.7%	#DIV/0!	17.8%	5.0%	3.2%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	5.6%	38.7%	36.2%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

The project description was poorly written. If the proponent cannot communicate clearly in writing a proposal they are unlikely to adequately do so when reporting the results of the proposed study. The scientist(s) conducting the monitoring were not identified and no credentials or experience cited.

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Mean of all Scores:	3.4
SD of all Scores:	0.6
2 X SD of all Scores:	1.2
Mean - 2 X:	2.1
Mean + 2 X:	4.7

Clallam Watertype Inventory and Assessment

09053

Overall Weighted Score

114.76

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Advances robust harvestable stocks	2.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	3.0	NS	3.5	4.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	0.0	2.692	3.47	9.35	50.6%
2	Advances implementation of recovery plans	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	NS	4.0	4.0	4.5	5.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	3.5	3.42	4.03	13.79	26.6%
3	Advances habitat protection and restoration	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	NS	3.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	4.0	3.81	4.42	16.82	23.7%
4	Advances recovery of ecosystem function	2.5	3.0	4.0	5.0	2.5	NS	4.0	5.0	4.5	2.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.77	4.31	16.23	25.8%
5	Advances ecosystem awareness	2.0	3.0	5.0	5.0	3.5	NS	3.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	2.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.04	2.78	11.22	27.9%
6	Advances integration	2.0	2.5	3.5	1.0	2.5	NS	2.0	5.0	4.0	2.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	2.23	2.28	5.08	75.8%
7	Fulfills requirements of external agencies	3.0	3.5	4.0	5.0	2.5	NS	2.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	4.00	2.31	9.22	25.0%
8	Advances multi-agency funding strategy	3.0	3.0	2.0	5.0	1.0	NS	3.5	4.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	4.5	0.0	2.0	2.54	2.03	5.15	62.0%
9	Spatial scale of influence	2.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	NS	4.0	4.0	5.0	3.0	2.0	4.5	3.0	3.5	3.58	3.56	12.72	23.4%
10	Temporal scale of influence	3.5	3.0	5.0	4.0	3.5	NS	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	4.31	3.53	15.20	16.1%
	Mean	2.70	3.00	3.85	4.10	2.90		3.45	4.50	3.75	3.70	2.70	4.30	2.65	3.10	**Overall Weighted Score**		**114.76**	
	CoV	21.7%	7.9%	22.1%	31.4%	31.3%	#DIV/0!	24.1%	11.7%	53.4%	38.3%	46.4%	6.0%	66.6%	58.8%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

Comments

N. Olympic LE Workplan Capital WORK PLAN Project Criteria									Date:
ID	Criteria for Ranking	Criteria Narrative	0	1	2	3	4	5	Mean Weight
1	Watershed Priority	What is the watershed priority score for this proposal? This criterion is mandated by regulation. The score is calculated based on data concerning historical and current productivity and stock diversity of the NOPLE watersheds. This score is added by Lead Entity staff for the watershed(s) covered by the proposed project.	Watershed priority scores have been calculated for each NOPLE watershed. The calculation produced a numerical score based on difference between historical and current watershed productivity plus historical number of stock and stock elements. See separate Watershed Priority Table for data and more details on the calculation.						2.96
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	How well does the proposed work address the limiting factor(s) pertinent to the watershed and stock?	Does not mention or address a limiting factor at all	Mentions a limiting factor, but addresses only vaguely	Indirectly addresses a limiting factor but only minimally	Indirectly addresses a limiting factor, but only moderately, OR Directly addresses limiting factor, but only minimally	Addresses a limiting factor directly and moderately	Addresses a limiting factor directly and substantially	4.08
3	Addresses stock status and trends	How well does the proposed work address the status and trends of the stock(s) of interest?	Stock fully recovered; no more work needed	Addresses recovered stock	Addresses rebuilding stock	Addresses depressed stock that is increasing	Addresses depressed stock that is decreasing	Addresses critical stock	2.88
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	To what extent does the watershed or nearshore area need further habitat protection and/or restoration efforts?	Recovery completed; needs no further efforts to complete recovery	Recovery in progress; needs just a little protection and/or restoration effort to complete recovery	Recovery in progress; needs some protection and/or restoration effort to complete recovery	Recovery in progress; needs moderate protection and/or restoration effort to complete recovery	Recovery in progress; needs more than moderate protection and/or restoration effort to complete recovery	Recovery in progress; needs substantial or major protection and/or restoration effort to complete recovery	2.81
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	To what extent does the project benefit listed stocks?	Does not mention or address a listed stock at all	Mentions listed stock, but addresses only vaguely	Indirectly addresses listed stock and only minimally	Indirectly addresses listed stock moderately OR Directly addresses listed stock only minimally	Directly and moderately addresses listed stock	Directly and substantially addresses listed stock	3.65
6	Addresses other stocks	To what extent does the project benefit non-listed stocks?	Does not mention or address a non-listed stock at all	Mentions non-listed stock, but addresses only vaguely	Indirectly addresses non-listed stock and only minimally	Indirectly addresses non-listed stock moderately OR Directly addresses non-listed stock only minimally	Directly and moderately addresses non-listed stock	Directly and substantially addresses non-listed stock	3.27
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	How well does the proposed work and instrument protect fish habitat?	Does not mention or address criterion at all; benefits not discernible	Mentions habitat protections but addresses criterion only vaguely; benefits uncertain at best	Addresses criterion only indirectly with only minimal benefits	Addresses criterion indirectly with moderate benefits OR addresses criterion directly with only minimal benefits	Addresses criterion directly with moderate benefits	Addresses criterion directly with substantial benefits	4.12
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	How well does the project restore formerly productive habitat?	Does not mention or address criterion at all; benefits not discernible	Mentions habitat restoration but addresses criterion only vaguely; benefits uncertain at best	Addresses criterion only indirectly with only minimal benefits	Addresses criterion indirectly with moderate benefits OR addresses criterion directly with only minimal benefits	Addresses criterion directly with moderate benefits	Addresses criterion directly with substantial benefits	4.04
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	How well does the project restore and maintain ecosystem functions?	Does not mention or address criterion at all; benefits not discernible	Mentions ecosystem restoration but addresses criterion only vaguely; benefits uncertain at best	Addresses criterion only indirectly with only minimal benefits	Addresses criterion indirectly with moderate benefits OR addresses criterion directly with only minimal benefits	Addresses criterion directly with moderate benefits	Addresses criterion directly with substantial benefits	3.88
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	How far does the spatial scale of influence extend through a watershed or nearshore area?	Potential spatial scale of influence not mentioned or addressed; scale of benefits not discernible	Potential scale of influence minimal; Benefits local (limited to project area) at most and uncertain	Potential scale of influence slight; scale of benefits more than local and discernible	Potential scale of influence over a moderate portion of a watershed or nearshore area; benefits moderate and spread beyond the project area through part of the system	Potential scale of influence over a majority of a watershed or nearshore area; benefits more than moderate and spread through much of the system	Potential scale of influence over a watershed or nearshore area; benefits substantial and spread through essentially all of the system	3.62
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	How far does the temporal scale of influence extend through a watershed or nearshore area?	Potential temporal scale of influence not mentioned or addressed; scale of benefits not discernible	Potential scale of influence minimal; Benefits seasonal at most and uncertain	Potential scale of influence slight; scale of benefits more than seasonal but less than 1 year and discernible	Potential scale of influence of moderate duration; benefits moderate and endure for 2 to 4 years	Potential scale of influence of more than moderate duration; benefits moderate and endure for 5 to 10 years	Potential scale of influence of long-term to indefinite duration; benefits substantial and endure beyond 10 years	3.23
12	Project Readiness	How ready is the project to start now, if funded?	Not ready for foreseeable future; Time to overcome known obstacles and fulfill requirements is not determined but not in immediate future	Not ready for some years; time to overcome known obstacles and fulfill requirements is greater than 5 years	Ready within 3 or 4 years; Remaining obstacles and requirements can be resolved over 3 to 4 years	Ready within 2 years; remaining obstacles and requirements can be resolved within 2 years	Ready next year; remaining obstacles and requirements can be resolved within 1 year	Ready to start now given award of funds; no remaining obstacles or requirements; a ready-to-go project	2.85

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Mean of all Scores:	5.00
SD of all Scores:	0.00
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.00
Mean - 2 X:	5.00
Mean + 2 X:	5.00

Capital Project

MAXIMUM POSSIBLE SCORE

Overall Weighted Score

206.96

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Watershed Priority	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000	2.96	14.81	0.0%
2	Addresses limiting factor(s)	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.08	20.40	0.0%
3	Addresses stock status and trends	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.88	14.40	0.0%
4	Addresses progress toward recovery	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.81	14.05	0.0%
5	Addresses an ESA-listed stock	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.65	18.25	0.0%
6	Addresses other stocks	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.27	16.35	0.0%
7	Protects high-quality fish habitat	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.12	20.60	0.0%
8	Restores formerly productive habitat	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.04	20.20	0.0%
9	Supports restoration and maintenance of ecosystem functions	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.88	19.40	0.0%
10	Spatial Scale of Influence	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.62	18.10	0.0%
11	Temporal Scale of Influence	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.23	16.15	0.0%
12	Project Readiness	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.85	14.25	0.0%
	Mean	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	**Overall Weighted Score**		**206.96**	
	CoV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity (NOPLE) for Salmon
Criteria & Weights for Scoring and Ranking NON-Capital Projects

Final wording and weights from Fall 2013 Retreat. New or modified wording in BOLDFACE Italics

The scale for criterion mean weight is from 1 to 5, with 5 being highest.

Criteria 1 through 9 inclusive are used to assess Work Plan Narratives for NON-Capital Projects.

All Criteria are used to assess Project Proposals for Current Year's funding.

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Criteria Narratives	Mean Weight
1	**Advances robust harvestable stocks**	This criterion derives from NOPLE's GOAL to achieve harvestable fish stocks. To what extent does the proposed work lead to progress towards harvestable fish stocks?	**3.23**
2	**Advances implementation of recovery plan(s)**	This criterion derives from NOPLE's GOAL to implement recovery plans. To what extent does the proposed work lead to progress in the implementation of recovery plan(s)?	**3.73**
3	**Advances habitat protection and restoration**	This criterion derives from NOPLE's GOAL to protect and restore salmon habitat. To what extent does the proposed work lead to progress in protecting and/or restoring salmon habitat?	**4.05**
4	**Advances recovery of ecosystem function**	This criterion derives from NOPLE's GOAL to support recovery and restoration of ecosystem function. To what extent does the proposed work lead to progress in the recovery and restoration of ecosystem function(s)?	**4.21**

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Criteria Narratives	Mean Weight
5	**Advances ecosystem awareness**	This criterion derives from NOPLE's GOAL to instill ecosystem awareness. To what extent does the proposed work increase the ecosystem awareness and its application? To what extent does the proposed work address and overcome obstacles to awareness?	**2.81**
6	**Advances integration**	This criterion derives from NOPLE's objective of advancing the integrations of the four H's: Habitat, Harvest, Hatcheries, and Hydropower. To what extent does the proposed work acknowledge the influence of the other H's on the work and the potential influence of the work on the other H's?	**2.05**
7	**Fulfills requirements of external agencies**	This criterion derives from NOPLE's objective to network with other entities and agencies. To what extent does the proposed work recognize and coordinate with the efforts and requirements of agencies? To what extent does the proposed work contribute to the knowledge and databases at the regional and state levels?	**1.71**
8	**Advances multi-agency funding strategy**	This criterion derives from NOPLE's objective of diversifying the funding base. To what extent will the proposed work be eligible and competitive for Non-SRFB funding?	**1.81**
9	**Has large spatial-temporal scale of effects**	This criterion derives from NOPLE's objective to support non-capital projects that benefit salmon recovery on a NOPLE-wide or regional basis. To what extent does the proposed work aid salmon recovery to a broad degree in time and space?	**3.38**

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Criteria Narratives	Mean Weight
10	**Likelihood of success based on proposer's past success in implementation**	This criterion is a standard one in project selection and management. What is the probability that the project sponsor will succeed with the proposed work given their previous experience and current expertise and capability with the type of work proposed?	**1.92**
11	**Likelihood of success based on approach**	This criterion is a standard one in project selection and management. Is the approach appropriate to the work proposed? What is the probability of success of the proposed approach?	**3.10**
12	**Reasonableness of cost and budget**	This criterion is a standard one in project selection and management. Do the scope of work, overall estimated cost, and budget align? Are the budget items and costs reasonable given the scope of work?	**2.69**

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Mean of all Scores:	5.00
SD of all Scores:	0.00
2 X SD of all Scores:	0.00
Mean - 2 X:	5.00
Mean + 2 X:	5.00

Non Capital Project

MAXIMUM POSSIBLE SCORE

Overall Weighted Score

163.47

NS = No Score Given

CoV = Coefficient of Variation (Standard deviation/Mean as %)

ID	Criteria for Ranking	Score 0 to 5 with 5 being best														Mean Score	Weight	Weighted Mean Score	CoV (%)
		Scorer 1	Scorer 2	Scorer 3	Scorer 4	Scorer 5	Scorer 6	Scorer 7	Scorer 8	Scorer 9	Scorer 10	Scorer 11	Scorer 12	Scorer 13	Scorer 14				
1	Advances robust harvestable stocks	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**3.5**	17.36	0.0%
2	Advances implementation of recovery plans	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**4.0**	20.14	0.0%
3	Advances habitat protection and restoration	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**4.4**	22.08	0.0%
4	Advances recovery of ecosystem function	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**4.3**	21.53	0.0%
5	Advances ecosystem awareness	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**2.8**	13.89	0.0%
6	Advances integration	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**2.3**	11.39	0.0%
7	Fulfills requirements of external agencies	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**2.3**	11.53	0.0%
8	Advances multi-agency funding strategy	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**2.0**	10.14	0.0%
9	Spatial scale of influence	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**3.6**	17.78	0.0%
10	Temporal scale of influence	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**3.5**	17.64	0.0%
	Mean	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	**Overall Weighted Score**		**163.47**	
	CoV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
	Outside 2 Standard Deviations?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				

N. Olympic LE Work Plan Proposals

Date:

Final Watershed Priorities Sorted by Standardized Score

WRIA	System	Overall Standardized Score (Max 5)
18	Elwha River	5.000
18	Dungeness River	4.699
17 + 18 + 19	Nearshore	4.639
18	Morse Creek	4.096
19	Pysht River	3.494
19	Hoko River	3.494
19	Lyre River	3.193
19	Clallam River	2.861
19	Sekiu River	2.831
19	Sail River	2.530
18	Ennis Creek	2.530
19	Salt Creek	2.530
19	Deep Creek	2.199
19	Colville Creek	1.898
17	Jimmycomelately Creek	1.867
19	East Twin River	1.867
19	West Twin River	1.867
18	McDonald Creek	1.867
18	Siebert Creek	1.867
17	Chicken Coop Creek	1.566
17	Dean Creek	1.566
17	Johnson Creek	1.566
19	Butler Creek (19.0112)	1.566
19	Field Creek	1.566
19	Jim Creek	1.566

WRIA	System	Overall Standardized Score (Max 5)
19	Joe Creek	1.566
19	Murdock Creek	1.566
18	Peabody Creek	1.566
18	Lees Creek	1.566
18	Meadowbrook Creek	1.566
18	Tumwater Creek	1.566
18	Valley Creek	1.566
18	Bell Creek	0.904
18	Cooper Creek (18.0017)	0.904
18	Cassalery Creek	0.904
19	Olsen Creek	0.904
18	Bagley Creek	0.904
18	Dry Creek	0.904
18	Gierin Creek	0.904