

Puget Sound Steelhead Wild Salmonid Management Zone (WSMZ) Candidate Ranking

PSHAAC- 2-20-2012		PSHAAC Concensus WSMZ Candidates		PSHAAC Geo-region WSMZ Ranking														Comments	
Geo-region	Population	WSMZ Candidate?	WSMZ Qualifiers	PSHAAG Member ID													Geo-region Rank		
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Total		(1=highest WSMZ candidate)
North Sound	Nooksack Winter	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	SF Nooksack Summer	Yes	Would not replace other, more appropriate candidates. Based on an assessment of current viability.	7	10	2	9	9	5	7	10							59	8
	Samish Winter	Yes	None	3	6.5	7	10	10	6	8	6							57	7
	Skagit S/W	Yes	Would require discontinuation of the remaining Marblemount Hatchery STHD Program. Non-concurrence from F. Urabeck	1.5	2	9	1	1	9	2	2							28	2
	Baker S/W	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Sauk S/W	Yes	None	1.5	1	1	2	2	1	1	1							11	1
	Stillaguamish Winter	Yes[1]	Would require the discontinuation of the Whitehorse hatchery STHD Programs- Winter and Summer.	9.5	3	8	6	6	8	6	8							55	6
	Deer Creek Summer	Yes	Would require either the discontinuation of the Whitehorse hatchery STHD Programs- Winter and Summer, or the potential use of a weir to remove hatchery strays from Deer Creek.	7	5	5	3	3	6	4	3							36	4
	Canyon Creek Summer	Yes	After looking at the location, which is an upper system tributary to the South Fork Stilly, I feel that this could be managed as a WSMZ, while still operating Whitehorse, in the N. Fork. Thoughts?	7	9	6	7	7	7	9	9							61	9
	Snoh/Sky Winter	Yes[2]	Would require the discontinuation of the Reiter and Wallace hatchery STHD programs.	9.5	8	10	8	8	10	10	7							71	10
	Pilchuck Winter	Yes	None	5	4	3	8	8	4	5	4							41	5
	Snoqualmie Winter	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	NF Skykomish Summer	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tolt Summer	Yes	None	4	6.5	4	4	4	2	3	5							33	3	
South Central	Lk. Wash. Winter	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Cedar	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Green	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Puyallup/Carbon Winter	Yes	None	2.5	3	3	3	3	3	3	3						24	3	
	White Winter	Yes[3]	None	2.5	2	2	2	2	2	2	2						17	2	
	Nisqually	Yes	None	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	1						12	1	
	South Sound Tribs.	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Olympic	East Kitsap Winter	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Skokomish Winter	Yes <sup>3</sup>	None	2	5	3	3	3	4	3	5						28	3	
	East-Hood Canal Winter	Yes <sup>3</sup>	None	4	4	2	5	5	2	4	4						30	4	
	West Hood Canal Winter	Yes <sup>3</sup>	None	3	2	1	2	2	2	1	2						15	1	
	Sequim Winter	Yes	None	5.5	6	5	6	6	5	6	6						46	6	
	Dungeness Winter	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Strait Independent Winter	Yes	None	5.5	3	4	4	4	3	5	3						32	5	
Elwha	Yes <sup>3</sup>	Reiterated desire to have tribal Chambers program discontinued.	1	1	6	1	1	6	2	1						19	2		

[1] Associated with N.F. Stillaguamish including Deer Creek

[2] Proposal for entire Skykomish system for both winter and summer races

[3] Formalize once integrated program sunsets.

<sup>4</sup> From the Puget Sound Steelhead TRT draft DIP paper:

**31. Strait of Juan de Fuca Independent Tributary Winter-Run Steelhead**

This population consists of steelhead spawning in small independent tributaries to the Strait of Juan de Fuca between the Dungeness and Elwha Rivers, including: Ennis, White, collectively, the creeks cover a 410 km2 watershed. Sports catch (punch card) data for Morse, Siebert, and McDonald Creeks indicate that well over a 100 "wild" fish were caught annually from the 1950s and 1960s, with a peak catch of 258 in 1958 (WDG undated(b)). The IP-based estimate for capacity is 508 fish, with the most recent (2006/2007) abundance estimate, 181 steelhead, based on index counts in just Morse and McDonald creeks. The headwaters of these creeks extend into the Olympic Mountains and flows can be considerable, especially following lowland rain events (Haring 1999).

The TRT concluded that it was unlikely that any one of the streams within this DIP was large enough persist as a DIP, and in any case their proximity to one another, in addition to their environmental similarity, limited the likelihood of their demographic independence. Distances between streams in this DIP and the Dungeness and Elwha rivers to the East and West, respectively, were at their closest less than 20 km. The TRT concluded that while these distances were somewhat less than desired for a DIP, ecological differences between the smaller creeks and larger river systems would provide an additional isolating mechanism.