

Table 43. Summary and Results of Comprehensive Prioritization of Restoration and Protection Actions¹

Restoration Tier	Sub-watershed	Restoration Ratings			Protection Ratings		
		Stream Restoration Rating	Wetland Restoration Rating	Forest Restoration Rating ²	Stream Protection Rating	Wetland Protection Rating	Forest Protection Rating ²
Tier 1 Sub-watersheds for Restoration and Protection	Lower Padden Creek	Highest	Highest	Highest	Lower	Lower	
	Baker Creek Tributary	Highest	Lower		Lower	High	
	Lower Baker Creek	High	Moderate-High		Lower	Moderate	
	Lower Spring Creek	Moderate	High		High	Lower	
	Chuckanut Creek	Lower	Lower		Highest	Highest	Highest
	Upper Whatcom Creek	Lower	Lower		Highest	Highest	Highest
	Cemetery Creek	Moderate	Lower		High	Highest	
	Bear Creek	Moderate	Lower		Moderate	High	
	Lower Squalicum Creek	Moderate	Lower	Highest	Moderate	High	Highest
Tier 2 Sub-watersheds for Restoration and Protection	Lower Toad Creek	High	Highest		High	Lower	
	Upper Padden Creek	Lower	High		Highest	Moderate-Low	
	Little Squalicum Creek	Highest	Lowest		Lower	Lowest	
	Hannah Creek	High	Lowest		High	Lowest	
	Lost Creek	High	High-Moderate		Lower	High	
	Fort Bellingham	Moderate	High		Moderate	High	
	Silver Creek Tributary #1	Moderate	Moderate		Moderate	Moderate	
	Lake Padden	Lower	Moderate		Moderate	Moderate	
	Spokane Creek	Lower	Lower		High	Lower	
	Connelly Creek	Lowest	Highest		Lowest	Highest	
	Lincoln Creek	Lowest	Highest		Lowest	Highest	
	Lower Whatcom Creek	Lowest	Lowest		Lowest	Lowest	
	Silver Creek Tributary #2	Lowest	Moderate		Lowest	Moderate	
	Fever Creek	Lowest	High		Lowest	High	
Tier 3 Sub-watersheds for Restoration and Protection ¹	North Lower Squalicum	No Streams	Lowest ³		No Streams	Lowest ³	
	South Bellingham	No Streams	Lowest ³		No Streams	Lowest ³	
	Alderwood Creek	Lowest ³	Lowest ³		Lowest ³	Lowest ³	
	Central Bellingham	No Streams	Lowest ³		No Streams	Lowest ³	
	Squalicum Harbor	No Streams	Lowest ³		No Streams	Lowest ³	

¹ Some of the Restoration Assessment results appear to conflict with the prioritized restoration rankings presented in CGS (2013). This can be explained based on the exclusion of marine nearshore habitat in the assessment. Although a sub-watershed may rank low for wetland, forest, or riverine restoration many of these sub-watersheds could benefit from nearshore restoration.

² Only the Tier 1 forest protection priorities are shown in the table. See Table B-8 in Attachment B for complete list of forest block prioritization.

³ Classified as Tier 3 during the Secondary Prioritization. These sub-watersheds were evaluated as having an extremely low chance of successful restoration, due to very low existing habitat functions for both riverine and wetland Habitat Groups or the lack of multiple Habitat Groups.