



YAKIMA BASIN  
FISH AND WILDLIFE  
RECOVERY BOARD

## ***DRAFT* AGENDA**

### **Board of Directors Meeting**

**August 18, 2011**

**1:00 to 2:00 pm Pre-meeting Tour at the Prosser Hatchery, 990 Grande Road, Prosser**

**2 pm to 4 pm Board Meeting (LOCATION TO BE CONFIRMED)**

- |  |        |
|--|--------|
| 1) Welcome, Introductions                                  | 5 min  |
| 2) Lamprey Presentation                                    | 20 min |
| 3) Review of Agenda & 7/6/11 Minutes*                      | 5 min  |
| 4) Board Correspondence and Announcements                  | 15 min |
| <i>SRFB Updates: New members, Sept 1<sup>st</sup> tour</i> |        |
| <i>PCSRF Status</i>  |        |
| <i>NOAA Status Review</i>                                  |        |
| <i>Columbia River Biological Opinion update</i>            |        |
| 5) SRFB project list review and approval*                  | 40 min |
| 6) Budget Corrections*                                     | 10 min |
| 7) Board Logistics   | 15 min |
| <i>October meeting date and agenda</i>                     |        |
| <i>Website Update</i>                                      |        |
| <i>Audit update</i>  |        |
| <i>YRBWEP Committee Participation</i>                      |        |
| 8) Financial Reports                                       | 5 min  |
| 9) Public Comment  | 5 min  |

**\*Decision Item**

## **August 18<sup>th</sup>, 2011 YBFWRB MEETING OVERVIEW**

### **Pre-meeting Tour**

We'll meet at 1 pm for a tour of the Yakima/Klickitat Fisheries Program Prosser hatchery facility, and then head to the meeting room at 2 pm.

### **1 & 2) INTRODUCTION AND LAMPREY PRESENTATION**

We'll start the meeting with introductions and a presentation on the Yakama Nation's lamprey recovery program.

### **3) REVIEW OF AGENDA AND MINUTES      ACTION ITEM**

We'll review and approve the agenda and the minutes of our last meeting. Both are attached.

### **4) ANNOUNCEMENTS & CORRESPONDENCE**

#### ***A) SRFB Tour***

The morning of Friday, September 1<sup>st</sup>, Board staff will lead a tour of SRFB projects in the Cle Elum area for the members of the SRFB and senior RCO staff. Board members are encouraged to attend. A draft itinerary is attached.

#### ***B) New SRFB & NPCC Members***

The Governor has appointed Kitsap County Commissioner Josh Brown and State Senator Phil Rockefeller to fill the two vacancies on the state's Salmon Recovery Funding Board. Phil Rockefeller has also been appointed to serve as one of Washington's two representatives on the Northwest Power and Conservation Council.

#### ***C) PCSRF Funding Levels***

The Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund, which was funded at \$80 million in FY 2011 is included in the President's FY 2012 budget at \$65 million. On July 6 the House Appropriations Committee released the fiscal year 2012 Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill which includes \$65 million for the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund.

#### ***D) NOAA Status Review***

Every 5 years, the Endanger Species Act requires assessing the status of a listed species to determine if a change in listing status is warranted. While NOAA recommends maintaining the current 'Threatened' status for Mid-Columbia steelhead, it notes that the DPS as a whole, and the Yakima in particular, are headed in the right direction. More information can be found at: <http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/ESA-Salmon-Listings/5-yr-review.cfm>

#### ***E) Columbia River Biological Opinion***

In his final ruling on the current Biological Opinion for the Federal Columbia River Power System, Judge Redden allowed the current biological opinion to stand through 2013, but required that the action agencies develop a more detailed plan for proposed habitat actions from 2014 on. We'll briefly discuss the implications of this ruling for our work. For more info see: <http://www.cbulletin.com/411336.aspx>

## **5) REVIEW AND APPROVE 2011 RANKED PROJECT LIST FOR THE SRFB ACTION ITEM**

Our main item of business for this meeting is to review and approve the 2011 ranked project list for submission to the State's Salmon Recovery Funding Board. Darcy will give an overview of the Lead Entity review process to date, and will briefly present each of the projects recommended for funding by our citizen's committee. The TAG and citizen's committee minutes and the proposed ranked list are attached for your review.

## **6) BUDGET CORRECTIONS ACTION ITEM**

I made an error in incorporating the Executive Committee's performance adjustments into the budget approved at the July meeting. A revised budget is attached for the Board's consideration, with the changes to the annual totals highlighted in yellow. Last biennium the Board partially offset my paying an increased percentage of my health insurance costs by increasing my salary (I had been hired with 100% employee paid coverage, but agreed to reduced coverage as part of standardizing benefits for all employees). However in last biennium's budget, this money was left in the insurance line item of the budget, instead of being moved to the salary line item. In adapting the old budget for the new biennium, I moved the excess into contingency instead of the salary line item. The proposed corrections move that amount to salary and payroll and retirement benefits (which are budgeted as a percent of salary).

## **7) BOARD LOGISTICS**

Our next meeting is scheduled for October 13<sup>th</sup>. Agenda items include:

- Bull trout Plan and Task Force Updates
- SRFB List adjustments, if needed
- IRS 990 Tax Report Review
- Review of Audit Report
- Review & Approve Policy Manual
- Review & Approve Lead Entity Manual revision
- Roll out new Website

We are currently in the midst of completing the new website, and the auditor has completed field work and is writing up our audit report.

We may touch briefly on staff participation in the YRBWEP planning process if time allows.

## **8) FINANCIAL REPORTS**

Financial reports are attached.



YAKIMA BASIN  
FISH AND WILDLIFE  
RECOVERY BOARD

DRAFT

**Minutes of the 07/06/2011 Annual Meeting**

Those present:

*Members:* Terry Keenhan (Yakima County), Dave Ettl & Dave Brown (City of Yakima), Nancy Lillquist (City of Ellensburg), Dan Olson (City of Union Gap), Leo Bowman & Adam Fyall (Benton County), John Hubbard (City of Kennewick), Paul Ward (Yakama Nation), Jay McGowan (City of Cle Elum), Obie O'Brien (Kittitas County)

*Guests:* Lynn Hatcher (NOAA), David Child (Yakima Basin Joint Board)

*Staff:* Alex Conley (Executive Director), Yuki Reiss (Recovery Program Coordinator), Denise Buck (Operations and Outreach Coordinator), Darcy Batura (Lead Entity Coordinator)

**1) Welcome, Introductions & Approval of Minutes**

Nancy called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. After introductions, the Board reviewed the minutes of the March 10<sup>th</sup> and April 14<sup>th</sup> meetings. Terry Keenhan motioned to approve the minutes as submitted; Leo Bowman seconded, and the motion passed with support of all present.

Darcy Batura, new Lead Entity Coordinator, was introduced and welcomed.

**2) Board Correspondence and Announcements**

**Correspondence:** Alex shared recent correspondence to the Board, including notification of Wenatchee National Forest Plan revisions, informal responses to the bull trout letter, a thank you letter for participating in the April NPCC meeting, and a thank you letter from the Governor to participants in development of the new YRBWEP proposal. Alex circulated a letter congratulating Phil Miller on his retirement for signature by those present.

**Announcements:**

- An Executive Meeting was held June 28; notes were included in the meeting packet.
- Alex summarized the status of state and federal budgets. He noted that funding for Board operations and the broader programs we work with is largely intact. Adam Fyall stated that the Klickitat Lead Entity agreement to extend coverage to WRIA 31 should be finalized soon, and that Benton County will be represented in the project review process for that area.

- Alex displayed the Final Draft of the VSP Section of the Yakima Steelhead Research, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, which has been printed in a limited amount.
- Alex informed the Board that two Community Salmon Fund projects were funded, a Wilson Creek habitat project and a Salmon-Safe project. The CSF does not have funds for an upcoming grant cycle.
- Adam Fyall announced that the Barker Ranch along the Yakima in Benton County is available to give tours to interested parties. The Barker Ranch is a 2000+ acre hunting club.
- Paul Ward mentioned the lamprey work being done in Prosser and invited the Board to visit. The Board suggested holding the August 18 meeting at the Prosser Hatchery. Paul will follow up with the Board on logistics. Paul also updated the Board on work being done with sockeye, Coho and Chinook at Lake Cle Elum and sturgeon in the mid-Columbia.
- There is an open house and salmon bake at the Cle Elum Hatchery on July 15.
- Yuki updated the Board on the bull trout task force (BTTF). The task force held an orientation and information session for 24 people on June 30. The task force is scheduled to work with volunteers at various sites throughout the basin to educate the public, creel surveys, snorkel surveys and remove recreation dams. They will be doing outreach at the Cle Elum open house and the Teanaway Festival. They are available to speak to groups and visit classrooms.

### **3) Approve Workplan and Budget**

The draft work plan has been revised based on feedback at the March and April meetings and the Executive Committee meeting. Leo Bowman motioned that the work plan be approved as submitted, Dan Olson seconded and the motion passed with support of all present.

### **4) Board of Directors Membership**

Alex noted that a letter went out to all ILA signatories in May asking for updates and any requests to join the Board of Directors. We received some updated contact information, and were notified that our representative from Cle Elum was no longer on the City Council. This creates a vacant Board of Director's seat for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Kittitas City slot. The City of Cle Elum has proposed that Jay McGowan, a council member, fill that vacancy. No other correspondence was received from other Kittitas County cities. Dan Olson motioned to approve Jay McGowan as the representative from the City of Cle Elum, Leo Bowman seconded and the motion passed with support of all present.

Alex will draft a letter to Kittitas County members notifying them of Jay's appointment and soliciting candidates from other Kittitas County Cities interested in acting as alternates for Jay. Leo motioned to approve the Board of Directors membership with the addition of Jay McGowan, Terry Keenhan seconded and the motion passed with support of all present.

### **5) Office Elections**

A nomination was made to maintain the current suite of officers (Nancy Lillquist, Chair, Mike Leita, Vice-Chair/Treasurer, and Dan Olson, Secretary). No other nominations were made. Leo Bowman motioned to renew the appointment of the existing officers through June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2012. Paul Ward seconded and the motion passed with support of all present.

## **6) Approve Registered Agent**

The registered agent is the formal point of contact for the Board, as registered with the Secretary of State's Corporations division. Alex currently serves as registered agent. Dan Olson motioned to re-appoint Alex Conley as the registered agent for the Board, Leo Bowman seconded and the motion passed with support of all present.

## **7) Committee Memberships**

The current membership of the Executive Committee, the Technical Advisory Group and the Citizen's Committee members were reviewed. Paul Ward appointed two members (Emily Washines and McClure Tosch )to represent the Yakama Nation on the Citizens' Committee,. Paul motioned that the membership of the three committees be approved, with the Nation's additions to the Citizen's Committee, Dan Olson seconded and the motion passed with support of all present.

## **8) Review RCO Contract Status**

Alex stated that we have maintained status quo funding for the next biennium, and that the Executive Committee had authorized the Chair's signature on the new FY 2012-13 RCO Recovery Board/Lead Entity Contract. The Board briefly discussed the new contract and affirmed the Executive Committee's action.

## **9) Set Board Meeting Schedule**

After a discussion by the Board, Dan Olson motioned to approve August 18, October 13, January 26, 2011, March 29, and June 7 as dates for future Board of Director's meetings. Leo Bowman seconded and the motion passed with support of all present.

## **10) Policy Manual Update**

Alex stated that he hopes to have the policy manual ready for review in August.

## **11) Review Bylaws**

There were no recommended bylaw changes.

## **12) Program Updates**

Darcy Batura gave a brief overview of 10 projects submitted for funding. \$1.776 million was allocated to the Mid-Columbia region. Klickitat LE has stated they have proposals requesting approximately \$750,000. The Board discussed how the Mid-Columbia funds are allocated between the Yakima and Klickitat Lead Entity lists. Members discussed how projects could be reviewed together to ensure the

best projects are funded, regardless of Lead Entity. The Board agreed that we should continue as we have, pending future discussion with the Klickitat Lead Entity.

Denise Buck updated the Board on the new website, stating that we are in the midst of design development and hope to have it completed in August. Dave Ettl offered his radio station as a means of outreach to the community. Leo Bowman suggested salmon success stories and Denise suggested bull trout task force activities as outreach topics. Alex mentioned that he would be leading development of a "State of the Yakima" report/document.

Yuki Reiss updated the Board on the Bull Trout Action Plan and reminded them of their goal to create a locally driven plan that analyzes the threats to bull trout and links these threats to specific actions. She thanked the Board for supporting her position and allowing her to work on this plan.

Nancy Lillquist asked how the projects were impacted by the flooding in the region. Alex stated that projects in the Taneum came through well. The Manastash Creek area remains a challenge. Obie O'Brien stated that he gets comments and questions regarding landowner's inability to remove debris from the creek, which they feel add to the flooding problems.

David Child described how multiple organizations worked together to survey Cowiche Creek in early spring and 27 redds were identified which indicates 50+ adults present. It has been good to document significant fish use in Cowiche Creek following the removal of several passage barriers.

Yuki described a steelhead radio-telemetry study taking place over the next 3 years to see where the steelhead are going once they pass Prosser. This study will answer a number of key questions identified in the Yakima Steelhead Recovery Plan.

### **13) Financial Reports**

The financial reports were reviewed. The Board briefly discussed the audit scheduled for August.

### **14) Board Member Certification Form**

All present completed the form.

Leo Bowman motioned to adjourn the meeting at 4:00 p.m., Paul Ward seconded and the motion passed with support of all present.

## Project Itinerary

- 8:00 a.m.** Board members and staff depart from Ellensburg Holiday Inn Express hotel parking lot
- 8:30 a.m.** Rendezvous with other tour participants at the Thorp Fruit Stand  
(Exit 93 off I-90, 14 miles west of Ellensburg, see directions at end of memo)
- 8:45 a.m. Arrive at Bruton Dam (RCO project #07-1551, site #1)
- 9:10 a.m. Arrive at Taneum Canal Company (RCO project #07-1551, site #2)
- 9:40 a.m. Arrive at Taneum Creek Large Wood Project (part of RCO project #08-2001)
- 10:50 a.m. Arrive at Roslyn Park; carpool to next site
- 11:00 a.m. Arrive at Cle Elum Log Jam (RCO projects #06-2141 and 11-1564)
- 11:35 a.m. Arrive at Roslyn Park
- 11:45 a.m. Arrive Hundley Conservation Easement (RCO project #06-2143)
- Noon** **End tour**  
Participants can depart directly on I-90 for Seattle and Olympia, or, if headed east, car pool back to cars in Thorp and Ellensburg

## Project Details

### Taneum Creek Fish Passage (07-1551)

Type	Sponsor	Start Date	SRFB Grant	Match	Total Cost	Paid To Date
Restoration	Kittitas Conservation Trust	2/1/08	\$281,429	\$440,000	\$721,429	\$248,986

This project is in active status.

**Description:** The Kittitas Conservation Trust is using this grant to replace two ineffective and outdated fish passage structures in lower Taneum Creek by building new approaches at each diversion dam. Work includes finalizing engineering designs, getting construction permits, modifying the channel and replanting the work areas. Neither of the existing fish passage structures meets current standards. Modifying the stream channel will increase the ability of fish to access 30 miles of habitat during all water levels.



## Large Wood Replenishment (08-2001)

Type	Sponsor	Start Date	SRFB Grant	Match	Total Cost	Paid To Date
Restoration	Mid-Columbia RFEF	2/24/09	\$110,025	\$21,700	\$131,725	\$4,277

This project is in active status.

**Description:** This project will replenish large woody debris in key reaches of high-priority tributaries in the Yakima Basin. Implementation will result in direct habitat benefits including increased pool habitat; retention/deposition of spawning gravels; cooler water temperatures; and improved floodplain connectivity. This wood used in this project will be harvested from adjacent, over-stocked coniferous stands, thereby decreasing fire potential and making the riparian timber less susceptible to insect damage.

## Cle Elum River Instream Habitat (06-2141)

Type	Sponsor	Start Date	SRFB Grant	Match	Total Cost	Paid To Date
Restoration	Kittitas Conservation Trust	2/1/07	\$320,120	\$178,600	\$498,720	\$320,120

This project has been completed.

**Description:** The Kittitas Conservation Trust used this grant to design and build two logjams in the lower Cle Elum River, providing critical freshwater habitat for spring Chinook, mid-Columbia steelhead, bull trout and coho. Construction of the Cle Elum dam in 1933 and the ensuing regulation of flows in the lower Cle Elum River have reduced the extent and complexity of salmon rearing habitat. The dam had isolated the lower Cle Elum River from its upper watershed and the natural habitat forming processes associated with floods, sediment transport, and recruitment of large woody debris. Several meanders also had been cut off, limiting off-channel habitat for rearing.

## Cle Elum River PH-2 Instream Habitat Design (11-1564)

Type	Sponsor	Start Date	SRFB Grant	Match	Total Cost	Paid To Date
Planning	Kittitas Conservation Trust	n/a	\$172,000	NULL	\$172,000	n/a

This project is being proposed for funding in the 2011 grant round.

**Description:** This planning and design project will produce the full range of preliminary and final engineering designs, exhibits, and construction notes for eight large engineered log jams that are proposed for construction in the lower Cle Elum River. The primary purposes of the log

jams is to restore instream habitat complexity for spring Chinook, Coho, Sockeye, Steelhead, Bull trout and all aquatic species, direct mainstem flows into side channel rearing habitat, and optimize freshwater habitat quality and availability in a flow regulated tributary to the Upper Yakima River.

## Upper Yakima Protection-Hundley (06-2143)

Type	Sponsor	Start Date	SRFB Grant	Match	Total Cost	Paid To Date
Acquisition	Kittitas Conservation Trust	2/1/07	\$29,463	\$11,956	\$41,420	\$29,463

This project has been completed.

**Description:** The Kittitas Conservation Trust used this grant to protect 100 acres of floodplain in the Easton reach of the Yakima River, which includes prime salmon spawning and rearing habitat. The land, known as the Hundley property, is comprised of 500 acres that contain 3 miles of shoreline, 40 acres of connected ponds and wetlands and two small tributary streams. It is adjacent to 212 acres of property owned by the state Department of Fish and Wildlife and several hundred acres of conserved land associated with Suncadia Resort near Roslyn. Subdivision and rapid development had put the land at risk of fragmentation.

### Driving Directions and Map

Holiday Inn Express in Ellensburg to Thorp Fruit Barn

- Follow I-90 west to Exit 93, Elk Heights Road
- Turn right on Elk Heights Road
- Take first right onto Thorp Prairie Road
- Follow Thorp Prairie Road to Thorp Fruit Barn on left

Meet at Thorp Fruit Barn. From there, follow tour leaders to Taneum Creek project sites. Then drive to Roslyn Pioneer Park and follow project leaders to remaining project sites. Tour will conclude on I-90 between Cle Elum and Easton.

Driving directions and a map will be provided at the meeting.

# Appendix F

## Lead Entities List Memorandum 2011

Each lead entity submitting a project list must complete this form.

**Lead Entity:** Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board

**Lead Entity Allocation:** \$1,243,200

The Salmon Recovery Funding Board is hereby asked to consider the project list and application for financial assistance for the salmon recovery projects described below and to grant funding from such state and federal sources as may be available. Applications are prepared with knowledge of, and in compliance with, SRFB's policies and procedures.

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Prospective Sponsor	SRFB Request	Sponsor Match	Project Total Cost	Project Status	Response to Review Panel Comments (include attachment # in PRISM)
1	11-1373	Rattlesnake Creek Side Channel Restoration	Robert Inouye	\$36,933	\$6,600	\$43,533		Attachments 38 & 39
2	11-1564	Cle Elum River Phase 2 Instream Habitat Design	Kittitas Conservation Trust	\$172,000	\$0	\$172,000		None
3	11-1320	Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration, Phase 2	Mid-Columbia RFEG	\$90,429	\$16,362	\$106,791		Attachment #8
4	11-1600	Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration Design	Yakima County Public Services	\$100,000	\$5,000	\$105,000		
5	11-1595	Pott Habitat Restoration	Yakama Nation	\$98,500	\$18,500	\$117,000		Attachment #8
6	11-1565	City of Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem Restoration	City of Yakima	\$275,400	\$115,000	\$390,400		Attachments 11 - 16
7	11-1321	Teanaway Forks Large Wood Trapping	Mid-Columbia RFEG	\$243,752	\$45,305	\$289,057		Attachments 17 and 18
8	11-1525	Coleman Creek - Ellensburg Water Company	Kittitas County Conservation Trust	\$500,022	\$353,730	\$853,752	Partial Funding	Attachment 17

**Totals:** \$1,517,036 \$560,497 \$2,077,533

**2011 SRFB Grant Round: TAG Project Evaluation Minutes - July 19, 2011**

**Matrix Ranking Summary: Scenario 1**

Tier	Project #	Project Name	Sponsor	Matrix Score	Notes	Funding Request	Cumulative Allocation
1	11-1373	Rattlesnake Creek Side Channel	Robert Inouye	18.9	High Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 36,933.00	\$ 36,933.00
1	11-1321	Teaway Forks Large Wood Treatment	Mid-Columbia RFEG	18.1	High Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 243,752.00	\$ 280,685.00
1	11-1564	Cle Elum River PH-2 Instream Habitat	Kittitas Conservation Trust	12.4	High Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 172,000.00	\$ 452,685.00
2	11-1320	Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration	Mid-Columbia RFEG	10.3	Medium Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 90,429.00	\$ 543,114.00
2	11-1600	Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration	Yakima County	10.3	Medium Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 643,114.00
2	11-1595	Pott Habitat Parcel Restoration	Yakama Nation	8.6	Medium Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 98,500.00	\$ 741,614.00
2	11-1565	City of Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem	City of Yakima	9.3	Medium Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 275,400.00	\$ 1,017,014.00
2	11-1525	Coleman Creek - Ellensburg Watershed	Kittitas County Conservation	5	Medium Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 500,022.00	\$ 1,517,036.00
3	11-1322	Horse Heaven River Ranch Riparian	Mid-Columbia RFEG	1.3	Low Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 78,870.80	\$ 1,595,906.80
DNF	11-1558	CCWUA Fish Screening and Bait	North Yakima Conservation	19.8	DNF unless 2009; then high priority	\$ 627,661.00	
						\$ 2,223,567.80	\$ 1,243,200.00

Granted the SRFB allotment of \$1,776,600.00 and our 30% share to Klickitat, (\$532,800), we have \$1,243,200.00 to allocate. The scenario above means we would fully fund projects through the City of Yakima's project and see if KCCD can move Coleman Creek forward with \$226,186.00.

**Matrix Ranking Summary: Scenario 2 (Including CCWUA w/ YTID option)**

Tier	Project #	Project Name	Sponsor	Matrix Score	Notes	Funding Request	Cumulative Allocation
1	11-1558	CCWUA Fish Screening and Bait	North Yakima Conservation	19.8	DNF unless 2009; then high priority	\$ 450,000.00	\$ 450,000.00
1	11-1373	Rattlesnake Creek Side Channel	Robert Inouye	18.9	High Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 36,933.00	\$ 486,933.00
1	11-1321	Teaway Forks Large Wood Treatment	Mid-Columbia RFEG	18.1	High Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 243,752.00	\$ 730,685.00
1	11-1564	Cle Elum River PH-2 Instream Habitat	Kittitas Conservation Trust	12.4	High Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 172,000.00	\$ 902,685.00
2	11-1320	Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration	Mid-Columbia RFEG	10.3	Medium Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 90,429.00	\$ 993,114.00
2	11-1600	Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration	Yakima County	10.3	Medium Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 1,093,114.00
2	11-1595	Pott Habitat Parcel Restoration	Yakama Nation	8.6	Medium Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 98,500.00	\$ 1,191,614.00
2	11-1565	City of Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem	City of Yakima	9.3	Medium Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 275,400.00	\$ 1,467,014.00
2	11-1525	Coleman Creek - Ellensburg Watershed	Kittitas County Conservation	5	Medium Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 500,022.00	\$ 1,967,036.00
3	11-1322	Horse Heaven River Ranch Riparian	Mid-Columbia RFEG	1.3	Low Priority Funding Recommendation	\$ 78,870.80	\$ 2,045,906.80
						\$2,045,906.80	\$ 1,243,200.00

Given this scenario, we could fund Klickitat at 30% (\$532,800) and use the remaining \$1,243,200 to fund our projects. We would fully fund projects through Pott Habitat Parcel Restoration and inquire whether or not the City of Yakima can move forward with \$51,586.00.

## **11-1320 Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration, Phase 2: Mid-Columbia RFEG**

Matrix Score: 10.3

### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment: High**

**Project Sequence: High**

**Reasonable Budget: High**

**Organizational Capacity: High**

**Appraisal: N/A**

**Uncertainties and Constraints: Medium**

**Fit to Regional Plan: High**

**Value to Education/Outreach: N/A**

**Future Stewardship: Low**

**Threat to Habitat Values: N/A**

### **Summary of Discussion**

The strengths of this project include how it builds upon previous work completed on the nearby Lamas and Jennerjohn projects and confidence in the organizational capacity of the proponent (Mid-Columbia RFEG) and the Cowiche Canyon Conservancy and their relationship with the landowners. The proposed project addresses limiting factors, such as floodplain connectivity. Implementation of this project would allow Cowiche Creek access to a portion of the floodplain in a critical rearing reach for steelhead, coho and spring chinook. The concept is fine and the budget request appears reasonable for the amount of earthwork involved in relocating the levee, removing concrete armoring and reshaping the bank.

There is uncertainty about future stewardship by the landowners and protection of the SRFB investment. If the current landowners decide to sell their property, it is possible the new owners would build another levee. As there is no conservation easement proposed to prevent future development in the restored areas, confidence in the future stewardship would be bolstered by an assurance that the landowners fully understand what the conceptual design will entail, including setbacks, building removal, and a freeform, reconnected floodplain. Additional assurances regarding long-term weed control and maintenance of the native riparian plantings are desired.

### **Recommendations to Improve Project:**

Include a design showing a 30% layout, including setbacks, building removal, and the potential extent of the active floodplain. Secure a higher level of commitment/understanding from the landowners and adjacent neighbors that this project is beneficial and they can accept a more natural creek channel that floods and moves around over the long-term. Evaluate the potential for easements or other tools to protect the habitat investments if the land changes owners. Confirm the landowner listed as Luanne Bush (Parcel 2) in the application, is actually Luanne Crandall, as listed on Attachment 7 in PRISM.

## **11-1321 Teanaway Forks Large Wood Trapping: Mid-Columbia RFEG**

Matrix Score: 18.1

### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment: Medium**

**Project Sequence: High**

**Reasonable Budget: Medium**

**Organizational Capacity: High**

**Appraisal: N/A**

**Uncertainties and Constraints: Low**

**Fit to Regional Plan: High**

**Value to Education/Outreach: High**

**Future Stewardship: High**

**Threat to Habitat Values: N/A**

### **Summary of Discussion**

Overall, the TAG felt this is a strong project that addresses the lack of channel complexity, scour to bedrock, low pool frequency, and the lack of large wood accumulation in the Teanaway River. Conservation and recovery of the Teanaway River ecosystem is extremely important for recovery of steelhead in the basin. Further, the Steelhead Recovery Plan Action #14 is addressed by this project. The TAG has confidence in the organizational capacity of the proponent (Mid-Columbia RFEG), their ability to select and manage an appropriate engineering consultant, and to monitor structure performance. The landowner (AFLC) is on board with the project, although the TAG was unclear about their stance on floodplain activation, as the project may cause the water to spread laterally across the floodplain. Since the project is a pilot approach to a wood trapping method, the TAG was unable to compare the soundness of the budget to the scope of work proposed.

Uncertainties articulated during review were in regard to the limited information provided in the application about the location of the structures in regard to floodplain connectivity, though this may be mitigated by the plan to survey the river to identify project sites.

Additional concerns were raised in regard to public scoping and how the Kittitas County Planning Department will respond with consideration to the county shorelines plan. Will WDFW allow this project under the streamlined HPA process? If not, will the county issue shorelines permits for this project?

### **Recommendations to Improve Project:**

Contact WDFW and Kittitas County about the proposal and determine if permitting will be a problem. Provide additional assurances that AFLC supports floodplain activation in the proposed project sites and understands that the project may alter river dynamics and reactivate side channels.

## **11-1322 Horse Heaven River Ranch Riparian Restoration – Mid-Columbia RFEG**

Matrix Score: 1.3

### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment: High**

**Project Sequence: High**

**Reasonable Budget: Medium**

**Organizational Capacity: High**

**Appraisal: N/A**

**Uncertainties and Constraints: Medium**

**Fit to Regional Plan: Low/Medium**

**Value to Education/Outreach: N/A**

**Future Stewardship: Low**

**Threat to Habitat Values: N/A**

### **Summary of Discussion**

This is a landowner initiated proposal that, to a limited extent, supports local salmon recovery actions and addresses riparian condition limiting factors for 0.3 mi on one bank of the Yakima River. Discussion focused on the project's limited benefit to salmon due to its location in the watershed and limited ability to improve temperatures. The TAG has confidence in the organizational capacity of the proponent (Mid-Columbia RFEG) and their relationship with the landowner. The budget seems reasonable for 10 acres, although without a design, it is difficult to determine if the budget is appropriate. A more developed design would benefit budget development.

The TAG indicated concern about project success without using herbicides to control weeds. Concern was raised about long-term landowner commitment to reactivating the floodplain and maintaining weed control (post 2015) as a necessity to assure the re-establishment of native riparian vegetation and elimination of non-native plants. Since there is no conservation easement, there is an uncertainty about project success if the land changed ownership. The TAG is eager to learn if the property is eligible for CREP consideration as it seems like a more appropriate funding source than SRFB.

### **Recommendations to Improve Project:**

Provide updates on the NRCS response to CREP eligibility and the issue of conventional versus organic weed control in the project area.

## **11-1373 Rattlesnake Creek Side Channel Restoration - Inouye**

Matrix Score: 18.9

### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment: High**

**Project Sequence: High**

**Reasonable Budget: High**

**Organizational Capacity: Medium**

**Appraisal: N/A**

**Uncertainties and Constraints: Medium**

**Fit to Regional Plan: High**

**Value to Education/Outreach: N/A**

**Future Stewardship: Low**

**Threat to Habitat Values: N/A**

### **Summary of Discussion**

Overall, the TAG felt this is a strong project that addresses several limiting factors in Rattlesnake Creek, i.e., lack of shade cover and large wood, and elevated water temperature. This project creates high quality, year-round off-channel rearing habitat for four salmonid species. Beaver activity is already improving on the landowners initial attempts to create fish and wildlife habitat. Rattlesnake Creek is a priority area for protection and restoration for four species. Project was initiated by the private landowner who is highly motivated to improve his property for fish and wildlife benefit. Although there is no conservation easement on the property, the landowner has the time, resources and equipment to complete the project, and has worked to garner help from YTAHP, YN and WDFW. The landowner has owned this property for over 15 years and is highly invested in this project. The TAG members and the review panel appreciated that the landowner used feedback from project site reviewers to modify his proposal, improving the cost/benefit ratio (\$238,159 reduction). The modified project design is technically and biologically feasible with fewer negative impacts (compared to the original), at less cost.

Constraints identified during TAG review indicated a need for the landowner to work with WDFW's Yakima Construction Shop to determine the best way to combine the side channel intake with the McDaniels fish screen bypass. The side channel will become the bypass for the fish screen and be watered up year-round to provide rearing and egress for juvenile fish. Discussion also focused on summer low flow conditions in the main stem Rattlesnake Creek and the need to ensure the project does not further increase flow limitations in the main channel.

### **Recommendations to Improve Project:**

Sponsor has already made the necessary changes based on the site review comments from statewide and local SRFB technical experts. Evaluate the potential for easements or other tools to protect the habitat investments if the land changes owners.



## **11-1525 Coleman Creek EWC – Kittitas County Conservation District**

Matrix Score: 5

### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment: High**

**Project Sequence: Low**

**Reasonable Budget: High**

**Organizational Capacity: High**

**Appraisal: N/A**

**Uncertainties and Constraints: Low**

**Fit to Regional Plan: High**

**Value to Education/Outreach: N/A**

**Future Stewardship: High**

**Threat to Habitat Values: N/A**

### **Summary of Discussion**

This project builds upon a design only proposal funded by the SRFB in 2008. The design is solid; it is similar to comparable projects the sponsor has completed in the past, although some TAG members feel it is expensive for .5 mile of access. This project could potentially provide fish passage and screening for anadromous fish and is a good example of positive work with the agricultural community. Steelhead adults have access to the project, as do juvenile coho and Chinook. It also scored points for water quality as it would reduce the impact of sediment and contaminants from treating the canal. This project will enable the complete separation of the Creek and canal - very important in the context canal herbicide applications. Herbicide leaks could potentially be harmful all the way down to the Yakima. Several members questioned if the loss of ditch water would affect instream flows. The main concern with this project at this stage is low certainty of success at providing access from the Yakima River for rearing juveniles or adults. By the sponsors own admission, two barriers downstream have not been removed, and plans and landowner agreements have not been finalized. It was the certainty of success weighting score that lowered the rank of this project. The 2011 project proposal continues to struggle due to the current lack of commitment from downstream landowners with existing barriers below the site. Several TAG members also raised concern over the high cost benefit ratio. The TAG members suggested that once these barriers are dealt with, it would be appropriate to resubmit the application.

### **Recommendations to Improve Project:**

The TAG support funding this project with the condition that an implementation plan be submitted along with signed landowner and water right holder agreements before spending SRFB dollars. In the event that a plan and signatures cannot be obtained this year, it would be appropriate to resubmit the application once downstream landowner commitment to remove barriers below the project site is secured. Additional cost-shares to lower the proposed SRFB project cost would also be welcomed.

## **11-1558 CCWUA Fish Screening and Barrier Removal Project – N. Yakima CD**

Matrix Score: 19.8

### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment: High**

**Project Sequence: Low**

**Reasonable Budget: Medium**

**Organizational Capacity: High**

**Appraisal: N/A**

**Uncertainties and Constraints: Low**

**Fit to Regional Plan: High**

**Value to Education/Outreach: N/A**

**Future Stewardship: ?**

**Threat to Habitat Values: N/A**

### **Summary of Discussion:**

The TAG felt this project is in line with recovery actions and addresses the limiting factors of two unscreened diversions, seasonal barrier, and low flow; however, this project does not address riparian issues or confinement and channelization. The project has strong landowner commitment - CCWUA supports this (and the 2009) proposal to solve these problems. Reviewers have confidence in the organizational capacity of the sponsor (NYCD) to complete this project without the cooperation of YTID.

The TAG had a lengthy discussion about the 2009 proposal, which was funded and then terminated by the applicant after disagreement between USBR and YTID, specifically; if USBR reaches agreement with YTID (or choses to exercise authority without agreement) to wheel water thru the mainline, then they can successfully implement the preferred 2009 original proposal, which will allow all of CCWUA Cowiche Cr. water to be trusted and stay instream to the mouth. This (2009) scenario would provide primary reach benefit and secondary benefits downstream by leaving more water in the creek for a longer distance, and enhance the species and habitat values considerably. The TAG was unanimous that the 2009 scenario was preferable to the current proposal, but had a long discussion about whether the uncertainty associated with the ability to implement the 2009 scenario justified proceeding now with a strong, but much less beneficial proposal. There was concern that if this proposal is implemented and the 2009 alternative moves forward later, SRFB resources would be wasted. This budget request is \$228,528 more than what was requested/awarded in 2009 (and represents about half the 2011 SRFB funds) – for a project that has less fish benefits and greater long-term O&M costs (pumping). A further and ultimately larger concern is that if this proposal is implemented, it would reduce the likelihood that the USBR and YTID will ever make the progress needed to implement the far more beneficial 2009 proposal. Therefore, the TAG strongly recommended that the current proposal not be funded.

### **Recommendations to Improve Project:**

Due to significant concerns about project sequencing, the cost/benefit ratio given increased SRFB cost and the reduced reach length, and the creation of long-term O&M costs, the TAG recommended that the sponsor develop an updated cost estimate for the 2009 scenario proposal and wait for the outcome of ongoing USBR negotiations, even if that means resubmitting the project next year. If resolution between USBR and YTID occurs before the 2011 project list is secured, the TAG agreed that the revised project (removing the current alternatives and substituting those with the 2009 proposal and updated budget) would be ranked as High Priority for funding.

## **11-1564 Cle Elum River PH-2 Instream Habitat Design – Kittitas Conserv. Trust**

Matrix Score: 12.4

### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment: High**  
**Project Sequence: High**  
**Reasonable Budget: High**  
**Organizational Capacity: High**  
**Appraisal: N/A**

**Uncertainties and Constraints: Medium**  
**Fit to Regional Plan: High**  
**Value to Education/Outreach: N/A**  
**Future Stewardship: High**  
**Threat to Habitat Values: N/A**

### **Summary of Discussion:**

This is a solid design proposal as the land is already in a conservation easement, and the proposal is strengthened by being the second phase, with two pilot ELJs already completed. The proposal addresses limiting factors in the Cle Elum River and is rooted in the Steelhead Recovery Plan actions, as steelhead are currently limited in this reach; however, the TAG expects to see increased steelhead rearing in side channels as a result of this project. The project has strong landowner commitment, and the TAG has confidence in the sponsor's (KCCT) organizational capacity, which was demonstrated by the design and construction of the 2009 pilot project. The budget is a reasonable request for the design work specified in the proposal.

The TAG raised concerns about the main channel benefit vs. side channel benefit. The project focus is on side channel enhancement, but creating mainstem rearing habitat would be appreciated. The TAG discussed potential benefits to the main channel if additional wood (accessible to fish) was incorporated as part of the structures. Additional discussion focused on the need for more information in regard to the ELJ locations, linear length of new side channels activated, and an estimate of how many miles of improved habitat would be created by the project.

### **Recommendations to Improve Project:**

Provide additional details in regard to main channel vs. side channel benefits. Project sponsor should attempt to recruit wood from upstream to this downstream project, as woody debris cleaned from the dam is currently considered waste and is burned. According to the Dam Manager, the woody material is not large diameter root wads, but is more like "racking logs". It would be appreciated if the project sponsor could explore a beneficial that material. Additional opportunities exist for utilizing wood waste obtained from thinning projects (like the approach used in the Large Wood Replenishment project) in the Cle Elum River side channels at a later time (work w/ Scott).

## **11-1565 City of Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem Restoration – City of Yakima**

Matrix Score: 9.3

### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment: High**

**Project Sequence: Medium**

**Reasonable Budget: Low**

**Organizational Capacity: Medium**

**Appraisal: N/A**

**Uncertainties and Constraints: Low**

**Fit to Regional Plan: High**

**Value to Education/Outreach: N/A**

**Future Stewardship: Medium**

**Threat to Habitat Values: N/A**

### **Summary of Discussion**

This project addresses floodplain connectivity, habitat complexity, and provides good rearing habitat for all present species. The proposal supports actions identified in the Steelhead Recovery Plan. Once complete, the project will eliminate the need for a fixed discharge point in the river, and will allow for more natural river dynamics (in line with goals of the larger Gap to Gap levee setback project). Immediate benefits include increasing floodplain roughness and improving water quality in, and access to the pond. The project creates surface flow, where there is currently just groundwater, enhances water quality in the rearing pond, and has the potential to connect to a very cold spring (Spring Creek). The proposal has strong landowner commitment (City of Yakima, Wastewater Div). There is no design at this time. The city intends to hire a design engineering consultant with their own funds. The project is well sequenced with the SR24 bridge construction and USBR – YRBWEP habitat acquisition/restoration in the gap-to-gap reach. The vegetation is sequenced correctly; however, the TAG questioned the persistence of the channels once the floodplain is fully activated by future levee breaching.

The TAG raised concerns about the lack of a detailed design on which to base the final approval of a construction budget. Project sponsor needs to better address the discharge/outflow and floodplain interaction. Specifics regarding the fill removal are needed, including: what will happen with existing fill; how much fill has been placed on site; does it make sense to invest in vegetation if the fill is going to be removed at a later date? The application and proposal seemed to lack certainty about how the floodplain will persist after levee setback. Additional discussion focused on the high cost/benefit ratio.

### **Recommendations to Improve Project:**

Improve proposal narrative regarding the project relationship with Gap to Gap objectives and increasing clarity on the relationship between phases I, II and III in terms of fill removal and expected grades. The TAG asks the sponsor to seek input of the fisheries community (YTAHP, TAG) on preliminary designs and fish habitat objectives for the constructed side channels.

## **11-1595 Pott Habitat Parcel Restoration – Yakama Nation**

Matrix Score: 8.6

### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment: High**

**Project Sequence: Medium**

**Reasonable Budget: High**

**Organizational Capacity: High**

**Appraisal: N/A**

**Uncertainties and Constraints: Medium**

**Fit to Regional Plan: High**

**Value to Education/Outreach: N/A**

**Future Stewardship: High**

**Threat to Habitat Values: N/A**

### **Summary of Discussion:**

This project proposal addresses Reecer Creek's channel simplification, lack of large wood, and poor riparian vegetation. The project sequencing complements floodplain restoration work completed downstream by MCREFG and the completed removal of all downstream barriers. Landowner commitment (Yakama Nation) is strong and includes a conservation easement granted to BPA. The TAG has confidence in the organizational capacity of the sponsor and their understanding of the risks and uncertainties involved. The project budget looks fine and reflects the work proposed. Reviewers like that this project is piloting a new, "CREP-like" style and asked why this was not a CREP project.

Concerns raised during the TAG review involved the sequencing of Crack Willow removal, as it will decrease shade in the short-term and increase the water temperature. Sequential girdling alleviates concern to a degree, as the project would establish a riparian zone and gradually kill the Crack Willow. There was some discussion of the relative habitat value of current and restored conditions in this highly altered system.

### **Recommendations to Improve Project:**

Need better understanding of correlation between floodplain vegetation & salmonid benefit, and specifics about the sequencing of the Crack Willow removal. Sponsor should explain why they have not applied for CREP funds.

## **11-1600 Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration Design – Yakima County**

Matrix Score: 10.3

### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment: High**

**Project Sequence: Low**

**Reasonable Budget: High**

**Organizational Capacity: High**

**Appraisal: N/A**

**Uncertainties and Constraints: Low**

**Fit to Regional Plan: High**

**Value to Education/Outreach: N/A**

**Future Stewardship: Medium**

**Threat to Habitat Values: N/A**

### **Summary of Discussion**

The proposed design project address legitimate habitat needs, including improved connectivity, complexity and habitat values in lower Cowiche Creek, in conjunction with relocating Fruitvale Canal POD (a separate project). This project is consistent with Steelhead Recovery Plan goals and addresses the limiting factors of channel confinement and floodplain function. The project will reduce channel length, but reconnect the floodplain. It also has the potential to improve side channel access and increase rearing habitat. This plan moves the creek mouth away from the steep pass, and helps to reestablish a natural creek dynamic. The project has strong landowner commitment, as this proposal is Phase 2 of a three phase project. Yakima Co. and landowner are proceeding with negotiating the conservation easement for the new creek channel and riparian zone. The TAG has confidence in the organizational capacity of the sponsor (Yakima County), as they have several large, funded projects in progress.

Concerns were raised during the TAG review about the certainty of the proposed move of the Fruitvale diversion away from the project site. Barrier removal is indicated as a primary objective although location of barrier is unclear (as Fruitvale division removal is a separate project). This project is potentially out of sequence with Fruitvale. If Fruitvale was not moved, the ability to implement the proposed design would be constrained. The TAG also indicated a desire for additional information in regard to the rearing conditions, while rearing is a primary benefit of the project, it will only improve conditions for about 1,000 feet. The TAG was also unclear about the habitat conditions (rearing values) to expect as a result of this project.

### **Recommendations to Improve Project:**

Sponsor should provide additional information about expected rearing values resulting from the project to be designed, and provide additional information on the timing and certainty of the proposed retirement of the Fruitvale canal.

**Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board**

**Citizen Committee Minutes**

August 11, 2011

9:00 am – 1:00 pm

Project Name	Fund Request	Cumulative	TAG Rank	CC Points	Final Rank	Recommendation
Rattlesnake Creek Side Channel Restoration	\$ 36,933.00	\$ 36,933.00	1	12	1	Fund in full
Cle Elum River PH-2 Instream Habitat Design	\$ 172,000.00	\$ 208,933.00	3	4	2	Fund in full
Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration, Phase 2	\$ 90,429.00	\$ 299,362.00	4	10	3	Fund in full
Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration Design	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 399,362.00	5	7	4	Fund in full
Pott Habitat Parcel Restoration	\$ 98,500.00	\$ 497,862.00	6	5	5	Fund in full
City of Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem Restoration	\$ 275,400.00	\$ 773,262.00	7	6	6	Fund in full
Teaway Forks Large Wood Trapping	\$ 75,000.00	\$ 848,262.00	2	-1	7	Fund adjusted design budget
Coleman Creek - Ellensburg Water Company	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 1,348,262.00	8	9	8	Fund partial (\$344,938 estimate)
Additional Klickitat Need for Rock Creek	\$ 143,200.00	\$ 1,491,462.00	N/A	N/A	N/A	Fund partial (\$50,000 estimate)
Horse Heaven River Ranch Riparian Restoration	\$ 78,870.80	\$ 78,870.80	9	3		Do not fund
CCWUA Fish Screening and Barrier Removal Project	\$ 627,661.00	\$ 2,223,567.80	DNF	8		Do not fund
	\$ 2,223,567.80					
Total 2011 SRFB Allocation	\$ 1,776,600.00					
Allocation to Klickitat (30%)	\$ 532,800.00					
Allocation to the Yakima Basin (70%)	\$ 1,243,200.00					
Minimum for Coleman Cr to move forward	\$ 300,000.00					
Minimum for Klickitat's Rock Cr project	\$ 50,000.00					

**Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board  
Citizen Committee Minutes**

August 11, 2011  
9:00 am – 1:00 pm

Those present:

Kittitas County: Jim Schnebly, Mark Charlton, & David Bowen  
 Yakima County: Neil McClure, Bill Gillespie, & Don Chaplin  
 Yakama Nation: Tony Monroe, McClure Tosch, & Emily Washines  
 Benton County: Jack Clark, & Kathryn Knutson  
 TAG Rep: David Child  
 Staff: Alex Conley & Darcy Batura

We started off the meeting with introductions. Darcy reviewed the CC ranking process, applicable bi-laws, and updated the group on Mid C funding negotiations with Klickitat County, scope amendments, and project updates.

<b>Project:</b>	11-1320 Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration, Phase 2
<b>Matrix value:</b>	10
<b>Comments:</b>	Discussion focused on how the project will affect recreational opportunities vs. rec spending. No significant disagreement.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC maintained the project's relative position on the matrix as their results supported the TAG's opinion.

<b>Project:</b>	11-1321 Teanaway Forks Large Wood Trapping
<b>Matrix value:</b>	-1
<b>Comments:</b>	General comments focused on surprise that the TAG ranked this so high. They felt the budget was high for a pilot project. Committee had some discussion and defense of the budget appreciating that the sponsor is anticipating problems. CC had concerns that the project could potentially create a legal liability in the event that boaters get hung up (although they recognized that this is not a popular boating area due to low flow). The reduction of number of structures with no real change of budget raised questions. Opinions varied about the cost/benefit of the investment – compromised to 0. Group was in mostly in agreement about project uncertainties – would have like to have seen examples of engineering from similar projects.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	Group decided to move below City of Yakima, and above Coleman, as they think it should be more engineered. The CC feels additional groundwork is required before construction funding is approved.

<b>Project:</b>	11-1322 Horse Heaven River Ranch Riparian Restoration
<b>Matrix value:</b>	3
<b>Comments:</b>	Group consensus concluded this is a valuable habitat project,



	with little benefit to fish.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC moved this project into the do not fund category and would support efforts to assist the sponsor in finding alternate funding sources for habitat.

<b>Project:</b>	11-1373 Rattlesnake Creek Side Channel Restoration
<b>Matrix value:</b>	12
<b>Comments:</b>	The CC was pleased to see that the landowner/sponsor improved the proposal while also reducing the request. Landowner has developed good partnerships that will help the project succeed. There was some disagreement on ESA liabilities moved from a -1 to 1.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC maintained the TAG ranking

<b>Project:</b>	11-1558 CCWUA Fish Screening and Barrier Removal Project
<b>Matrix value:</b>	8
<b>Comments:</b>	<p>Early conversation: Committee weighed the comments provided by the TAG and considered the project history. After 20 minute discussion, the CC checked in with each other around the table. Of the ten members present, six were in favor of maintaining the DNF designation; four recommended reversing the DNF designation.</p> <p>Discussion during official ranking: YN perspective is in support of the YTID option. However we are talking about the current proposal – compromised to a 0. Spread of opinion on the cost/benefits – compromised on a 0. Broadly, the CC members reminded others that the proposal needed to be evaluated as it stands. The CC agreed to another year of trying to reach agreement on the YTID option – if the agreement is not obtained, they would like to see and alternate (2011) proposal funded.</p>
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC maintained the TAG “do not fund” designation

<b>Project:</b>	11-1525 Coleman Creek - Ellensburg Water Company
<b>Matrix value:</b>	9
<b>Comments:</b>	The CC recognized that this is a well-developed project – the designs are solid and thorough, and the sponsor has experience managing projects such as this one. The project has significant benefits for the Ag community. The CC considers the budget to be quite expensive, although they have a 41% match. How well the project in coordinated w/ other projects was a discussion point which ended with the CC compromising on a value of 1.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC moved this project down the list to account for the TAG ranking, yet they felt that work on this project should begin immediately. There has been a lot of effort gone into this project and they want to see the benefit.

<b>Project:</b>	11-1564 Cle Elum River PH-2 Instream Habitat Design
<b>Matrix value:</b>	4
<b>Comments:</b>	The CC appreciated that the constructed project will reduce the BOR habitat issues. Concern over potential liability to recreational users - it is a popular float area, especially with Suncadia Resort guests. The cost/benefit difficult to evaluate because it is a design proposal. Same difficulty with certainty and recreational benefits.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC maintained the project's relative position on the matrix.

<b>Project:</b>	11-1565 City of Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem Restoration
<b>Matrix value:</b>	6
<b>Comments:</b>	The CC appreciated the innovative bio-filtration approach to wastewater discharge while improving habitat and protecting fish. The CC saw potential benefits to lamprey and enjoyed the fish viewing ideas.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC maintained the project's relative position on the matrix.

<b>Project:</b>	11-1595 Pott Habitat Parcel Restoration
<b>Matrix value:</b>	5
<b>Comments:</b>	Group moved quickly – very little discussion.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC maintained the project's relative position on the matrix.

<b>Project:</b>	11-1600 Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration Design
<b>Matrix value:</b>	7
<b>Comments:</b>	The CC liked this project because it fits nicely with all of the work slated for this location (moving the Fruitvale diversion to Nelson Dam) and shows strong work between partners. Group moved quickly – very little discussion. Clarified that the letters of support have been received
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC maintained the project's relative position on the matrix.

The CC decided that we should approach the Teanaway project sponsor about revising their proposal to a design only approach. If more money were to become available as a result of this change, they would like to see Coleman Creek funded at a level that will allow the project to move forward. Alex informed the group that the Klickitat Lead Entity had a project on Rock Creek that the Lower Columbia region allocation was unable to fully fund. Klickitat feels this is an important project for the basin and it comes with strong partnerships and a 45% match. If we had money remaining, would we be willing to backfill this deficit? The CC members agreed that we should do this as a goodwill gesture.

**PROPOSED REVISED 2012-2013 Budget**

	<u>FY 2011 Budget</u>	<u>FY 2012</u>	<u>FY 2013</u>	<u>Biennium</u>	<u>CHANGE</u>
<b>INCOME</b>					
RCO Regional Organization & Lead Entity Contract	380,000	349,547	350,453	700,000	
RCO Implementation Schedule Extension		52,500		52,500	
		<u>402,047</u>	<u>350,453</u>	<u>752,500</u>	
<b>EXPENSES</b>					
Personnel					
Executive Director (1 FTE)	74,648	79,020	79,020	158,041	2,133
Lead Entity Program Coordinator (1 FTE)	48,538	44,000	45,000	89,000	-
Recovery Coordinator (.75 FTE)	46,965	48,374	48,374	96,748	-
Operations/Outreach Coordinator (.75 FTE)	45,000	33,540	33,540	67,080	-
Payroll Expenses	25,818	24,592	24,712	49,304	256
Retirement benefits	6,455	6,148	6,178	12,326	64
Health Benefits	33,000	34,000	37,400	71,400	-
Total Personnel	<u>280,423</u>	<u>269,674</u>	<u>274,224</u>	<u>543,899</u>	
Operating Costs					
Computer Support	2000	4,000	4,000	8,000	
Dues and Subscriptions	500	500	500	1,000	
Registration Fees	1,000	2,000	2,000	4,000	
Insurance	3,000	2,500	2,500	5,000	
Office Supplies	2,750	3,000	3,000	6,000	
Postage and Delivery	500	1,000	1,000	2,000	
Advertising	2,000	1,500	1,500	3,000	
Printing and Reproduction	5,000	5,000	5,000	10,000	
Office Rent	18,600	19,800	19,800	39,600	
Utilities					
Natural gas	1,500	1,600	1,600	3,200	
Electric	1,200	1,300	1,300	2,600	
Security	390	400	400	800	
Janitorial	1,690	1,690	1,750	3,440	
Telephone	4,000	2,500	2,500	5,000	
Internet Service	2,000	1,200	1,200	2,400	
Equipment & Furnishings	3,000	2,500	2,500	5,000	
Food & Beverages	new item	500	500	1,000	
Interest Expenses	225	225	225	450	
Bank Service Charges	275	275	275	550	
Total Operating Costs	<u>48,630</u>	<u>51,490</u>	<u>51,550</u>	<u>103,040</u>	
Professional Fees					
Consulting					
Technical writing/editing	5,000	5,000	3,000	8,000	
Web design/support	10,000	1,500	1,000	2,500	
Technical Support					
Technical support for database/data mgmt	6,317	52,500	-	52,500	
Accountant/Audit	8,000	9,000	9,000	18,000	
Legal	1,000	1,000	1,000	2,000	
	<u>35,317</u>	<u>69,000</u>	<u>14,000</u>	<u>83,000</u>	
Program Expense	250	250	250	500	
Misc Expense/contingency	3,630	4,383	3,179	7561.5	(2,452)
Travel					
Lodging	2,000	1,500	1,500	3000	
Meals & Per Diem	600	600	600	1200	
Travel- other	150	150	150	300	
Mileage Reimbursements	8,000	5,000	5,000	10000	
Total Travel	<u>11,750</u>	<u>7,250</u>	<u>7,250</u>	<u>14,500</u>	
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<u><b>380,000</b></u>	<u><b>402,047</b></u>	<u><b>350,453</b></u>	<u><b>752,500</b></u>	
<b>Net Income</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(0)</b>	

**Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board**  
**Balance Sheet**  
 As of August 16, 2011

	Aug 16, 11
<b>ASSETS</b>	
<b>Current Assets</b>	
<b>Checking/Savings</b>	
100 · Wells Fargo Checking	3,566.88
110 · Wells Fargo Saving	8,743.76
<b>Total Checking/Savings</b>	12,310.64
<b>Total Current Assets</b>	12,310.64
<b>Fixed Assets</b>	
<b>160 · Fixed Assets</b>	
<b>161 · Equipment</b>	
163 · Equipment & Furnishings	8,911.30
161 · Equipment - Other	37,198.32
<b>Total 161 · Equipment</b>	46,109.62
<b>Total 160 · Fixed Assets</b>	46,109.62
<b>170 · Accumulated Depreciation</b>	-16,715.59
<b>Total Fixed Assets</b>	29,394.03
<b>TOTAL ASSETS</b>	<b>41,704.67</b>
<b>LIABILITIES &amp; EQUITY</b>	
<b>Liabilities</b>	
<b>Current Liabilities</b>	
<b>Accounts Payable</b>	
200 · Accounts Payable	349.03
<b>Total Accounts Payable</b>	349.03
<b>Credit Cards</b>	
205 · Denise Credit Card	68.21
202 · Alex Credit Card	10.50
<b>Total Credit Cards</b>	78.71
<b>Other Current Liabilities</b>	
203 · Unearned Income	38,000.00
<b>210 · Payroll Liabilities</b>	
2105 · 940 Fed Unemployment Payable	180.96
2106 · Medical Insurance Payable	-69.08
2108 · Labor & Industries Payable	96.04
2109 · Employment Security Payable	21.15
<b>Total 210 · Payroll Liabilities</b>	229.07
<b>Total Other Current Liabilities</b>	38,229.07
<b>Total Current Liabilities</b>	38,656.81
<b>Total Liabilities</b>	38,656.81
<b>Equity</b>	
310 · Retained Earnings	-46,270.45
Net Income	49,318.31
<b>Total Equity</b>	3,047.86
<b>TOTAL LIABILITIES &amp; EQUITY</b>	<b>41,704.67</b>

**Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board**  
**Profit & Loss**  
 July 6 through August 16, 2011

	Jul 6 - Aug 16, 11
<b>Ordinary Income/Expense</b>	
<b>Income</b>	
510 · State Funds	75,000.00
<b>Total Income</b>	75,000.00
<b>Gross Profit</b>	75,000.00
<b>Expense</b>	
706 · Personnel	
7061 · Benefits	
70611 · Medical Insurance	2,841.21
70612 · Simple IRA	312.73
<b>Total 7061 · Benefits</b>	3,153.94
7062 · Salary & Wages	13,778.44
7063 · Paid Time Off	
70631 · Holiday Pay	866.32
70633 · Vacation Pay	2,378.86
<b>Total 7063 · Paid Time Off</b>	3,245.18
7064 · Payroll Tax Expenses	
70641 · Federal Social Security Taxes	1,002.12
70642 · Federal Medicare Taxes	234.37
70643 · State Industrial Insurance Tax	53.70
70644 · State Unemployment Taxes	21.10
<b>Total 7064 · Payroll Tax Expenses</b>	1,311.29
<b>Total 706 · Personnel</b>	21,488.85
710 · Operating Costs	
7102 · Bank Service Charges	-12.50
7103 · Communications	
71031 · Internet Service	117.90
71032 · Telephone	334.58
<b>Total 7103 · Communications</b>	452.48
7105 · Dues and Subscriptions	29.00
7120 · Office Rent	1,550.00
7130 · Office Supplies	23.57
7140 · Postage and Delivery	40.64
7150 · Printing and Reproduction	421.33
7155 · Seminar Registration Fees	300.00
7157 · Food & Beverages	223.28
7160 · Utilities	
7161 · Electric	166.09
7162 · Natural Gas	24.13
7163 · Janitorial	135.00
<b>Total 7160 · Utilities</b>	325.22
717 · Interest Expenses	
7113 · Loan Interest	41.17
<b>Total 717 · Interest Expenses</b>	41.17
<b>Total 710 · Operating Costs</b>	3,394.19
715 · Professional Fees	
7151 · Accounting	200.00
<b>Total 715 · Professional Fees</b>	200.00

5:13 PM  
08/16/11  
Accrual Basis

**Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board**  
**Profit & Loss**  
July 6 through August 16, 2011

	<u>Jul 6 - Aug 16, 11</u>
780 · Travel	
784 · Mileage Reimbursements	586.04
785 · Miscellaneous, Parking, Ferries	13.50
<b>Total 780 · Travel</b>	<u>599.54</u>
<b>Total Expense</b>	<u>25,682.58</u>
<b>Net Ordinary Income</b>	49,317.42
<b>Other Income/Expense</b>	
<b>Other Income</b>	
801 · Interest Income	0.89
<b>Total Other Income</b>	<u>0.89</u>
<b>Net Other Income</b>	<u>0.89</u>
<b>Net Income</b>	<u><u>49,318.31</u></u>