

2008 Yakima Basin Regional Area Funding Report

1. Internal Funding Allocations

A. Describe the process and criteria used to develop allocations across watersheds with the region.

The Mid-Columbia Region was allocated \$ 1,974,000 for the 2008 SRFB Grant Round. As defined by the GSRO, the Mid-Columbia Region includes WRIAs #30 (Klickitat), #31 (Rock-Glade), #37 (Lower Yakima), #38 (Naches) and #39 (Upper Yakima).

The Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board is the Salmon Recovery Regional Organization for the Yakima Basin (WRIAs 37, 38 & 39). The Board is also under contract with WDFW to serve as the Lead Entity for these three WRIAs. There is no regional organization serving WRIAs 30 and 31. WRIA 30 is part of the Klickitat Lead Entity. The Klickitat Lead Entity also includes part of WRIA 29, which is not in the Mid-Columbia Region. WRIA 31 is not part of a Lead Entity.

Because there is not a single regional organization that includes both the areas served by the Yakima Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board and that portion of the Klickitat Lead Entity's area that is within the Mid-Columbia Region, the two organizations entered into discussions about how to divide the Mid-Columbia allocation between them.

The YBFWRB and the Klickitat Lead Entity agreed to submit separate Lead Entity lists for 2008 and to divide funding between the two lists based on an agreed-upon allocation. Discussions for developing a region-wide process continue. Early in the review process, it became apparent that the SRFB funding request from the Klickitat LE area would be more than it had in the past few years, closer to 40% of the total allocation for the Mid-Columbia Region. As the LE received and amended SRFB grant applications, the Klickitat LE kept the Yakima Board informed regarding its funding needs so the Yakima Board could adjust expectations accordingly and determine if there would be a need to negotiate how to divide funding. The total SRFB funding request for the Klickitat LE project list is \$776,880.00 (39%) of the money allocated for the Mid-Columbia Region, leaving \$1,197,120 (61%) for allocation by the YBFWRB in WRIAs 37, 38 and 39. After the Yakima Board completed its review process, it became apparent negotiating for more than 61% of the allocation would not be necessary this year. The average allocation over the three funding cycles since regional allocations began is 74% Yakima Lead Entity, 26% Klickitat Lead Entity.

2. Regional Technical Review Process

A. Explain how the regional technical review was conducted.

In the Yakima portion of the Middle Columbia River region, the Regional Organization and the Lead Entity are the same organization. We ran the Lead Entity process using

the Yakima Lead Entity's existing Technical Advisory Group (TAG) as the technical review team. Given that 1) the area covered by the Lead Entity and the regional organization is identical, and 2) most potential candidates for serving on a regional technical review team were already serving on the lead entity review team, the YBFWRB saw no reason to convene a separate review team. If in the future, there were agreement among all parties that we should develop a regional review that involves multiple Lead Entities, we would work with other parties to develop a separate regional technical review process.

B. What criteria were used for the regional technical review?

The Lead Entity used the same evaluation criteria for both the regional and local review. See the local review process below in question 4A.

C. Who completed the review, and are they part of the regional organization or independent?

Participants in the 2008 SRFB Technical Advisory Group are listed below. Participants were chosen to assure 1) a broad range of knowledge about fisheries and habitat restoration in the Yakima Basin, 2) inclusion of participants from all parts of the basin (upper, mid and lower), and 3) representation of the full range of organizations active in fisheries and watershed management in the basin. While some members have changed over time, the TAG is a long-standing committee that the Lead Entity has used in past SRFB project reviews, and in the Yakima Subbasin Review of BPA proposals conducted by the YBFWRB in the spring of 2006. All of the voting members are independent of the regional organization in that they work with the Lead Entity as representatives of their individual organizations, and are not otherwise directly affiliated with the regional organization.

Yakima Basin Technical Advisory Group

Richard Visser, TAG moderator (non-voting), WDFW, Watershed Steward
Dale Bambrick, NOAA Fisheries, Ellensburg Branch Chief
John Easterbrooks, WDFW, Regional Fish Program Manager
Joel Freudenthal, Yakima County, Fish & Wildlife Biologist
Anna Lael, Kittitas County Conservation District, District Manager
Paul LaRiviere, WDFW, Instream Flow Biologist
Walt Larrick, Bureau of Reclamation
David Lind, Yakama Nation, Fisheries Biologist
Pat Monk, US Fish & Wildlife Service, Fisheries Biologist
Scott Nicolai, Yakima Klickitat Fisheries Project Habitat Biologist
Karin "Yuki" Reiss, US Forest Service, Fisheries Biologist
Tom Ring, Yakama Nation, Hydrogeologist
Jeff Thomas, US Fish & Wildlife Service, Fisheries Biologist
Rebecca Wassell, Mid Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group, Program Manager

D. Where there any projects submitted to the SRFB for funding that were not specifically identified in the regional implementation plan or habitat work schedule? If so, please provide justification for including these projects to the list of projects recommended to the SRFB for funding. If the projects were identified in the regional implementation plan or strategy but considered a low priority or in a low priority area, please provide justification.

We had one project, 08-2015 Amon Creek Fish Passage 2, which did not strongly align with biological priorities identified in the regional implementation plan. The TAG and CC included this project on our LE List as an alternate because of the high public visibility and accessibility of the project within the community and its potential to promote salmon recovery efforts in the lower Yakima basin. This project has the support of an organization with a proven record of accomplishment of environmental education, so success in this arena is likely.

3. How did your regional review consider whether a project:

A. Provides benefit to high priority stocks for the purpose of salmon recovery or sustainability. In addition to limiting factors analysis, SASSI and SSHIAP, what stock assessment work has been done to date to further characterize the status of salmonid species in the region? Briefly describe.

Steelhead and bull trout are the ESA listed species in the Yakima Basin, and all stocks are high priority for recovery actions. The Yakima Steelhead Recovery Plan review draft dated March 24, 2008 contains the most current data and local knowledge of the status of steelhead populations. As indicated in the plan, "Ongoing monitoring of steelhead populations will be required to allow objective comparisons between current status and trends of key VSP parameters and recovery criteria. This work should be closely coordinated among NOAA Fisheries, the Interior Columbia Technical Recovery Team, WDFW, the Yakama Nation, and the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board." A bull trout update to the Board's 2005 Salmon Recovery Plan is in development in cooperation with U.S. Fish & Wildlife.

B. Address cost effectiveness. Provide a description of how cost-effectiveness was considered.

Both our TAG and CC evaluated project budgets as a part of the ranking process. The TAG assigned each project a high, medium, or low certainty of success score based on the whether the budget was complete and accurate, if the costs were reasonable for the work proposed relative to similar projects, if the return for the dollars invested was acceptable, and if the project identified a priority for salmon recovery in the basin. Our CC determined if a budget was too high or low, if it was reasonable relative to other similar projects and the benefits derived, or if it had a high cost to benefit ratio. The scores for each project for both the TAG and CC process are included in question 4.

One of the challenges our TAG members encounter when analyzing budgets is determining the true benefits of projects regardless of cost. For instance, many TAG members consider 08-1952 Manastash Creek Diversion Consolidation to be a small part of a very expensive project. However, when this project is completed, it will open up approximately 25% of the potential tributary habitat for steelhead in the Upper Yakima. For this reason, both the TAG and CC were more than willing to invest \$600,000 in the project. Alternately, there have been several projects presented to both committees that had reasonable budgets with high match, but the opportunity cost and smaller benefit to fish made them not as attractive or exciting. This has been the crux of our ongoing debate over “bang for buck” and the quest for the “wow” project.

C-1 Appendix M

See Appendix A: Regional Area Project Matrix

4. Local Review Process

A. Provide project evaluation criteria and documentation (local technical reviewer and citizen committee score sheet or comment forms) of your local Citizens Advisory Group and Technical Advisory Group ratings for each project, including explanations for difference between the two groups ratings.

Local Pre-Application Process

The Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board requested pre-applications for potential projects that qualified for SRFB funding in March 2008. The RFP was posted on the YBFWRB website, posted in local newspapers, and distributed via email networks. On May 23, 2008, the Board received 16 pre-applications. Board staff reviewed these proposals, and corresponded with applicants regarding developing the proposals into full applications. On July 23, 2008, applicants submitted all 16 of the pre-applications as complete SRFB funding requests.

2008 Yakima Basin SRFB Applications

08-1476	Wade Road Farm	Cascade Land Conservancy
08-1477	Whiskey Creek	Cascade Land Conservancy
08-1799	Swauk Creek Wood Addition & Assessment	Central Washington University
08-1930	Herke Fish Screening – Ahtanum Creek	North Yakima Conservation District
08-1931	Canal Siphon Undershot Fish Passage -Cowiche	North Yakima Conservation District
08-1939	Jack Creek Restoration Design	Mid Columbia RFEG
08-1945	Upper Yakima Instream Habitat	Kittitas Conservation Trust
08-1946	Port of Sunnyside Wetlands Habitat	Port of Sunnyside
08-1947	Swauk and Iron Creek Restoration Design	Mid Columbia RFEG
08-1948	Upper Wapato Reach Restoration	Yakima County Public Service
08-1949	Coleman Creek irrigation Redesign	Kittitas County Conservation District
08-1952	Manastash Creek Diversion Consolidation	Kittitas County Conservation District
08-1964	Oak Flats Protection	WDFW
08-1965	Wapato Reach Assessment	WDFW
08-2001	Large Wood Replenishment	Mid Columbia RFEG
08-2015	Amon Creek Fish Passage 2	Meadow Springs Country Club

Board staff reviewed these applications for completeness, and then compiled reference binders containing color copies of each application in its entirety. We distributed these binders to Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and Citizens Committee (CC) members between July 7 and July 11. We also sent copies to the state review panel members scheduled to visit our basin. Extra copies were available after that date for other interested parties.

Presentations to Reviewers

On July 18, applicants presented their projects to members of the TAG and CC. Each applicant had 20 minutes to present an overview of their projects and answer questions posed by TAG and CC members present. This initial meeting was an opportunity for TAG and CC members to become more familiar with the projects, and to address any preliminary issues with the projects.

Those present at the July 18 Presentations were:

TAG Members: Richard Visser, Paul Lariviere, Dale Bambrick, Pat Monk, Yuki Reiss, John Easterbrooks, Joel Freudenthal, Anna Lael, Jeff Thomas, Tom Ring, David Lind, Scott Nicolai, Becca Wassell,

CC Members: Don Chaplin, Onni Perala

Staff: Alex Conley, Angie Begosh

Site Tour with State Review Panel Representatives

The Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board invited the SRFB Review Panel to tour our 14 project sites on July 23 – 25, 2008. The panel members selected to visit the Yakima Basin projects were Pat Powers and Patty Michak, with Barb McIntosh of the RCO joining them. We were originally scheduled for 2 days, but because we had so many projects spread throughout our basin, they were gracious enough to come an extra ½ day early. Panel members received copies of the application binders to review prior to the tour. They viewed 14 of 16 project sites. Rather than a field tour, the Richard Visser gave a presentation on WDFW's Oak Flats Protection (08-1964) project in the field during lunch for the sake of time and convenience. Joel Freudenthal from Yakima County Public Services gave a presentation on the Upper Wapato Reach Restoration (08-1948) project and we viewed both Wapato projects (08-1948 and 08-1965) from the van. Board staff invited TAG and CC members to participate in this process. Joel Freudenthal (TAG) accompanied us for part of the second day, and Pat Monk (TAG) participated on the third day. The panel members asked questions and addressed their concerns with project applicants and Board staff. Barb McIntosh forwarded the panel's written comments to the YBFWRB staff on August 4. These comments were shared with applicants, and they were asked to address these issues to strengthen their proposals and enter them into PRISM.

Between July 18 and August 14, applicants had the opportunity to submit any changes or adjustments to their applications so a packet containing amended applications could be prepared for the TAG's review.

Technical Advisory Group Review Process

The TAG met on August 14, from 9:00 am – 5:00 pm in the Labor & Industries Conference Room in Yakima to review the applications. The Board staff provided the members with updates and changes to proposals. We had sent comments from the state review panel site visits on July 23-25 the week prior to the evaluation.

Those present were:

TAG members: Scott Nicolai, Becca Wassell, Anna Lael, Tom Ring, Pat Monk, David Lind, Yuki Reiss, John Easterbrooks, Dale Bambrick, Jeff Thomas, Paul Lariviere, Joel Freudenthal, Richard Visser.

Staff members: Alex Conley, Angie Begosh

TAG Criteria

For the regional and local technical review, we used two sets of criteria to rank projects.

1. TAG Biological Matrix: The TAG used this tool to award projects a score based on its possible and intended biological benefit. The maximum score a project can receive is listed under possible score – projects can receive partial points. This score is adjusted based on two weighting factors; habitat quantity and quality and biological certainty. The final score was normalized so that the maximum possible score for a project cannot exceed 100.

2. TAG Evaluation Forms: LE Staff developed two evaluations sheets to help guide the TAG discussion; one for protection projects and one for restoration projects. These worksheets listed several "certainty of success" categories, and TAG members used these as a guide to discuss factors not addressed in the matrix. This is the first year we used these evaluation sheets, and they were designed to help maintain consistency in the project evaluations, and to help LE staff document the discussion.

See Appendix B: TAG Matrix

See Appendix C: TAG Evaluation Sheets

We made several adjustments to last year's scoring matrix to try to address concerns about scoring biases for certain types of projects. After completing last year's review, TAG members felt that the scoring model gave too much credit to some protection type projects (acquisitions) but not enough credit to some passage projects. This year the matrix appeared to do an adequate job of ranking projects without the need for adjustments. Score sheets for each proposal are included in:

Appendix D: TAG Project Matrix Scores and Evaluation Notes

Citizens Committee Review Process

The Citizens Committee membership was selected based on location within the basin and representation of a wide variety of interests within the community. Since hiring a full time LE coordinator last year, the board is working to expand Citizens Committee membership to include more participants from Benton County. We are working closely with the Benton County Conservation District as they work on SRFB funded project 07-1566 Lower Yakima River Assessment. As they identify potential projects and vet them through their technical and citizens processes, we hope to recruit participants from this process into our LE process.

2008 Yakima Basin Citizens Committee participants

Don Chaplin, Yakima County, retired, WSU Extension

Mark Charlton, Kittitas County, agricultural producer

Jack Clark, Benton County, Benton County Conservation District Board

Kevin Eslinger, Kittitas County, agricultural producer

Bill Gillespie, Yakima County, North Yakima Conservation District Board

Onni Perala, Yakima County, retired, Bureau of Reclamation

Ken Ratliff, Kittitas County, Land Developer

Jim Schnebly, Kittitas County, agricultural producer

After the 2007 SRFB grant round, the Citizen's Committee members expressed dissatisfaction with the evaluation criteria provided in the 2005 Lead Entity Strategy. Members felt that the categories were vague, and did not provide clear definitions of what they were required to evaluate. In response, Lead Entity staff developed a new set of criteria for the Citizens Committee. Rather than defining categories (such as cultural, social, and economic values), we created specific questions that related to each category. Additionally, instead of ranking projects according to the Citizen's matrix, the committee assigned a value to each project, and used the value to adjust the TAG ranking.

See Appendix E: Community Evaluation and Ranking Matrix

The Citizens Committee convened on August 21, 2008, at the USDA Service Center to evaluate the SRFB projects. Prior to meeting, they received updated project applications, comments from the state review panel visit, and notes and priority ranking from the TAG review.

Those present:

CC: Ken Ratliff (Kittitas County), Mark Charlton (Kittitas County), Jim Schnebly (Kittitas County), Onni Perala (Yakima County), Jack Clark (Benton County), Don Chaplin (Yakima County)

Staff: Richard Visser, Alex Conley, Angie Begosh

See Appendix F: CC Criteria Scores

See Appendix G: CC Evaluation Discussion and Justification for Rank

The TAG and the CC each had distinctive roles in the prioritization of projects. The TAG was responsible for determining the technical validity of a project, and how valuable the project was to salmonid populations. The CC was responsible for evaluating how the project might affect the community, and how much community support the project garnered. The Citizens Committee did not determine a separate ranking, rather, they scored projects and used this score to justify adjusting the TAG ranking to create a final ranking.

B. Identify your local technical review team (include expertise, names, and affiliations of members).

Our local technical review team is the same as our regional review team (see Question 2C above.)

C. Explain how and when the SRFB Review Panel participated in your process (e.g., early in the process, throughout, late; technical and citizen processes).

The SRFB participated late in our process, starting with the site visits on July 23-25th. They provided feedback to staff and applicants on site, and followed up promptly with their written comments, understanding that our TAG review would be in three weeks.

They also provided LE staff with feedback on some of the technicalities of applications such as eligibility, budget formatting, and description wording. Patty was especially helpful in providing suggestions to help applicants improve their applications from a logistical standpoint. They also attended our TAG review on August 14th. Here they were a tremendous asset to our process as they could provide feedback to our TAG members based on their site visits while at the same time taking into consideration the local expertise when they evaluated projects. We will work to involve the SRFB Review Panel earlier in our process next year, and we are pleased with how well their involvement enhanced our process this year.

5. Local Evaluation Process and Project Lists

A. Explain how multi-year implementation plans or work schedules were used to develop project lists.

The March 24, 2008 Draft Yakima Steelhead Recovery outlines a list of recovery actions recommended to contribute to restoring steelhead to viable levels in the Yakima Basin. Project applicants were asked to identify the actions that pertained to their project in their application, and during the TAG evaluation process, we determined if a project had a high, medium or low fit to the recovery plan. This information is included in the summary of our TAG discussion in the outline of the local review process in question 4.

B Explain how comments of technical, citizen, and policy reviews were addressed in finalizing the project list.

The scores and comments provided by the technical and citizen's committees form the basis for the ranked project list presented to the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board. No additional policy issues were raised by the Board, which approved the list at its September 3rd, 2008 meeting as submitted by the Citizen's Committee. Overall both committee members and the Board felt that the improvements made to the Lead Entity process increased the clarity and transparency of the process, and resulted in a strong project list that clearly reflected the knowledge and understanding of all participants in the review process.

Appendices

Appendix A: Regional Area Project Matrix

Appendix B: TAG Matrix

Appendix C: TAG Evaluation Sheets

Appendix D: TAG Project Matrix Scores and Evaluation Notes

Appendix E: Community Evaluation and Ranking Matrix

Appendix F: CC Criteria Scores

Appendix G: CC Evaluation Discussion and Justification for Rank

Appendix A: Regional Area Project Matrix

APPENDIX M – REGIONAL AREA PROJECT MATRIX TEMPLATE

For Question 3C through 3I.
Region: Mid Columbia – Yakima Basin

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	3 C. Primary Fish Stock Benefited	3 C. Name of listed species	3 C. Other species benefiting from this project	3 D. Preserves high quality habitat	3 E. Priority in recovery plan or strategy (list page)	3 F. Match %	3 G. Sponsor record of SRFB project implementation	3 H. Veterans involved
1	08-1952	Manastash Creek Diversion Consolidation	Kittitas County Conservation District	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	coho, spring Chinook	N/A	Basinwide Action #2: Adequately screen all water diversions. page 142 Basinwide Action #4: Increase irrigation water delivery efficiency. Upper Yakima Action #5: Provide passage and instream flows in lower Manastash Creek page 186	73%	8 Awarded 3 Completed 5 Active	No
2	08-2001	Large Wood Replenishment	Mid Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group	Upper Yakima and Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	bull trout, Chinook, coho	N/A	Naches Action #12: Place large woody debris in Little Naches page 163 Upper Yakima Action #14: Restore instream and floodplain habitat complexity in Swauk and Taneum Creeks and Teanaway and lower Cle Elum Rivers. page 192	16%	3 Awarded 1 Completed 2 Active	No
3	08-1964	Oak Flats Protection	WDFW	Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	bull trout, Chinook, coho	298 acres, 2.4 miles of stream	Naches Action #7: Protect habitats in Naches River mainstem above Tieton confluence. page 161	74%	2 Awarded 1 Complete 1 Active (in this basin)	No

4	08-1948	Upper Wapato Reach Restoration	Yakima County Public Services	Naches and Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Chinook, coho	N/A	Basinwide Action # 10: Promote land and resource use decisions that protect and enhance fisheries resource values p.146 Basinwide Action #11: Restore beaver population page 147 Basinwide Action # 12: Improve recruitment of cottonwoods page 147 Lower mainstem Action # 6: Restore mainstem and side channel habitats page 152 Lower mainstem Action #7: Protect and restore mainstem and floodplain habitats below Sunnyside Dam. page 153	55%	2 Awarded 1 Complete 1 Active (in this basin)	No
5	08-1965	Wapato Reach Assessment	WDFW	Satus, Toppenish, Naches, Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Chinook, coho	N/A	Basinwide Action # 10: Promote land and resource use decisions that protect and enhance fisheries resource values p.146 2. Basinwide Action #11: Restore beaver population, page 147 3. Basinwide Action # 12: Improve recruitment of cottonwoods, p. 147 4. Lower mainstem Action # 6: Restore mainstem and side channel habitats p. 152	15%	2 Awarded 1 Complete 1 Active (in this basin)	No
6	08-1946	Port of Sunnyside Wetlands Habitat	Port of Sunnyside	Satus, Toppenish, Naches, Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Chinook, coho	N/A	Lower Mainstem Action #7: Protect and restore mainstem and floodplain habitats below Sunnyside Dam page 153	28%	None	No

7	08-1939	Jack Creek Restoration Design	Mid Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group	Upper Yakima Steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Chinook, bull trout	N/A	Upper Yakima Action #14: Restore instream and floodplain habitat complexity in Swauk and Taneum Creeks and Teanaway and lower Cle Elum Rivers page 192	15%	3 Awarded 1 Completed 2 Active	No
8	08-1949	Coleman Creek Irrigation Redesign	Kittitas County Conservation District	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Chinook, coho	N/A	Basinwide Action #2: Adequately screen all water diversions. p. 142 Upper Yakima Action #11: Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg area tributaries, p. 189	15%	8 Awarded 3 Completed 5 Active	No
9	08-1476	Wade Road Farm	Cascade Land Conservancy	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Chinook, coho, bull trout	13 acres .5 miles of stream	Upper Yakima Action # 13: Protect and restore floodplain, riparian, and in-channel habitats in Upper Yakima, Kittitas, and Easton/Cle Elum reaches page 191	16%	1 awarded 1 active (in this basin)	No
10	08-1930	Herke Fish Screening, Ahtanum Creek	North Yakima Conservation District	Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Chinook, coho, bull trout	N/A	Basinwide Action #2: Adequately screen all water diversions. page 142	15%	7 awarded 4 complete 3 active	No
11	08-1947	Swauk & Iron Creek Restoration Design	Mid Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Chinook	N/A	Upper Yakima Action #4: Improve instream flows in Swauk Creek and Teanaway watersheds, p. 185 Upper Yakima Action #14: Restore instream and floodplain habitat complexity in Swauk and Taneum Creeks and Teanaway and lower Cle Elum Rivers, p. 192 Upper Yakima Action #20: Restore tributary headwater meadows, p. 196	15%	3 Awarded 1 Completed 2 Active	No

12	08-2015	Amon Creek Fish Passage 2	Meadow Springs Country Club	Satus steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	coho	N/A	Not specifically identified as action in plan, but referenced in Section 4.3.9 of plan and potential contributor to meeting Satus "mainstem block" steelhead abundance targets.	58%	None	No
----	---------	---------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------	------------------------	------	-----	---	-----	------	----

*Note: Blank Template available on the RCO website at: <http://www.rco.wa.gov/srfb/docs.htm>

Appendix B: TAG Matrix

TAG Biological Scoring Matrix	
Scoring Criteria	Possible Score
<i>Species – Action in Priority Area</i>	
Steelhead	2
Bull Trout	2
Spring Chinook	1
Fall Chinook	1
Coho	1
INSTREAM FLOW AND HYDROGRAPH	
1a Improves degraded instream flow and/or hydrograph for salmonid benefit (e.g. water rights placed in trust)	4
1b Assess instream flow needs (IFIM) or designs project to improve instream flow and/or hydrograph	3
WATER QUALITY (e.g. temperature, DO, suspended sediments, nutrients, toxics)	
2a Improves degraded water quality by reducing or eliminating contaminant (i.e. increased water temperature, sediment, nitrates, etc.)	4
2b Assess/design contaminant source fate and transport	3
IN-CHANNEL HABITAT (e.g. lwd, spawning gravel, pool/riffle ratios)	
3 Improves degraded LWD densities (e.g. wood has been removed or natural recruitment has been altered)	3
4a Protects rearing habitat	
4a Protects rearing habitat	4
4b Improves degraded rearing habitat	
4b Improves degraded rearing habitat	4
4c Assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs	
4c Assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs	3
5a Protects spawning habitat	
5a Protects spawning habitat	4
5b Improves degraded spawning habitat	
5b Improves degraded spawning habitat	4
5c Assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs	
5c Assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs	3
HABITAT ACCESS	
6a Restores access for juvenile and/or adult to high quality habitat	5
6b Restores access for juvenile and/or adult to functional habitat	4
6c Assess/design habitat access/factors affecting upstream distribution	3

DIVERSION SCREENING		
7a	Protects fish from entrainment, impingement and other diversion or screen induced mortality	5
7b	Assess/designs diversion screening	3
FLOODPLAIN CONNECTIVITY/RIPARIAN CONDITION		
8a	Protects functioning floodplain and riparian (e.g. acquisition)	4
8b	Improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions (e.g. dike breaching)	4
8c	Assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor & functions	3
* The terms restore/improves are used in the context of moving toward more natural levels or conditions		
<i>Weighting Factors</i>		
WF 1 = Quality and Quantity		
Quality	> 3 miles 1 to 2 miles < 1 mile	
High	2.0 1.8 1.4	
Medium	1.8 1.6 1.2	
Low	1.4 1.2 1.0	
WF 2 = Relative Certainty of Success (Biological Success)		
1.0 if high certainty of success about 100%		
0.8 if reasonably certain of success about 80%		
0.5 if moderately certain of success about 50%		
0.3 if low certainty of success less than 50 %		

Appendix C: TAG Evaluation Sheets

2008 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form – Protection and Restoration

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: In order for a project to be successful, the landowner has to have full support of a project. The landowner should be involved in discussions regarding this project early in the planning process, and should be aware of, and willing to wait through, the grant administration process. The SRFB requires that the landowner sign a Landowner Acknowledgement form before an applicant can submit a grant for evaluation, and a signed commitment by the landowner before funding is approved.

Appraisal: A landowner's expectations of his/her property's value are a critical component of land acquisitions. Has the land been appraised and are the landowner's expectations reasonable?

Project Sequencing: Immediate usefulness of projects. Are we implementing projects in the correct order? A project should build upon and complement existing or future actions, and/or pave the way for additional habitat projects. Correctly sequencing and coordinating projects is an efficient use of limited resources and maximizes potential beneficial impacts. The proposal should complement and support local and state salmon recovery regulations and programs, including land use and development regulations, critical area ordinances, storm water management regulations, shoreline master plans, forest management regulations, etc.

Reasonable Budget: A proposed budget should be analyzed to determine if it is complete and the prices quoted are reasonable as compared with similar projects.

Threats to Habitat Values: The most urgent acquisitions are those properties with high quality habitat where there is a short term development threat that will degrade the quality of the habitat and existing regulations and/or ordinances will not adequately provide protection.

Organizational Capacity: The success of a project is ultimately tied to the ability of the sponsor to plan, design, and implement a proposal. Project sponsors should demonstrate the ability and/or intent to involve expertise outside of their own organization. Their proposal should be well-researched and demonstrate knowledge of current priorities within the basin, and be well planned, and organized in a logical sequence. They should be able to recognize any potential limitations and constraints, and identify how to deal with these.

Uncertainties and Constraints: A project should be reviewed to determine if there are any technical, legal, financial, or environmental constraints that could affect the outcome of the project or its permitability.

Future Stewardship: The SRFB requires a stewardship plan with the final documentation at the close of the project for acquisition and restoration projects on lands owned or controlled by the applicant. The proposal should indicate some plan for maintenance and monitoring of the project for at least 10 years.

Fit to Regional Plan: The proposal should implement actions identified in the Yakima Subbasin Salmon Recovery Plan.

Design Adequate for Goals: Project design should be cost effective and based on proven methods. The design should match the goals outlined in the proposal, and meet standards established by WDFW. Innovative and experimental approaches should be considered if proven methods are not feasible, if the conditions they were designed for cannot be corrected through conventional methods, if the potential benefits exceed that of traditional designs, and if the cost to benefit ratio is high.

Value to Education and Outreach: If a project is in a highly visible location, it can be a valuable tool for teaching the community the importance of protecting and/or restoring salmonid habitat. It can also foster a sense of ownership and pride. In order for projects to be valuable in this role, however, they need to be properly executed, innovative, and meet local regulations and ordinances.

2008 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form - Protection

Project Title:	
Applicant:	
Date of Review:	
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments:
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments:
Final Matrix Score:	

Priority Area	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> Mapped	
<input type="checkbox"/> TAG Priority	
<input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area	

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High	
<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	
<input type="checkbox"/> Low	
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Appraisal	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High	
<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	
<input type="checkbox"/> Low	
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Project Sequence	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High	
<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	
<input type="checkbox"/> Low	
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Reasonable Budget	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High	
<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	
<input type="checkbox"/> Low	
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Threats to Habitat Values	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Organizational Capacity	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Uncertainties and Constraints	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Future Stewardship	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Fit to Regional Plan	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Education

Value to Education and Outreach	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low	

Strengths of Proposal:

Weaknesses of Proposal:

TAG recommended actions for improvement of proposal before official submission to SRFB:

Final Ranking and Rationale:

2008 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form - Restoration

Project Title:	
Applicant:	
Date of Review:	
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments:
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments:
Final Matrix Score:	

Priority Area	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> Mapped	
<input type="checkbox"/> TAG Priority	
<input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area	

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High	
<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	
<input type="checkbox"/> Low	
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Project Sequence	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High	
<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	
<input type="checkbox"/> Low	
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Design Adequate for Goals	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High	
<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	
<input type="checkbox"/> Low	
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Reasonable Budget	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High	
<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	
<input type="checkbox"/> Low	
<input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Threats to Habitat Values	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Organizational Capacity	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Uncertainties and Constraints	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Future Stewardship	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Fit to Regional Plan	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Education

Value to Education and Outreach	Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low	

Strengths of Proposal:

Weaknesses of Proposal:

TAG recommended actions for improvement of proposal before official submission to SRFB:

Final Ranking and Rationale:

Appendix D: TAG Project Matrix Scores and Evaluation Notes

Project Title:	08-1476 Wade Road Farm			
Applicant:	Cascade Land Conservancy			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 1, bull trout 1, spring Chinook 1, coho, 1 4a. protects rearing habitat 4 8a. protects functioning floodplain and riparian (e.g. acquisition) 4			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.2			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.0			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals N/A	Value to Education	Mapped Priority
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area
Final Matrix Score:	8			
TAG Rank:	7/16			
Summary of Discussion: The TAG agreed that this project is a good opportunity to purchase an easement that links several other salmon recovery projects that will improve and preserve mainstem Yakima floodplain and riparian habitat. There is question about the degree of threat to the habitat as the riparian parcel is in the floodway where risk of development is lower, but not eliminated. The proponent reduced the SRFB request by half because of the reduced development threat, which makes it more attractive to the TAG, but it also brings uncertainty regarding whether the landowner is willing to accept less. The landowner will manage the property as an active agricultural enterprise (the agricultural land is a part of a request for farmland preservation), however, the conservation easement will protect the 13-acre riparian parcel indicated in the map included in the application. The TAG expressed concern about potential grazing damage to the property. Those who				

visited the site indicate that it is not degraded, and expressed a desire to see the conservation easement address grazing impacts. It is a small parcel and not a high priority for steelhead, but its role as a piece in a series of acquisitions on the mainstem in this area makes it a worthwhile project.

Project Title:	08-1477 Whiskey Creek			
Applicant:	Cascade Land Conservancy			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 1, spring Chinook 1, coho 1 2a. improves degraded water quality 3 4b. improves degraded rearing habitat 2 8b. improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions 2			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.0			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.5			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals N/A	Value to Education	Mapped Priority
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area
Final Matrix Score:	2			
TAG Rank:	14/16			
Summary of Discussion: The main factor in determining if the TAG should prioritize this project for salmon recovery funding is whether Whiskey Creek is a viable route for fish passage to high quality habitat in upper Naneum Creek. This project could be a part of providing long-term access to a significant amount of habitat, but there is considerable question if this is a viable route (Naneum Creek branches out into several channels, several of which could provide passage). There are instream flow issues (during irrigation season, several sections of this creek are dewatered) and there is a need for significant riparian habitat restoration. There is also question of barriers above and below the project site. A potential downstream barrier may prevent juvenile fish from reaching this property and there are several known upstream barriers that will prevent both juvenile and adult passage. Fish surveys indicate the presence of brook and rainbow trout, with a potential for spring Chinook and steelhead rearing if the downstream				

culvert is not a barrier. The proposal indicates an easement for a 250-foot buffer around the creek totaling 20 acres along with a 50-foot buffer being fenced to exclude cattle. The proposal does not include a map showing the boundaries of the proposed easement. The TAG feels \$ 377,000 is a large request for this piece of property. The proposal is innovative and has the potential to be an example meeting both development and conservation goals. However, the ultimate uncertainty about whether this route is valuable for getting fish to the upper Naneum habitat along with the uncertainty of passage to the project site make this proposal premature.

Project Title:	08-1964 Oak Flats Protection			
Applicant:	WDFW			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 1, bull trout 2, spring Chinook 1, coho 1 4a. protects rearing habitat 4 8a. protects functioning floodplain and riparian (e.g. acquisition) 4			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.8			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.0			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals N/A	Value to Education	Mapped Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area	
Final Matrix Score:	15			
TAG Rank:	3/16			
Summary of Discussion: This is a strong proposal because it proposes purchasing almost 300 acres of land adjacent to the Oak Creek Wildlife Management Area. The property contains high quality bull trout (with significant use documented in radio-tracking studies) and steelhead habitat. The appraisal is complete, the City of Yakima is a willing seller, and the city is expected to accept the appraised value. This acquisition will also increase public access. There is high certainty for successful completion of this project.				

Project Title:	08-1799 Swauk Creek Wood Addition and Assessment			
Applicant:	Central Washington University			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 2, spring Chinook 1, coho 1 1a. improves degraded water quality by reducing or eliminating contaminants 1 3. improves degraded LWD densities 3 4b. improves degraded rearing habitat 2 5b. improves degraded spawning habitat 2 8b. improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.2			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.3			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal N/A	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals N/A	Value to Education	Mapped Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area	
Final Matrix Score:	3			
TAG Rank:	12/16			
Summary of Discussion: Originally, the applicants submitted this proposal to conduct research on nutrient spiraling in Swauk Creek and identify potential data gaps through SRFB approved protocols in addition to implementing restoration actions. After the state review panel site visit, they agreed to remove the assessment portion of this proposal and focus on the restoration piece – large woody debris addition to a stretch of Swauk Creek on property owned by a private developer. One of the hopes of this project is to generate long-term discussion on how to tie together research and restoration projects. The TAG struggled with this application. There is potential for a good restoration project, but TAG members and the state				

review panel representatives had questions about the design; what type of design are they considering, who would be involved in the engineering, etc. There is concern that the proponents had not thought through the details of wood placement and how to keep it in the system. The applicants listed a riparian restoration plan as match in the application – they need to be clearer on what is included in the riparian restoration plan. There was also uncertainty about the applicant's ability to execute the restoration – this is not necessarily a negative comment, however, the applicant has no experience in conducting restoration work. The TAG would like to see the applicant's partner with an organization experienced in restoration and pair their research/assessment piece with another organization's restoration work. In the past, the TAG has recommended applications similar to this one be turned into an assessment to identify what needs to be done in the reach and then design and implement the restoration piece, and link it to CWU's research work. The proposed budget was also of concern to the TAG – \$ 59,000 worth of staff time seemed steep, and they are not willing at this time to dedicate that much of our allocation to salary.

Project Title:	08-1930 Herke Fish Screening – Ahtanum Creek			
Applicant:	North Yakima Conservation District			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 2, bull trout 2 7a. protects fish from entrainment, impingement, and other diversion or screen induced mortality 5			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.6			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.0			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal N/A	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals	Value to Education	Mapped Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area	
Final Matrix Score:	7			
TAG Rank:	9/16			
Summary of Discussion: The TAG agrees that this is a project is a priority – these are among the last unscreened diversions on Ahtanum Creek. However, the applicants need to address several questions and unresolved issues before we invest money in this project. First, we need to be certain about the amount of water at different times of the year that the landowner has a right to and then we need to install the appropriate screen size for the diversion. This information can be used make a better estimate of project costs. Mr. Herke has a specific water right, but during a certain time of year, he has access to an undefined excess water right. Mr. Herke states that he could use 8 cfs divided between his two diversions. Another question is if he should consolidate the two diversions. Mr. Herke is hesitant to do this because of fear of flooding his residential property, but many TAG members feel this would be more cost effective. TAG members from the Yakama Nation revealed a major uncertainty at the TAG meeting – that the				

Yakama Nation was filing a brief challenging the granting of rights to excess water in Ahtanum. Given these uncertainties, the TAG felt that while the project is a long-term priority, funding would be premature.

Project Title:	08-1945 Upper Yakima Instream Habitat			
Applicant:	Kittitas Conservation Trust			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 2, bull trout 1, spring Chinook 1, coho 1 3. improves degraded LWD densities 2			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.4			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.3			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal N/A	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals	Value to Education	Mapped Priority
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area	
Final Matrix Score:	1			
TAG Rank:	15/16			
Summary of Discussion: The TAG's primary concern with this project is that it is a bank protection project rather than restoration. The application did not document the need for this project in this reach. They would like to see an assessment showing the need (including photos) for an instream structure in this reach. Immediately upstream of this area there are high concentrations of large wood (within 1/2 mile of site.), however, there is a lack of wood at the proposed project site. Does this area need large wood addition? Could wood be a good thing at the site? This is unknown without an assessment. There is also concern that this project may degrade spawning habitat. This project would not be the best use of resources, as it is not addressing a limiting factor in this reach at this time. The TAG scored the project based on habitat value, not bank protection as a factor. At best, this project may add some habitat value, but the key question is how much. The applicant indicated that they would be willing to fund an assessment, but they				

would only carry it out if there were strong certainty that the proposed location would be determined to be ideal, and the TAG is uncertain whether an assessment would justify the proposal. There are more pressing needs in other locations in the basin considering the uncertainty of LWD needs in this section of the river and the limited resources available.

Project Title:	08-1952 Manastash Creek Diversion Consolidation			
Applicant:	Kittitas County Conservation District			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 2, spring Chinook 1, coho 1 1a. improves degraded instream flow and/or hydrograph for salmonid benefit 3 4b. improves degraded rearing habitat 1 6a. restores access for juvenile and/or adults to high quality habitat 5 7a. protects fish from entrainment, impingement and/or other diversion or screen induced mortality 5 8b. improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian function 1			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 2.0			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.0			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal N/A	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals	Value to Education	Mapped Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area	
Final Matrix Score:	26			
TAG Rank:	1/16			
Summary of Discussion: This complicated project is moving forward, and the sponsor has been determined to make it successful. The TAG agreed that this is a critically important project, not just for the habitat value, but for the community as well. The match has increased from the original proposal – there are several funding sources supporting this project, and many organizations cooperating to make this project work. There are a number of goals to this project, but there is a focus on restoring flow and passage. The primary goal of the project is to wet up the lower reach, but we have a long way to go. Implementing this project will improve the hydrograph of Manastash Creek, and provide access to significant				

amounts of potential rearing habitat. This piping will eliminate three unscreened diversions and address 2 of 6 passage barriers, including a significant barrier at Reed Ditch. Without this pipeline, consolidation won't happen, and the Manastash problems remain. There are still uncertainties remaining – the status of the abandoned dam is unknown and not all easements for the piping are finalized, but this project is too important not to go forward and fund it.

Project Title:	08-1965 Large Wood Replenishment			
Applicant:	Mid Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 2, bull trout 2, spring Chinook 1, coho 1 3. improves degraded LWD densities 3 4b. improves degraded rearing habitat 2 5b. improves degraded spawning habitat 2 8b. improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions 2			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.6			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.0			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal N/A	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals	Value to Education	Mapped Priority
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area	
Final Matrix Score:	19			
TAG Rank:	2/16			
Summary of Discussion: Overall, the TAG feels that this is an efficient project with high potential benefit and a minimal budget. This project has potential to enhance existing habitat, but not implementing the project will not cause habitat decline. There is potential to improve rearing and spawning habitat, and potential to improve floodplain function, instream flow, and decrease temperatures where they are impaired. It is important that the applicant choose sites carefully as this project is best suited for narrow channels. In addition, the applicant should consider potential downstream barriers. Landowner cooperation is likely, because most of these sites are on state or federal land. However, there may be extensive public review before some of the proposed projects can proceed. The TAG has questions about the durability of the logs placed in the system. Will the logs stay where placed? Will they be transported and remain functional, or will they be				

transported but become non-functional? Will logs be monitored and be repositioned and moved if non-functional? The benefits vary by site, but the recovery plan does address large wood replenishment. One suggestion to improve the application is to explain the rationale behind each site selection.

Project Title:	08-2015 Amon Creek Fish Passage 2			
Applicant:	Meadow Springs Country Club			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 2, coho 1 4b. improves degraded rearing habitat 2 6b. restores access for juvenile and/or adults to functional habitat 4 8b. improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions 1			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.6			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.8			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal N/A	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals	Value to Education	Mapped Priority
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area
Final Matrix Score:	6			
TAG Rank:	11/16			
Summary of Discussion: Many TAG members expressed support this project; others noted that from a purely biological perspective, it was a low priority. This project is in a highly visible location within the community, and organizations with a proven record of accomplishment in public education and outreach support it. It is an excellent opportunity to promote salmon recovery in the lower basin. The golf course has provided a significant match and passage design is adequate; there were questions about what the goals and plans are for riparian management. Improving riparian habitat should be a major goal of this project since improving floodplain conditions on the golf course is not a realistic expectation. It would be good to talk to the greens keeper and identify those areas where they are willing to plant. There is a mindset open to making changes. The TAG also asked whether the proponents should consider an alternative to routing the creeks through the lakes. Water going thru 200' of closed culvert or narrow channel				

would be cooler than that exposed to solar radiation in the lakes. Many TAG members are convinced deepening the ponds will also improve water quality (temperature) but will provide more room for predators (this is a better statement than above). Another issue that the TAG struggles with regarding this project is this is not historical fish habitat, and that the relationship between habitat management and management of return flows by the Kennewick Irrigation District (KID) is uncertain. The project will require work on easements owned by the Bureau of Reclamation and managed by KID. Overall, the TAG agreed that it is important to support this project because of its role in increasing the visibility of salmon recovery in the lower basin, but that the applicant needs to obtain the support of the Kennewick Irrigation District and the Bureau of Reclamation before the project should be approved for SRFB funding.

Project Title:	08-1948 Upper Wapato Reach Restoration			
Applicant:	Yakima County Public Service			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 1, spring Chinook 1, fall Chinook 1, coho 1 4b. improves degraded rearing habitat 3 5b. improves degraded spawning habitat 1 8b. improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian function 4			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.8			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.0			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal N/A	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals	Value to Education	Mapped Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area	
Final Matrix Score:	12			
TAG Rank:	4/16			
Summary of Discussion: The TAG felt that this proposal addresses critical issues along the Wapato reach, and that the benefits of restoration would accrue beyond the site. There is not a lot of salmonid spawning in this reach, but it is an important area for rearing juveniles. There are secondary benefits for spawning fall Chinook. Breaching dykes, removing dumped concrete, restoring riparian vegetation then allowing the channel to migrate will improve the floodplain. This is exactly what the Wapato reach needs. The TAG would like to see the applicants expand the area to be planted.				

Project Title:	08-1931 Cowiche Canal Siphon Undershot Fish Passage			
Applicant:	North Yakima Conservation District			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 1, spring Chinook 1, coho 1 6d. assess/design habitat access/factors affecting upstream distribution			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.8			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.0			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal N/A	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals	Value to Education N/A	Mapped Priority
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area	
Final Matrix Score:	1			
TAG Rank:	16/16			
Summary of Discussion: The project sponsors changed this application from a restoration to a design proposal after the initial presentation and the state review panel visit. Comments from the local TAG and the state review panel indicated that the sponsors needed to better assess the problem and determine how proposed solutions can best be integrated with other infrastructure and stream/floodplain restoration projects that will affect the project site. The TAG suggested that the applicants convene a workgroup to line up projects and determine an order of tasks to understand appropriate course of action. The TAG agrees that there is a worthwhile project here, though there was some discussion about the degree to which a seasonal juvenile barrier like this was limiting; it just needs to be demonstrated that the solution will fit well with other work planned for the site and immediately adjoining areas.				

Project Title:	08-1939 Jack Creek Restoration Design			
Applicant:	Mid Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 2, bull trout 1, spring Chinook 1 4c. assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs 3 5c. assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs 3 8c. assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor and functions 3			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.6			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.8			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal N/A	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value N/A	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship N/A
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals	Value to Education	Mapped Priority
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area	
Final Matrix Score:	10			
TAG Rank:	5/16			
Summary of Discussion: The TAG agrees that this proposal focuses on an area that is important for steelhead recovery and will be accessible to steelhead following projects that are already in progress that will replace downstream barriers. Restoring this creek is important for steelhead spawning, and the creek is severely degraded in several locations. The project provides a range of restoration alternatives. The TAG felt this was a difficult project to evaluate because the applicant didn't propose specific examples of suggested instream solutions. The most important step in restoring this creek is eliminate grazing impacts, remove the existing culvert that is currently a fish barrier (already funded), and move the road (proposed by the USFS in association with this proposal). The role of additional instream				

restoration was not clear to all TAG members. The TAG has questions regarding who will be setting the goals for the restoration work, and is uncertain whether the landowner will be willing to implement and protect the proposed restoration actions. However, if this design leads to a restoration project, an area with high potential for steelhead restoration potential will be improved.

Project Title:	08-1946 Port of Sunnyside Wetland Design			
Applicant:	Port of Sunnyside			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 1, spring Chinook 1, fall Chinook 1, coho 1 2b. assess/design contaminant source fate/transport 1 8c. assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor and functions 2			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.0			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.0			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal N/A	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value N/A	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals N/A	Value to Education	Mapped Priority
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area	
Final Matrix Score:	3			
TAG Rank:	13/16			
Summary of Discussion: The major issues the TAG has with this project are the uncertainty of whether the water discharged into the river will have a significant cooling effect, even for creating pockets of cool water refugia, and the degree to which any resulting cool pockets would address limiting factors for anadromous fish. The applicant was not able to estimate what the temperature of the water will be when it enters the river. Many on the TAG, however, felt comfortable with the idea that after moving underground through 2-3 miles of pipe, the water would be markedly cooler. The applicant indicated that these funds would help to determine the amount of cooling that will be accomplished as the project is designed. The TAG questioned the sequence of building wetlands then installing piping – how can you build a wetland without water? They are doing habitat restoration through the construction of the wetland and removal of levees, and there might be				

potential for future channel development. If this project is successful, there is strong likely hood that the applicants could use this site as an educational model for the public. The project applicants are very determined, and they have been working toward completing this project for a decade, so there is certainty that this project will proceed. The TAG commends the applicants for attempting to dovetail fish benefits with economic development. Although there is potential for benefit in funding this project, the biological benefits to fisheries are uncertain.

Project Title:	08-1947 Swauk & Iron Creek Design			
Applicant:	Mid Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 2 1b. assess instream flow needs (IFIM) or designs project to improve instream flow and/or hydrograph 1 4c. assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs 3 5c. assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs 3 8c. assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor and functions.			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.4			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.0			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal N/A	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value N/A	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship N/A
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals N/A	Value to Education	Mapped Priority
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area	
Final Matrix Score:	6			
TAG Rank:	10/16			
Summary of Discussion: This project is a floodplain restoration project that aims to improve spawning and rearing habitat for steelhead. The TAG discussed how this project fits into the larger picture of floodplain restoration in Swauk Creek. There are mining impacts and flow diversions downstream, but this project offers real opportunities to improve floodplain function, and as a result, downstream flow and temperature. The work on Swauk Creek is a much higher priority than Iron Creek work; if funds are short, the design work should concentrate on Swauk Creek first. The feasibility of long-term implementation depends on alternatives presented. Presence of the highway creates challenges, but there appears to be opportunity				

to increase floodplain functions by addressing the earthen berm along Swauk in the project location. Some TAG members questioned if the budget request for the consultant's time and requested information on how much engineering time and fieldwork is required.

Project Title:	08-1949 Coleman Creek Irrigation Redesign			
Applicant:	Kittitas County Conservation District			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 1, spring Chinook 1, coho 1 6d. assess/design habitat access/factors affecting upstream distribution 3 7b. assess/designs diversion screening 3			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.6			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.0			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal N/A	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value N/A	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship N/A
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals N/A	Value to Education N/A	Mapped Priority
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area	
Final Matrix Score:	8			
TAG Rank:	6/16			
Summary of Discussion: This project is meant to provide access to rearing habitat for steelhead, spring Chinook and coho. The habitat currently supports a healthy rainbow population; however, habitat conditions can be improved significantly in many locations where access will be provided. The proponents have been steadily working up this creek to provide passage. It would be ideal if Ellensburg Water Company could support this project by providing some funding for this project. We have fixed two of their siphons in the past, and they provided some construction match for those. The overall fix for Coleman Creek will be expensive, but the cost of this design proposal is reasonable. There is uncertainty about how the proposed project can be balanced with Olmstead State Park's commitment to maintain the historical value of the diversion structure. The proponents are working with the Park to provide passage around the historic infrastructure while maintaining the structure for a historic display.				

Project Title:	08-1965 Wapato Reach Assessment			
Applicant:	WDFW			
Factors where points were awarded:	steelhead 1, spring Chinook 1, fall Chinook 1, coho 1 4c. assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs 3 8c. assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor and functions 3			
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.8			
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.0			
Certainty of Success Categories:	Landowner Commitment	Appraisal N/A	Project Sequencing	Reasonable Budget
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Threats to Habitat Value N/A	Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties & Constraints	Future Stewardship N/A
	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
	Fit to Regional Plan	Design Adequate for Goals N/A	Value to Education N/A	Mapped Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mapped <input type="checkbox"/> TAG <input type="checkbox"/> Not in Priority Area	
Final Matrix Score:	9			
TAG Rank:	8/16			
Summary of Discussion: This proposal focuses on the North bank; the Yakama Nation is conducting similar work on the South bank. WDFW is a major landowner along this stretch of the Yakima River, which starts at Union Gap and ends downstream at the confluence with Satus Creek; there are also numerous privately held parcels in the reach. Cooperation with private landowners is uncertain but we hope this will not become a major issue for the success of this assessment. The TAG and state review panel members thought this assessment should lead to conceptual design of a few projects. The proposal may need to give more detail about how resulting project proposals will be identified, reviewed and prioritized. There was some discussion about the relative merits of contracting this work vs conducting it in-house with WDFW staff.				

Appendix E: Community Evaluation and Ranking Matrix

An important step in evaluating projects for SRFB funding is how the proposed project affects the community in which sponsors implement them. The task of the Citizen's Committee is to evaluate individual projects based on their value within the community. Using this matrix, committee members will determine what level of effect the project has on the specific issues indicated in each of four categories.

In this matrix, the committee will not award projects scores based on a numeric scale, rather each point will be designated with a +1, 0, or – 1 as follows:

+1 = positive effect

0 = no significant effect

-1 = negative effect

We will assess the positive, neutral, and negative marks for each project and use this information, with the recommendations of the TAG, as a guide to rank the projects. In the comments section, explain why the project received the values it was awarded if necessary.

Cultural & Social Benefits

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members?

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community?

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large?

How will the project affect ESA liabilities for community members?

How will the project affect recreational opportunities?

Will the project create defined educational/outreach opportunities?

Economic Considerations

What is the potential impact of the project on the community's economy?

How will the project affect recreational spending?

Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable?

How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

Project Context & Organization

If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature?

Is the project innovative, standard, or outdated?

How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions?

Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties?

Partnerships & Community Support

What is the breadth and strength of the community/citizen involvement in the project?

What is the breadth and strength of the partnership supporting the project (technical support, financial and in-kind contributions, labor)?

Will partner/citizen involvement increase the likelihood of the project's success or is this involvement lacking?

Appendix F: Citizens Criteria Scores

Cultural and Social Benefits																
	Whiskey Creek	Wade Road Farm	Swauk Wood Add. & Assess	Herke Fish Screening	Canal Siphon Undershot	Jack Creek Restoration	Upper Yak. Instream Hab.	Port of Sunnyside	Swauk & Iron Creek	Upper Wapato Reach Rest.	Coleman Creek	Manastash Creek	Oak Flats	Wapato Reach Assess	Large Wood Replenishment	Amon Creek
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members?	0	0	0	-1	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community?	-1	0	0	1	X	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large?	0	1	0	0	X	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
How will the project affect ESA liabilities for community members?	0	0	0	1	X	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
How will the project affect recreational opportunities?	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Will the project create defined educational/outreach opportunities?	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1

Economic Considerations

	Whiskey Creek	Wade Road Farm	Swauk Wood Add. & Assess	Herke Fish Screening	Canal Siphon Undershot	Jack Creek Restoration	Upper Yak. Instream Hab.	Port of Sunnyside	Swauk & Iron Creek	Upper Wapato Reach Rest.	Coleman Creek	Manastash Creek	Oak Flats	Wapato Reach Assess	Large Wood Replenishment	Amon Creek
What is the potential impact of the project on the community's economy?	-1	0	0	0	X	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
How will the project affect recreational spending?	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable?	0	0	-1	-1	X	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?	-1	1	-1	0	X	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0

Project Context & Organization

	Whiskey Creek	Wade Road Farm	Swauk Wood Add. & Assess	Herke Fish Screening	Canal Siphon Undershot	Jack Creek Restoration	Upper Yak. Instream Hab.	Port of Sunnyside	Swauk & Iron Creek	Upper Wapato Reach Rest.	Coleman Creek	Manastash Creek	Oak Flats	Wapato Reach Assess	Large Wood Replenishment	Amon Creek
If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature?	-1	1	0	-1	X	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
Is the project innovative?	0	1	-1	0	X	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions?	0	1	0	1	X	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties?	-1	1	-1	0	X	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1

Partnership & Community Support

	Whiskey Creek	Wade Road Farm	Swauk Wood Add. & Assess	Herke Fish Screening	Canal Siphon Undershot	Jack Creek Restoration	Upper Yak. Instream Hab.	Port of Sunnyside	Swauk & Iron Creek	Upper Wapato Reach Rest.	Coleman Creek	Manastash Creek	Oak Flats	Wapato Reach Assess	Large Wood Replenishment	Amon Creek
What is the breadth and strength of the community/citizen involvement in the project?	0	0	0	0	X	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
What is the breadth and strength of the partnership supporting the project (technical support, financial and in-kind contributions, labor)?	0	0	-1	1	X	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1
Will partner/citizen involvement increase the likelihood of the project's success or is this involvement lacking?	0	0	0	1	X	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1

Appendix G: Citizens Committee Discussion and Justification for Rank

Project:	08-1476 Wade Road Farm
Matrix value:	6
Comments:	The major benefit of this project is that it is well coordinated with past projects in that it helps link up a group of similar acquisitions on the Yakima mainstem. This fact enhances the habitat benefits of all of the projects and provides greater returns for the dollars invested in this easement. The landowners are experiencing health problems and need the money from the purchase of the easement, so it is appropriate to provide funding for this project this grant round. It is innovative, in that it protects the most valuable habitat from development while allowing the landowners to maintain their agricultural operation. This is a straightforward project, and should be able to proceed with few complications.
Rank adjustment:	Maintains TAG ranking position.

Project:	08-1477 Whiskey Creek
Matrix value:	-5
Comments:	Citizens Committee members agree with the TAG in that they question if Whiskey Creek is the best route to the Upper Naneum habitat. This project has the potential to adversely affect mid-range irrigators on the Naneum side of the bifurcation, and this fact coupled with the overall uncertainty of its benefits to fish make it not worth the expense at this time. The Citizens Committee feels that this project is premature, and agree that of all the projects proposed this year, it is the most uncertain.
Rank adjustment:	Maintains TAG ranking position.

Project:	08-1799 Swauk Creek Wood Addition and Assessment
Matrix value:	-5
Comments:	The LE staff reiterated the fact that the applicants had pulled the assessment piece from this application, and the budget and SRFB request had been reduced, however, the CC was still uncomfortable with the budget. They felt that the fish benefit relative to the cost was low, and they would like to see CWU contribute some of the match. They were unclear about the specifics and benefits of the proposed management plan; a more detailed description would have helped. The budget was confusing, and they felt that SRFB dollars were not intended to fund this much salary. They were also uncertain about the applicant's ability to implement a restoration project.
Rank adjustment:	Maintains TAG ranking position

Project:	08-1930 Herke Fish Screening, Ahtanum Creek
Matrix value:	2
Comments:	The Citizens Committee felt that this would be an excellent project if the uncertainties with the water right could be resolved. The applicant also needs to consider consolidating the diversions, determine the appropriate screen size and corresponding costs so there are more defined project parameters. The Citizens Committee likes this project because it sequences nicely with other screening projects on the Ahtanum and could screen some of the last unscreened diversions on the creek, and it will reduce ESA liabilities for agricultural producers. Because of the uncertainty of the water right and associated uncertainties with screen size and budget, this proposal is premature. The Citizen's Committee would like to see this project submitted again when these issues are resolved.
Rank adjustment:	Maintains TAG ranking position

Project:	08-1931 Canal Siphon Undershot Fish Passage, Cowiche Creek
Matrix value:	Not evaluated
Comments:	The Citizens Committee did not evaluate this project. The applicant changed the proposal from a restoration to a design, and did not have time to put together an adequate proposal to support the design.
Rank adjustment:	Maintains TAG ranking position

Project:	08-1939 Jack Creek Restoration Design
Matrix value:	3
Comments:	Jack Creek is a tributary of the Teanaway, so the CC sees this project as an ideal location. The budget is reasonable, and it coordinates nicely with KCCD's Jack Creek culvert removal project.
Rank adjustment:	Maintains TAG ranking position

Project:	08-1945 Upper Yakima Instream Habitat
Matrix value:	0
Comments:	The Citizens Committee concurs with the TAG in that this project does have potential value, but an assessment should be completed first to determine if this is the best use of limited funds.
Rank adjustment:	Maintains TAG ranking position

Project:	08-1946 Port of Sunnyside
Matrix value:	11
Comments:	The Citizens Committee members really liked this project and felt that the TAG did not rank it high enough. Members felt it was innovative – something needs to be done with the water from the Port of Sunnyside, and the applicants are attempting to benefit fish and improve riparian habitat in what is essentially an economic development project. The project applicants have demonstrated that there is high certainty that they will complete the project, and they have already secured some of the future funding. This project has potential to serve as an educational tool for coordinating development with salmon recovery. The amount of money they are requesting from the SRFB is a small piece of a large project, so the potential benefits relative to our investment are large. This project benefits the agricultural community and the community in general, and the CC wants to see more projects proposed in the lower basin. The CC does recognize that the potential benefits to fish are not as clearly defined as the TAG would like, but they believe the project is worth the investment.
Rank adjustment:	Move from 13 to 6.

Project:	08-1947 Swauk and Iron Creek Restoration Design
Matrix value:	0
Comments:	The CC felt that this was a worthwhile project without any major social issues attached to it, but not one of the more important projects in the application pool. They noted the concern that the TAG expressed with including Iron Creek in this proposal and agree that funding Swauk should be a priority.
Rank adjustment:	Maintains TAG ranking position

Project:	08-1948 Upper Wapato Reach Restoration
Matrix value:	9
Comments:	The CC liked this project because it proposes to actively benefit the lower river system which is used by all fish runs in the basin and has received less attention than the tributaries and upper river. The budget is reasonable, and CC members felt it was a good value for the dollars spent. The high match shows that the applicants are committed to making this project happen. This project is innovative in terms of the location selected, and it complements restoration work by the Yakama Nation on the opposite bank. The partnership is strong, expertise is there, and with funding, this will happen. The community on this end of the river needs to see these improvements.
Rank adjustment:	Maintains TAG ranking position

Project:	08-1949 Coleman Creek Irrigation Redesign
Matrix value:	5
Comments:	This project is highly beneficial to the agricultural community, and addresses future ESA issues. The budget is reasonable, and the project coordinates well with other salmon recovery efforts. The KCCD has been gradually working their way up this creek and has a proven record of accomplishment in completing projects.
Rank adjustment:	Maintain TAG ranking position

Project:	08-1952 Manastash Creek Diversion Consolidation
Matrix value:	15
Comments:	This is an opportunity to fund an important project and help get it finished. This project has tremendous benefits to the agricultural community and the community in general, and the applicant has been working in partnership with a number of organizations, including the Yakama Nation, to make it work. This will address ESA issues and will open a tremendous amount of potential habitat for fish. This is an expensive project, but the Citizens Committee members recognize that the benefits are worth the investment. This project has been used as a case study, and its success will be a model for other communities.
Rank adjustment:	Maintain TAG ranking position

Project:	08-1964 Oak Flats Protection
Matrix value:	9
Comments:	If WDFW does not purchase this land, it will go up for auction and most likely be developed for residential purposes. This acquisition is important for recreational value as it adds acreage to existing public land (Oak Creek Wildlife Area) and opens up more land for public access, largely for hunting purposes. There is a sizeable match, and there is high certainty that the project will be successful since the seller is willing and has already accepted the appraised value.
Rank adjustment:	Maintain TAG ranking position

Project:	08-1965 Wapato Reach Assessment
Matrix value:	7
Comments:	Again, the CC member like this project because it focuses on the lower mainstem, which they believe needs increased attention. This section of the river is heavily used, and the community needs to see it restored and will benefit from the restoration. There is a lot of opportunity for projects in this stretch of water, and this project will prioritize the work and allow for more effective use of funds. This project will complement the work done by the Yakama Nation in this stretch.
Rank adjustment:	Move from 8 to 5.

Project:	08-2001 Large Wood Replenishment
Matrix value:	5
Comments:	The CC felt that this project has potential for high biological benefit with a relatively small budget. It is straightforward; put wood where it is needed and where it is appropriate using the methods proposed. It is innovative in that it provides an opportunity to conduct small scale thinning and use the unwanted trees to improve fish habitat.
Rank adjustment:	Maintain TAG ranking position.

Project:	08-2015 Amon Creek Fish Passage 2
Matrix value:	5
Comments:	This project has potential to serve as an educational opportunity for salmon recovery efforts in the lower basin in a highly visible location. Citizens who may not otherwise be exposed to these efforts will witness it within the city limits. There is strong partnerships, and it is an innovative project – the only proposal in an urban setting. The uncertainties with the KID/BOR easement make the CC uncomfortable, and although they want to support the project and are pleased with the increase in match from the country club, they feel this project isn't ready for funding until the easement issues are resolved.
Rank adjustment:	Maintain TAG ranking position