



YAKIMA BASIN
FISH AND WILDLIFE
RECOVERY BOARD

Recreation and Conservation Office
P.O. Box 40917
1111 Washington Street
Olympia WA 98504-0917

September 14, 2009

Dear SRFB Staff and Review Panel,

We are pleased to present you with the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board's 2009 Lead Entity Ranked Project List and a Regional Area Funding Report that describes the process used to create this list. We look forward to working with you between now and December to review this list and present it to the SRFB Board for approval. Please feel free to contact us directly with any questions or comments.

Thank you for your ongoing support,

Sincerely,

Angie Begosh
Lead Entity Coordinator
abegosh@ybfwrp.org

Alex Conley
Executive Director
aconley@ybfwrp.org

2009 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 \$ 1,776,600 for the 2009 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 RCO 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 enter into discussions each year about how to divide the Mid-Columbia allocation between them.

As of the submission date of September 1, 2009, the YBFWRB and the Klickitat Lead Entity had not arrived at an agreement for division of funds. It became apparent that both LE's had strong project lists, and there would not be a clean division as in past grant rounds. The YBFWRB LE would prefer to see a 70/30 split. We agreed to submit separate Lead Entity lists for 2009 that included all projects recommended for funding and alternates, and work with sponsors to refine and reduce budgets. Discussions for developing a region-wide process continue. The average allocation over the 2005-2007 was 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 is 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 2009 YBFWRB 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, (non-voting), WDFW, Watershed Steward (now USFWS)
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
Tom Ring, Yakama Nation, Hydrogeologist
Jeff Thomas, US Fish & Wildlife Service, Fisheries Biologist

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.

All projects submitted for the 2009 SRFB grant round are identified in the Yakima Steelhead Recovery Plan. The actions database included in the plan is recognized as our implementation schedule of actions as per correspondence dated October 20, 2008 from the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office.

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 completeness and accuracy of project budgets;
- the reasonableness of costs relative to similar projects;
- the proposed return for the dollars invested;

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.

As both committees have evaluated projects over the past few years, they have been concerned about the increasing cost of implementing projects. This year the focus was proactive – asking sponsors to adjust their budgets and remove cost elements from projects that they felt weren't the best use of limited salmon recovery funds.

See Appendix A: Regional Area Project Matrix (Questions C-I Appendix M)

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 group's 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 2009. We posted the RFP on the YBFWRB website and distributed it via email networks that we expanded from previous years. On May 4, 2009, the Board received 12 pre-applications.

2009 Yakima Basin SRFB Pre-Applications

Little Naches River Carcass Analog Supplementation	Yakama Nation – YKFP
CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water Project	North Yakima Conservation District
Matson Barrier Removal & Trust Water Project	North Yakima Conservation District
Lower Yakima River Fish Screening	Benton Conservation District
Twin Bridges Island	Benton Conservation District
Cowiche Jennerjohn Restoration	MCRFEG & WDFW
Weikel Acquisition	Cowiche Canyon Conservancy
Gold Creek Habitat Project	Cascade Land Conservancy
Helen McCabe Park – Rearing Channel Design	Kittitas Environmental Education Network
Teaway River – 3M Ditch	Kittitas County Conservation District
Jack Creek Floodplain Restoration	MCRFEG
Swauk Creek Habitat Protection	Kittitas Conservation Trust

Board staff compiled these proposals, and scheduled pre-application conferences with the proponents May 11-13. The pre-application review committee was:

Angie Begosh, Program Coordinator, YBFWRB
Alex Conley, Executive Director, YBFWRB
Richard Visser, WDFW Watershed Steward
Jennifer Scott, YTAHP (Yakima Tributary Access and Habitat Program) Permit Writer

The purpose of the pre-application conferences was to provide suggestions and feedback to the applicants regarding their proposals, and to address any potential problems early in the process. Proponents also used these conferences as an opportunity to discuss other potential projects with the committee and further flesh out their ideas. On June 8, 2009, applicants submitted 12 of the pre-applications as complete SRFB funding requests.

2009 Yakima Basin SRFB Applications

09-1520	Jack Creek Channel & Floodplain Restoration	Mid Columbia RFEG
09-1522	Carcass Analog Intro to Yakima Tributaries	Yakama Nation – YKFP
09-1527	Lower Yakima River Fish Screening	Benton Conservation District
09-1544	Swauk Creek Habitat Protection	Kittitas Conservation Trust
09-1569	Cowiche Creek Restoration – Jennerjohn	Mid Columbia RFEG
09-1572	Eschbach Park Levee Setback and Restoration	Yakima County Public Services
09-1577	CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water Project	North Yakima Conservation District
09-1590	Matson Barrier Removal & Trust Water Project	North Yakima Conservation District
09-1611	Acheson Ranch – Yakima River Project	Kittitas County Conservation District
09-1612	Teanaway River – 3M Ditch	Kittitas County Conservation District
09-1613	Yakima River Church Property	Cascade Land Conservancy
09-1616	Twin Bridges Island	Benton Conservation District
09-1725	Cowiche Creek Habitat Protection – Jennerjohn***	Cowiche Canyon Conservancy
***	This project was submitted late in the grant round	

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 June 16 and June 24. 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 June 24, 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.

Additional agenda topics for the joint meeting was a review of the status of funded SRFB projects from past rounds, and to discuss a possible scope change to 06-2141 Cle Elum River Instream Habitat.

Those LE members present at the July 18 Presentations were:

TAG Members: Dale Bambrick, Jeff Thomas, David Child, John Easterbrooks, David Lind, Anna Lael, Joel Freudenthal, Paul LaRiviere

CC Members: Jack Clark, Onni Perala

Staff: Alex Conley, Angie Begosh, Richard Visser

See Appendix B: Presentation & Joint TAG/CC Meeting Minutes

Site Tour with State Review Panel Representatives

The Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board invited the SRFB Review Panel to tour our 12 project sites on July 9-10, 2009. The panel members selected to visit the Yakima Basin projects were Pat Powers and Patty Michak, with Barb McIntosh of the RCO joining them. Panel members received copies of the application binders to review prior to the tour. They visited 10 of 12 project sites with the project sponsors and heard a presentation by Hank Fraser on the Yakama Nation/YKFP's 09-1522 Carcass Analog Introduction. Patty and Pat indicated that they did not need a site visit for the 09-1520 Jack Creek Channel & Floodplain Restoration proposal since they had seen the site last year. They did, however, want to arrange a conversation with the project sponsor regarding how she developed her budget and how Interfluve arrived at their cost estimate. This was accomplished through a series of emails at a later date since the applicant was ill during the site visits.

Board staff invited TAG and CC members to participate in this process. Onni Perala (CC) accompanied us for part of the first day, and John Easterbrooks (TAG) participated on the second 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 July 27. These comments were shared with applicants, and they were asked to address these issues to strengthen their proposals as they entered them into PRISM.

Between July 13 and July 28, 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 July 28 from 9:00 am – 5:00 pm in the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board office in Yakima to review the applications. The Board staff provided the members with updates and changes to proposals. Copies of the state review panel comments were provided at the meeting, and were reviewed before each project evaluation.

Those present were:

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

Staff members: Alex Conley, Angie Begosh, Richard Visser

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 three evaluations sheets to help guide the TAG discussion; one for protection projects, one for restoration projects, and one for design/assessments. These worksheets listed several "certainty of success" categories, and TAG members used these as a guide to discuss factors not addressed in the matrix. The main intent of these forms is to help maintain consistency in the project evaluations, and to help LE staff document the discussion.

See Appendix C: TAG Matrix

See Appendix D: TAG Evaluation Sheets

Score sheets for each proposal are included in:

Appendix E: TAG Project Matrix Scores, Evaluation Notes, and Meeting Minutes

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.

2009 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

The Citizens Committee used the same criteria for ranking projects as last year. The only suggested change to their matrix for next year is to combine a few questions to make it more streamlined. LE staff will work with the CC to edit the CC matrix before the next grant round.

See Appendix F: Community Evaluation and Ranking Matrix

The Citizens Committee convened on August 18, 2009, at the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board Office 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), Jim Schnebly (Kittitas County), Onni Perala (Yakima County), Jack Clark (Benton County), Don Chaplin (Yakima County)

Bill Gillespie (Yakima County) was unable to be present at the meeting, but sent an previously sent an email to Angie with his position on the Cowiche Canyon Conservancy scope change, and sent Frank Hendrix in his place with his preferences for ranking. Frank is Bill's co-member on the North Yakima Conservation District Board.

Staff: Richard Visser, Alex Conley, Angie Begosh

See Appendix G: CC Criteria and Scoring

See Appendix H: CC Evaluation Discussion, Meeting Minutes, 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 participation started with the site visits on July 9-10th. They provided feedback to staff and applicants on site, and followed up with their written comments. They also provided LE staff with feedback on some of the technicalities of applications such as eligibility, budget formatting, and wording. There were periodic emails regarding specific questions with projects. Patty attended our TAG review on July 28th. Here she was a tremendous asset to our process as she could provide feedback to our TAG members based on site visits while at the same time taking into consideration the local expertise when the TAG evaluated projects. We are pleased with how well their involvement enhances our review process, and will continue to work to increase their involvement.

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. On August 20, the Board met and reviewed the ranked Lead Entity list submitted by the Citizen's Committee. After reviewing the draft minutes of the meeting, several Board members had serious concerns about how two acquisition projects (09-1725 Cowiche Creek Habitat Protection – Jennerjohn and 09-1613 Yakima River Church Property) and the proposed scope change to 07-1598 Cowiche Creek Protection & Restoration, may have been evaluated because of statements made at the Citizen's Committee meeting. A stand-in for one of our Yakima representatives was strongly opposed to land acquisitions and indicated that the Yakima County Commissions took this position as well. After the meeting we returned to the bylaws to discover that while the Citizen's Committee has always worked by consensus, there is a 65% supermajority decision rule when consensus is not achieved.

One of our Board members, a county employee, noted that while he did not want to speak for the commissioners, his understanding was that the county did not have a blanket policy regarding acquisitions, but evaluated each situation on an individual basis, and had in the past supported them when it was in the best interest of the community.

The Board recommended that the list be remanded to the Citizens Committee to recount individual votes on the two acquisition projects and the scope change to reflect both the clarifications to statements made and the supermajority rule. The intent of this remand was not to have them change the order of the list, but for them to restate their votes on whether the two fee-simple acquisition projects should remain "not recommended for funding" or be included as alternate projects on the list, and whether the Cowiche Canyon Conservancy should be allowed to submit its scope change. Communication with the citizen's committee indicated that application of the supermajority rule would not have changed the outcome of the meeting, and the Board approved the project list as originally presented.

Appendices

- Appendix A: Regional Area Project Matrix (Matrix M)
- Appendix B: Presentations/TAG&CC Joint Meeting Minutes
- Appendix C: TAG Matrix
- Appendix D: TAG Evaluation Sheets
- Appendix E: TAG Project Matrix Scores, Meeting Minutes, and Evaluation Notes
- Appendix F: Community Evaluation and Ranking Matrix
- Appendix G: CC Criteria and Scoring
- Appendix H: CC Evaluation Discussion and Justification for Rank
- Appendix I: TAG Evaluation Results
- Appendix J: CC Evaluation and Ranking Results
- Appendix K: LE List

Appendix A: Regional Area Project Matrix (Matrix M)

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	09-1577	CCWUA (Cowiche Creek Water Users Association) Barrier Removal & Trust Water Project	North Yakima Conservation District	Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	coho, spring Chinook	N/A	Basinwide Action #4: Increase irrigation water delivery efficiency. Page 144 Basinwide Action #5: Utilize Trust Water Rights Program to improve instream flows. Page 144 Naches Action #21: Reduce irrigation diversions from Cowiche Creek. Page 170 Naches Action #22: Improve riparian, floodplain, and temperature conditions in Cowiche Creek. Page 171.	15%	7 Awarded 4 Completed 3 Active	No
2	09-1527	Lower Yakima River Fish Screening	Benton Conservation District	Upper Yakima, Naches, Satus, and Toppenish steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Fall and spring Chinook, coho	N/A	Basinwide Action #2: Adequately screen all water diversions. Page 143	21%	2 Awarded 2 Active	No
3	09-1612	Teanaway – 3M Ditch	Kittitas County Conservation District	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead, bull trout	Chinook, coho	N/A	Basinwide Action #3: Increase on-farm irrigation efficiency. Page 143 Basinwide Action #4: Increase irrigation water delivery efficiency. Basinwide Action #5: Utilize Trust Water	15%	10 Awarded 4 Completed 6 Active	No

								Rights Program to improve instream flows. Page 144 Upper Yakima Action #4: Improve instream flows in Swauk Creek and Teanaway Watersheds. Page 187			
4	09-1590	Matson Barrier Removal & Trust Water Project	North Yakima Conservation District	Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead, bull trout	coho	N/A	Basinwide Action #4: Increase irrigation water delivery efficiency. Page 144 Basinwide Action #5: Utilize Trust Water Rights Program to improve instream flows. Page 144 Naches Action #15: Improve Nile Creek flows through improved irrigation management. Page 166	16%	7 Awarded 4 Completed 3 Active	No
5	09-1572	Eschbach Park Levee Setback and Restoration	Yakima County Public Services	Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead, bull trout	Chinook, coho	N/A	Naches Action #5: Restore lower Naches River floodplain. Page 160 Naches Action #6: Improve sediment transport in lower Naches River. Page 161	21%	3 Awarded 1 Complete 2 Active	No
6	09-1544	Swauk Creek Habitat Protection	Kittitas Conservation Trust	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Chinook, coho	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 194 Upper Yakima Action #15: Restore tributary riparian areas. Page 195 Upper Yakima Action #16: Build conservation easements and other habitat protections	15%	7 Awarded 4 Active 3 Not Implemented	No

								into development plans. Page 196			
7	09-1611	Acheson Ranch – Yakima River Project	Kittitas County Conservation District	Upper Yakima Steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead. bull trout	Chinook, coho	N/A	Upper Yakima Action #15: Restore tributary riparian areas. Page 195	N/A	10 Awarded 4 Completed 6 Active	No

Appendix B: Presentations/TAG&CC Joint Meeting Minutes

2009 YBFWRB SRFB Presentation/TAG&CC Joint Meeting

June 24, 2009; 9:00 am – 5:00 pm

YBFWRB Office

Those present: *Staff:* Angie Begosh, Alex Conley, Richard Visser, Tiffany Bishop

CC: Onni Perala, Jack Clark, Ken Ratliff

TAG: Dale Bambrick, Jeff Thomas, John Easterbrooks, David Lind, David Child, Anna Lael, Joel Freudenthal, Paul LaRiviere

Applicants: David Gerth, Jill Arango, Becca Wassell, Marci Appel, Hank Fraser

Angie opened the meeting with information on this year's grant process and how much money we anticipated having to award (estimated 1.1 to 1.3 million). She reminded the group that we will still need to negotiate this figure with Klickitat County.

We had scope change request to evaluate – a cost increase for 06-2141 Cle Elum River Instream Habitat. David Gerth was requesting an additional \$ 100,000 from the SRFB to help cover the additional costs of the project. This request had initially been sent out over email, but TAG and CC members had enough questions regarding why additional money from SRFB was needed when USFWS had already contributed an additional \$ 87,000 to the project. They also wanted explanation as to why the project had become so much more expensive than the original budget proposal. David answered specific questions. In sum, the reason for the request was to cover cost increases caused by expanded design tasks, raw materials acquisition cost inflation, and construction related price escalations. The cost increases are a direct result of design and engineering scope of work expansion, public safety requirements, and reductions in project partner in-kind financial support. After some discussion, the TAG and CC agreed to approve the change of scope. Angie will work with David to get this request to RCO.

Angie also updated the group on the list of grants that had expired this year:

04-1691 South Fork Cowiche Creek Protection	\$ 146,985
04-1672 North Fork Teanaway River Floodplain Phase 1	\$ 380,000
04-1679 Upper Yakima River Easton Reach (Lumsdsen)	\$ 123,400
05-1571 Easton Reach Habitat Protection Phase 2	\$ 528,985

The 05-1572 North Fork Teanaway Floodplain Phase 2 project is set to expire in 6 days. The only potential we have for keeping this money in the basin is to request a scope change to a similar project, preferably a contiguous property. We do not currently have one identified, but Jill Arango of the Cascade Land Conservancy will be proposing one later today that might be acceptable. It would admittedly be a long shot since the property isn't contiguous, but we could try if the TAG and CC is agreeable. We agreed to make that decision at the end of the presentations.

The format of the presentations would be the same as previous years; each applicant would have 10 minutes for their presentations and 10 minutes for questions. We had some time flexibility built in to the schedule in case TAG/CC members had more than 10 minutes of questions.

09-1544 Swauk Creek Habitat Protection: David Gerth

There was some discussion on the value of the easement. The landowner is aware of how much David is asking from SRFB which is positive. The easement would be approximately 125 feet from the high water mark. Members had questions regarding what would happen if the creek migrated out of the easement area – no clear conclusion on this. TAG/CC members would like to see:

- the more detailed budget sheet as provided by the LE that includes details of the match;
- the restoration budget;
- the letter of intent.

09-1612 Teanaway – 3M Ditch – Anna Lael

Anna clarified that they are working with 7 landowners and 6 water rights (one split). Stan Isley has confirmed that the 3M pushup has acted as a passage barrier in some years. There was discussion of the fish screen in place – it will be good to get rid of this as it was outdated. Jason McCormick of the Washington Water Trust is working with the landowners on their water options – these discussions are still confidential. Anna will update the proposal as landowner discussions move along. No additional information was requested of the applicant.

09-1611 Acheson Ranch – Yakima River Project – Anna Lael

Anna reviewed the status of Fogarty ditch; the last of the diversions above the screen going to well as we speak. The property owner has control of 9,600 feet of river bank, and WDFW and BLM land is adjoining the property. The landowner is applying for EQIP funds for pivot, and he has long-term plans for sprinkler conversions. The budget is based on Entrix estimates to 30% design. No further information was requested from the applicant.

09-1613 Yakima River Church Property – Jill Arango

90 acres total – 75 acres riparian and 15 acres upland. There is WDFW property upstream (Teanaway junction boat ramp) and DNR property downstream. Pat Deneen (landowner) put in an application for a 300 condo/RV park and was denied; the reapplication is in process. Adjoining landowner expressed willingness to put money toward the purchase. WDFW would likely be the final landowner. The match is \$ 350,000 mitigation from WDFW. The property was purchased for \$ 1.5 million a few years ago. The TAG/CC had questions about the fate of the buildings – they would have to be removed if purchased with SRFB property. It would be best if the portion of

property with the structures were not part of the purchase. This proposal needs additional development.

09-1520 Jack Creek Channel & Floodplain Restoration – Becca Wassell

This project received funding last year for a feasibility study. A full survey by Interfluve arrived at 2 alternatives aimed at sediment transport equilibrium:

- Water to abandoned channel (still active at high flows)
- Leave water in current channel

Both with plantings, wood in creek and floodplain, fencing and off stream watering. The unmanaged cattle are still an issue for many TAG members. Becca will talk with Jeff Jones regarding long-term plans – continuous fencing has not been an option. Given that funds are short this year relative to proposals, MCRFEG is willing to ask for design only this year. TAG/CC members would like to see:

- Copy of road relocation map
- Updated budget slide

09-1569 Cowiche Creek Restoration – Jennerjohn – Richard Visser

This request is for an assessment of the Jennerjohn property to determine the need and design for a setback dike. The restoration dollars for the property are likely to be secured through a Community Salmon Fund Grant. If the CSF grant is not successful, they may pull this application or at least re-evaluate. The property has not been purchased, but the Cowiche Canyon Conservancy is in the process of doing so. There was some concern expressed over how this project was out of sequence.

09-1527 Lower Yakima River Fish Screening – Marci Appel

This project builds upon the previous SRFB grants funded in 2007. They now have a waiting list of landowners who would like to upgrade their fish screens. The BCD inventory documented 60+ intakes. All that have been reviewed are legal diversions with inadequate fish screens. The TAG/CC felt like this was a good project. One member expressed hesitation about providing public dollars for what is essentially the legal obligation of irrigators, but the TAG noted the standing precedent for funding fish screening efforts.

09-1522 Carcass Analog Introduction to Yakima Tributaries – Hank Fraser

There was discussion regarding rate of analog application, length of study, site location, and the involvement of Department of Ecology. John Easterbrooks stressed the importance of a monitoring component in cooperation with Gabe Temple's shop (Yakima Species Interaction Team). The cost of analogs is high – the sponsor would have to show strong benefit relative to cost. YKFP policy groups should be brought into

conversation. There was discussion on possible ways of reducing the cost of the request without reducing potential benefit.09

09-1616 Twin Bridges Island – Marci Appel

Marci understands that this proposal is a long shot, but she is genuinely interested in getting feedback from the TAG/CC members for potential projects like this in the future. Dale expressed concern that wood addition would create bass habitat. John agreed, adding that there was no real history of large wood in this area and it would be difficult to keep the wood anchored. Joel felt that realistically, flood hazard money should be used to purchase the island. Paul felt that historically, there was presence of large wood and there was potential in enhancing winter rearing habitat. He felt that there was a real value in enhancing lower river habitat. The reality is that this proposal is more for erosion control than enhancing habitat, and may not be eligible for SRFB dollars.

09-1577 CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water Project – Jeremy Lieb, Justin Bader, Mike Tobin

TAG members felt that this project would qualify for YRBWEP funds – has this been proposed? We will check with Walt Larrick on this. There was general discussion of the project, but agreement that this was important and should move forward.

09-1590 Matson Barrier Removal & Trust Water Project – Jeremy Lieb, Justin Bader, Mike Tobin

Will Nile Ditch screen still function if the project is implemented as proposed? According to Pat Schille, it will. It has an electric drive and bank for flashboards to keep the water level up. It may actually function better. Dale questioned if this was the correct way to do this project. Why can't you pump from Nile Ditch and avoid the need for a screen on the Naches? Mike indicated reluctance to pump and the challenge of getting all to work together. The Matson's are tired of fighting to push water; they already struggle to get their existing right to the end of their ditch. Applicants are confident that the landowner to the north will want to participate in the project. Mr. Matson signed a letter of intent for the SRFB proposal, a letter confirming his interest in working with the Washington Water Trust, and wants a solid system by the time cherries mature. The TAG/CC would like to see:

- a detailed schematic outlining the project (as in the PowerPoint presentation).

09-1572 Eschbach Park Levee Setback and Restoration

The TAG/CC members had questions on the design of this project. Would the setback levee allow for reactivation of side channels and would it allow for the river to reoccupy its historic floodplain? The applicant should budget for permit costs related to levee removal.

Appendix C: 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

2009 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.

2009 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form

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	Project Sequence	Reasonable Budget	Threats to Habitat Value
<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"/> 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

Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties and Constraints	Fit to Regional Plan	Appraisal (A)
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> High <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

Reasonable Design Goals (D)	Design Adequate for Goals (R)	Future Stewardship (P&R)	Value to Education & Outreach (P&R)
<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"/> 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

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:	09-1569 Cowiche Creek Restoration – Jennerjohn Property
Applicant:	Mid Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group
Date of Review:	July 28, 2009
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.8
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.2
Final Matrix Score:	2

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

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	Project Sequence	Reasonable Budget	Threats to Habitat Value
<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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown

Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties and Constraints	Fit to Regional Plan	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Reasonable Design Goals (D)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown			

Strengths of Proposal:
 This project is proposed in a priority reach, and it expands upon and compliments other acquisition and restoration work by Cowiche Canyon Conservancy on Cowiche Creek. This parcel is an important piece of the whole Cowiche picture. The proponents have recognized the need to look at liability issues and flood risk associated with restoring

floodplain function on this parcel. The TAG feels that the budget is reasonable for this type of assessment.

Weaknesses of Proposal:

The principal weakness of this proposal is the property for which the assessment is planned is not currently owned by the applicant and the restoration work is not guaranteed. Additionally, the assessment is small scale (only parcel reach). This proposal appears to be an afterthought for flood assessment risk, and was proposed out of sequence with other associated proposals for the property (acquisition and restoration). There is a weak link to habitat restoration.

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

The TAG suggests that the applicant should demonstrate a stronger link to the habitat restoration work – this assessment should have been included into the restoration proposal and included design. If the property was already owned and the assessment incorporated into the restoration work, this could have been a strong proposal.

Final Ranking and Rationale:

2/13

There was one project, 09-1522 Carcass Analog Introduction to Yakima Tributaries, that ranked above this project even though it scored lower. The TAG felt that even though this project had potential merit, the lack of connection to the habitat restoration work, its small scale (parcel only) and the fact that it was proposed out of order merited it placing at the bottom of our list (09-1616 Twin Bridges Island was a “Do Not Fund”)

Project Title:	09-1616 Twin Bridges Island
Applicant:	Benton Conservation District
Date of Review:	July 28, 2009
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments:
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments:
Final Matrix Score:	

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

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	Project Sequence	Reasonable Budget	Threats to Habitat Value
<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"/> 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

Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties and Constraints	Fit to Regional Plan	
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Reasonable Design Goals (D)			
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown			

Comments:
This project was not recommended for funding because it was determined the focus of the project was on flood control and bank stabilization. There is potential for projects like this in the Lower River, however, this is not the appropriate location.

Final Ranking and Rationale:
NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

Project Title:	09-1611 Acheson Ranch – Yakima River Project
Applicant:	Kittitas County Conservation District
Date of Review:	July 28, 2009
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.8
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.8
Final Matrix Score:	10

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

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	Project Sequence	Reasonable Budget	Threats to Habitat Value
<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

Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties and Constraints	Fit to Regional Plan	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Reasonable Design Goals (D)			
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown			

Strengths of Proposal:
The TAG felt like this design proposal had high potential for arriving at several restoration projects, especially projects to enhance rearing habitat. An assessment is warranted in this location. The landowner is willing, and this is a prime opportunity to develop a positive relationship with him. The budget for staff time is modest, and an assessment is an appropriate first step to take in this reach. WDFW electro-shocking showed high densities of fish in Sorenson Creek.

Weaknesses of Proposal:

The TAG had some concerns that there may be too much focus on bank stabilization outcomes from the landowners prospective. Although there is potential for projects, the outcome of the assessment is unclear and a bit generic. The assessment objectives should include more project/benefit options for Sorenson Creek.

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

The TAG encourages the applicant to be more specific about potential outcomes of this assessment – what would the landowner like to see? Consider adding piezometers to determine the groundwater relationships. Elaborate on the status of his leased lands – what can be done on these properties? The status of the dike removal on the Schake property should be considered before any project is proposed because it will affect the work done on this property.

Final Ranking and Rationale:**8/13**

The TAG placed three projects with lower matrix scores above this project – 09-1527 Lower Yakima River Fish Screening, 09-1613 Yakima River Church Property, and 09-1569 Cowiche Creek Restoration Jennerjohn Property. Although this design proposal presents potential for a variety of restoration projects, the lack of clear direction in the proposal and focus on bank protection creates some uncertainties.

Project Title:	09-1520 Jack Creek Channel & Floodplain Restoration
Applicant:	Mid Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group
Date of Review:	July 28, 2009
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.5
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.4
Final Matrix Score:	4

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

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	Project Sequence	Reasonable Budget	Threats to Habitat Value
<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	<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

Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties and Constraints	Fit to Regional Plan	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

Reasonable Design Goals (D)	Design Adequate for Goals (R)	Future Stewardship (P&R)	Value to Education & Outreach (P&R)
<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	<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

Strengths of Proposal:
The strongest and most certain benefit of this project proposal is the relocation of Forest Service Road #9738. This will allow for improvement of riparian habitat, reduce soil disturbance and sediment, and improve hydrologic conditions. Additionally, this project identifies incised channel conditions downstream of the Teaway Road crossing and proposes remedial actions that could restore floodplain function. Jack Creek has high

quality habitat above the project, and the restoration actions proposed in this proposal would improve spawning and rearing habitat in degraded lower reaches of the creek.

Weaknesses of Proposal:

The TAG recognizes that this proposed project is an important step in restoration of important tributary habitat for steelhead in the Upper Yakima. However, one of the root causes of habitat degradation, the unmanaged cattle grazing, has not been resolved. The TAG is not willing to fund this proposal until the applicant can provide assurances that the landowner is committed to excluding cattle from the creek. There was also some confusion over the design request – what was funded in last year’s grant round and what were the results?

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

The project applicant needs to resolve the cattle grazing issues with the landowner before the TAG will feel comfortable funding this project.

Final Ranking and Rationale:

10/13

There was one project, the 09-1725 Cowiche Creek Habitat Protection Jennerjohn Property that scored lower, but was ranked above this project in the TAG priority list. Although they support the road relocation, TAG members are not willing to recommend the Jack Creek project for funding until the cattle management issue is resolved.

Project Title:	09-1522 Carcass Analog Introduction to Yakima Tributaries
Applicant:	Yakama Nation - YKFP
Date of Review:	July 28, 2009
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.3
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1
Final Matrix Score:	0

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

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	Project Sequence	Reasonable Budget	Threats to Habitat Value
<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 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

Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties and Constraints	Fit to Regional Plan	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

	Design Adequate for Goals (R)	Future Stewardship (P&R)	Value to Education & Outreach (P&R)
	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown

Strengths of Proposal:
The TAG felt this was a more reasonable proposal when the budget was reduced from \$551,465 to \$95,663 (SRFB request \$468,745 to \$81,313). The applicant is to be commended for integrating existing monitoring efforts in Taneum Creek into this proposal.

Weaknesses of Proposal:

The TAG had difficulty evaluating this proposal in that it was uncertain how project criteria should be applied to this project. There are a lot of unknowns and uncertainties. The proposal gave no sense of how to evaluate the change in nutrient values and there are uncertainties in how to measure the effect of applying carcass analogs. There were questions regarding the science and question if nutrients are a limiting factor in this Taneum reach. The TAG also had questions regarding the certainty of effectively monitoring this project. For instance, is it possible to obtain a statistically valid sample size, etc? Carcass analogs are expensive, and their application does not derive a permanent benefit.

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

The TAG was more receptive to this project when the budget was reduced. A suggestion to further reduce the budget is to shorten the project length from 4 years to 2 years, which would reduce the SRFB request to \$39,455. The project applicant should include the monitoring plan in the SRFB application, understanding that the SRFB cannot pay for this aspect of the project. The sponsor indicated that there was a 10 ton minimum purchase for the analogs – will this be a problem?

Final Ranking and Rationale:**11/13**

This project ranked above another project, 09-1569 Cowiche Creek Restoration – Jennerjohn Property, because it is possible to carry out the proposal for 2 years at \$39,455 and they are incorporating it into an already established monitoring program.

Project Title:	09-1612 Teanaway – 3M Ditch Project
Applicant:	Kittitas County Conservation District
Date of Review:	July 28, 2009
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.8
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.8
Final Matrix Score:	22

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

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	Project Sequence	Reasonable Budget	Threats to Habitat Value
<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

Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties and Constraints	Fit to Regional Plan	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

	Design Adequate for Goals (R)	Future Stewardship (P&R)	Value to Education & Outreach (P&R)
	<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

Strengths of Proposal:
This is a strong, straightforward proposal in a priority watershed that states a clear problem with a defined solution. The applicant has a strong track record of managing and successfully completing complex projects. This is the last gravity diversion on the river, and the berm is a passage impediment. There is potential for instream flow augmentation in the bypass reach.

Weaknesses of Proposal:

There is always some concern when several landowners are involved in a project to make it successful, however, the TAG has full confidence that the applicant has developed strong working relationships with the landowners.

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

Encourage landowners to reduce irrigated land.

Final Ranking and Rationale:

1/13

Project Title:	09-1527 Lower Yakima River Fish Screening
Applicant:	Benton Conservation District
Date of Review:	July 28, 2009
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 1
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 2
Final Matrix Score:	6

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

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	Project Sequence	Reasonable Budget	Threats to Habitat Value
<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

Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties and Constraints	Fit to Regional Plan	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

	Design Adequate for Goals (R)	Future Stewardship (P&R)	Value to Education & Outreach (P&R)
	<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

Strengths of Proposal:
The TAG was pleased to see this proposal submitted, as it builds upon grants awarded in 2007 (07-1566 Lower Yakima River Assessment, 07-1899 Lower Yakima River Restoration). Installing NMFS compliant fish screening to replace non-compliant ones is important as every fish that enters the Yakima Basin benefits from these actions. All of the diversions currently identified in the proposal have water rights, and screening all diversions is a high priority in the Yakima Steelhead Recovery Plan.

Weaknesses of Proposal:

The TAG recognizes the importance of screening diversions, however, some are uneasy about providing public funds for bringing landowners into compliance.

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

The TAG suggests increasing the amount of cost share required from landowners.

Final Ranking and Rationale:

4/13

This is a technically solid project that should be funded. It provides clear cut benefits to fish, and the TAG wants to see projects in the Lower Yakima. This project scored low because the ranking matrix penalizes projects with a very specific and narrow focus, and this project fits into that category. As such, the TAG moved this project above several others that scored higher.

Project Title:	09-1572 Eschbach Park Levee Setback and Restoration
Applicant:	Yakima County Public Services
Date of Review:	July 28, 2009
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.8
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.2
Final Matrix Score:	7

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

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	Project Sequence	Reasonable Budget	Threats to Habitat Value
<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 type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown

Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties and Constraints	Fit to Regional Plan	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

	Design Adequate for Goals (R)	Future Stewardship (P&R)	Value to Education & Outreach (P&R)
	<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

Strengths of Proposal:
The strength of this proposal is it strives to increase floodplain and off channel function in a highly constrained section of the Naches River.

Weaknesses of Proposal:

The TAG had many questions about the potential benefits of this proposed project. If we build a levee, have we lost an opportunity to reconnect more floodplain in the future? There was the question of if the new levee location would benefit or enhance side channel function, if the new location was the best option, and how impaired side channel function actually was in this location. The proposal did not make a strong case that this project could benefit side channel function nor that the presented scenario was the best course of action. Some members questioned if reconnection of the side channels was valuable given the water table at this location. The TAG was concerned with including the cost of the bridge and drain field relocation in this proposal. Although the proposal presented why these costs were included, the TAG questioned if this was the best use of limited salmon recovery dollars. This is an expensive levee relative to the value of what it is protecting (the park and Yakima Valley Canal head-works and fish screens.) There was also concern over whether or not all options to prevent an avulsion had been explored. Have other options or exceptions from RCO for protecting the park been explored?

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

The TAG would like to see a history of analysis of options for levee setback on this site. Are there other options available that could avoid an avulsion, but maximize the amount of floodplain restored? Would a perforated levee provide some protection without completely inhibiting floodplain functions? What would be the problem with allowing the park to flood and is park relocation an option? The concern is we may be jeopardizing future opportunities to expand the floodplain. The proponent needs to expand and improve their case for how the new levee location will improve side channel functions. The TAG would also like to see a reduced budget by excluding the cost of the bridge and drainfield relocation.

Final Ranking and Rationale:**9/13**

There are two projects that ranked higher than this proposal in the final list, even though they received lower matrix scores (09-1527 Lower Yakima River Fish Screening and 09-1725 Cowiche Creek Habitat Protection Jennerjohn Property). The Lower Yakima River project was moved above this project because the TAG felt our matrix does not sufficiently award projects with a narrow focus such as fish screening project. The Cowiche Creek project was ranked above it because even though it is a small parcel with relatively small benefits on its own, as part of a series of acquisitions and restoration work, it has potentially high habitat benefit.

Project Title:	09-1577 CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water Project
Applicant:	North Yakima Conservation District
Date of Review:	July 28, 2009
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.9
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.8
Final Matrix Score:	20

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

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	Project Sequence	Reasonable Budget	Threats to Habitat Value
<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

Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties and Constraints	Fit to Regional Plan	
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

	Design Adequate for Goals (R)	Future Stewardship (P&R)	Value to Education & Outreach (P&R)
	<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

Strengths of Proposal:
The TAG members feel like this is a strong proposal that addresses a real problem and presents a straightforward way of improving flows in Cowiche Creek. The 7.915 cfs CCWUA water right will be transferred from the limited flow Cowiche Creek to the Tieton River which has abundant water resources. CCWUA will be able to receive their full water rights without depleting Cowiche Creek during late summer months when the

creek is almost dewatered, and will eliminate the need for fish screening at the two current points of diversion for the CCWUA.

Weaknesses of Proposal:

The TAG recognizes that the legal issues with the city have not been officially resolved. The city is working to confirm that this project will not impair their water right, but it isn't likely that this will jeopardize this project.

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

The TAG does not have any major recommendations for improvement. They did comment that this isn't necessarily a barrier removal project, but rather an infrastructure removal. At most, the structure is a partial barrier. There was discussion that this project would be a prime candidate for YRBWEP funds, however, this could delay the project 3-4 years and could undermine the chances for success.

Final Ranking and Rationale:

2/13

Project Title:	09-1590 Matson Barrier Removal and Trust Water Program
Applicant:	North Yakima Conservation District
Date of Review:	July 28, 2009
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.7
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 2
Final Matrix Score:	15

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

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	Project Sequence	Reasonable Budget	Threats to Habitat Value
<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

Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties and Constraints	Fit to Regional Plan	
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	

	Design Adequate for Goals (R)	Future Stewardship (P&R)	Value to Education & Outreach (P&R)
	<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

Strengths of Proposal:
The TAG felt this is a great project. It targets a high priority stream, removes an unscreened diversion, and doubles flows in lower Nile Creek. This project benefits a stronghold for Naches steelhead populations.

Weaknesses of Proposal:

The TAG questions if the barrier is an issue. It may be for coho, but not for steelhead. There is also uncertainty regarding the location of the pump station. The proposed site is on an active floodplain reach. The TAG would like to confirm that the landowner will be agreeable to locating his neighbor's pump station on his property – this was not provided in the application.

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

The project sponsor needs to confirm landowner willingness for the location of the pump station. The TAG would like a better explanation of why the landowner is not interested in delivering water via Nile Ditch.

Final Ranking and Rationale:

3/13

Project Title:	09-1544 Swauk Creek Habitat Protection
Applicant:	Kittitas Conservation Trust
Date of Review:	July 28, 2009
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.8
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.6
Final Matrix Score:	10

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

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	Project Sequence	Reasonable Budget	Threats to Habitat Value
<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

Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties and Constraints	Fit to Regional Plan	Appraisal (P)
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> High <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 type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown

	Design Adequate for Goals (R)	Future Stewardship (P&R)	Value to Education & Outreach (P&R)
	<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

Strengths of Proposal:
This project is proposed in a high priority reach, and the project sponsor has demonstrated that he has worked with the landowner to understand the terms of the easement proposed. The landowner has indicated his willingness to move forward with the conservation easement (pending outcome of the appraisal) based on the landowner letter of intent provided. The proposal is thorough and the project is well thought out and the applicant is detail oriented.

Weaknesses of Proposal:

Although the TAG recognizes the value of conservation easements, the proposed project is protecting land that will likely stay preserved for its value to the planned development. The project is essentially adding value to the development. As with any acquisition, there is always uncertainty in the negotiations until the appraisal is final and the landowner is satisfied with the offer.

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

None suggested at this time.

Final Ranking and Rationale:

6/13

The TAG moved the Yakima River Church Property (09-1613) ahead of this project because it is facing more threat of habitat loss, and the TAG felt it had higher habitat values. However, this current project shows more certainty of success because of documentation of the landowner negotiations, so the order could easily be reversed.

Project Title:	09-1613 Yakima River Church Property
Applicant:	Cascade Land Conservancy
Date of Review:	July 28, 2009
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.5
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.8
Final Matrix Score:	9

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

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	Project Sequence	Reasonable Budget	Threats to Habitat Value
<input type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" 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"/> High <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown

Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties and Constraints	Fit to Regional Plan	Appraisal (P)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <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 type="checkbox"/> Low <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown

		Future Stewardship (P&R)	Value to Education & Outreach (P&R)
		<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

Strengths of Proposal:
This is a highly functional habitat that is highly utilized and needs to be protected. Many on the TAG expressed that this area was a prime candidate for public ownership due to the habitat and recreation values in proximity to other public lands and the town of Cle Elum.

Weaknesses of Proposal:

Maps indicate that much of the riparian part of this property has floodway protection, but that has not prevented some habitat degradation in Kittitas County in the past. The applicant has not demonstrated the certainty of this acquisition being completed, or indicated where she is with landowner negotiations. There is no appraisal. Although the TAG recognizes that high land costs are not uncommon in Kittitas County, the cost of this property is extremely high.

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

The TAG encourages the applicant to continue working with the landowner to adjust the parcel lines to remove the structures from the proposal and reduce the total cost of the proposal. At the very least, the applicant should provide a Landowner Acknowledgement Form and other documentation to indicate how willing the landowner is to sell. If this property is purchased, there should be public access since it is such a costly investment.

Final Ranking and Rationale:**5/13**

This property ranked above the 09-1544 Swauk Creek Habitat Protection proposal because the TAG felt it was a more technically sound project with higher habitat value and a higher development threat. This ranking, however, is conditional. If the project sponsor cannot show documentation that the landowner is a willing seller, it will rank below the Swauk Creek project.

Project Title:	09-1725 Cowiche Cr. Habitat Protection Jennerjohn Property
Applicant:	Cowiche Canyon Conservancy
Date of Review:	July 28, 2009
Certainty of Biological Benefit Weighting Factor	Comments: 0.8
Habitat Quality and Quantity Weighting Factor	Comments: 1.2
Final Matrix Score:	3

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

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	Project Sequence	Reasonable Budget	Threats to Habitat Value
<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

Organizational Capacity	Uncertainties and Constraints	Fit to Regional Plan	Appraisal (P)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Medium <input type="checkbox"/> High <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

		Future Stewardship (P&R)	Value to Education & Outreach (P&R)
		<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

Strengths of Proposal: It is a small part of a larger series of acquisitions and restoration work that makes it more valuable than if it were to stand on its own.

Weaknesses of Proposal: This proposal was presented out of sequence with the restoration and assessment proposals presented.

TAG recommended actions for improvement of proposal before official submission to SRFB: None

Final Ranking and Rationale: 7/13

The TAG agreed to allow this proposal to be evaluated for this grant round even though it was not originally submitted. This project was moved above several projects that scored higher than it because of its value in combination with several acquisitions and restoration projects on Cowiche Creek. The landowner is also willing to sell and they already have an appraisal and are well under way with landowner negotiations.

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																
	Twin Bridges Island	Acheson Ranch – Yakima R.	Jack Crk Channel & Floodpl	Carcass Analog Introduction	Teanaway – 3M Ditch	Lower Yakima Fish Screens	Eschbach Park	CCWUA Barrier/Trust Water	Maston Barrier/Trust Water	Swauk Crk. Habitat Protect.	Yakima River Church	Cowiche Acq. – Jennerjohn	Cowiche Creek Restoration			
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members?	X	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0			
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community?	X	0	-1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0			
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large?	X	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0			
How will the project affect ESA liabilities for community members?	X	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0			
How will the project affect recreational opportunities?	X	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0			
Will the project create defined educational/outreach opportunities?	X	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0			

Economic Considerations

	Twin Bridges Island	Acheson Ranch – Yakima R.	Jack Crk Channel & Floodpl	Carcass Analog Introduction	Teanaway – 3M Ditch	Lower Yakima Fish Screens	Eschbach Park	CCWUA Barrier/Trust Water	Maston Barrier/Trust Water	Swauk Crk. Habitat Protect.	Yakima River Church	Cowiche Acq. – Jennerjohn	Cowiche Creek Restoration			
What is the potential impact of the project on the community's economy?	X	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0			
How will the project affect recreational spending?	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable?	X	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	-1	0	0			
How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?	X	0	0	-1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0			

Project Context & Organization

	Twin Bridges Island	Acheson Ranch – Yakima R.	Jack Crk Channel & Floodpl	Carcass Analog Introduction	Teanaway – 3M Ditch	Lower Yakima Fish Screens	Eschbach Park	CCWUA Barrier/Trust Water	Maston Barrier/Trust Water	Swauk Crk. Habitat Protect.	Yakima River Church	Cowiche Acq. – Jennerjohn	Cowiche Creek Restoration			
If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature?	X	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0			
Is the project innovative?	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions?	X	0	1	-1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0			
Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties?	X	0	-1	0	1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	0	0			

Partnership & Community Support

	Twin Bridges Island	Acheson Ranch – Yakima R.	Jack Crk Channel & Floodpl	Carcass Analog Introduction	Teanaway – 3M Ditch	Lower Yakima Fish Screens	Eschbach Park	CCWUA Barrier/Trust Water	Maston Barrier/Trust Water	Swauk Crk. Habitat Protect.	Yakima River Church	Cowiche Acq. – Jennerjohn	Cowiche Creek Restoration			
What is the breadth and strength of the community/citizen involvement in the project?	X	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0			
What is the breadth and strength of the partnership supporting the project (technical support, financial and in-kind contributions, labor)?	X	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0			
Will partner/citizen involvement increase the likelihood of the project's success or is this involvement lacking?	X	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0			

Appendix G: Citizens Committee Discussion and Justification for Rank

August 18, 2009

Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board Office

9:00 am – 1:00 pm

Those present: Kittitas County – Jim Schnebly, Ken Ratliff; Yakima County: Onni Perala, Don Chaplin, Frank Hendrix (for Bill Gillespie); Benton County: Jack Clark

We started off the meeting with introductions.

07-1598 Cowiche Creek Protection and Restoration Project: Angie noted that we still need a decision from the Citizen's Committee regarding whether or not they will support the cost increase request from Cowiche Canyon Conservancy to purchase a new, contiguous parcel (Jennerjohn parcel). Angie summarized the proposal as many committee members admitted that the e-mail strings and new applications had become confusing. The original CCC request for an additional \$95,000 was rejected by the TAG and the CC. It also appeared that the SRFB would not support this request. In response, the CCC reduced their request to \$43,200 by redistributing fund from several other grant sources. The committee had to make a decision based on two separate actions:

- From the 07 grant, the CCC would like to reallocate funds originally intended for restoration of the Lamas property towards the Jennerjohn purchase and request an additional \$43,200. The Lamas restoration would now be funded by a Community Salmon Fund grant.
- The CCC would like to submit a separate application for the Jennerjohn purchase for this grant round. They did not originally submit an application because they were concerned that the mid December award decision would be too late for the landowner.

The TAG had agreed to both of these requests.

The committee discussed the pros and cons of these requests, and the manner in which this request has been handled. Committee members were concerned with how the proposals have been out of order – for instance restoration funds acquired before the land was purchased and an assessment requested after the restoration was planned. Many members felt that submitting the application for this grant round in the middle of the process was unfair to other sponsors and undermining the SRFB process. This is a small request, however, and it could potentially fit in at the end of our list after larger project requests were met. There has been a lot of money spent on Cowiche Creek, and purchase of this parcel would provide more “bang for the buck” to CCC's existing project as it expands their restoration efforts to the other side of the creek. The general conversation focused on how this did seem like a good opportunity and was actually a better piece of land than some of the previous purchases in the CCC project. Frank brought up the fact that purchasing private land for conservation purposes/non-

profit/public purposes is a loss of revenue for the county, and he indicated that in conversations with the commissioners, this has become an issue of concern for Yakima County and that they oppose all land acquisitions. He noted that the North Yakima Conservation District also rejects land acquisitions for this reason, and he expressed strong opposition to this request on behalf of Bill Gillespie. Opinions were mixed at this point – there was concern about the unorganized manner in which the project had progressed, but they did see the property purchase as an opportunity. Many in the group conceded that the loss of revenue to the county is a very real issue, but admitted that this parcel would be a small loss. Other questions – had the NY Conservation District been approached to work with the landowner to do restoration work? Would the landowner be willing to have restoration work done on the property without selling it? What is the actual threat of development? How is the property zoned and had previous attempts at development been successful? Most committee members were willing to grant the cost increase request and rank out the project with the rest of the proposals. Frank remained strong in his opposition to the proposal. The committee decided to table the discussion until the end of the meeting when the other projects had been evaluated.

Project:	09-1616 Twin Bridges Island
Matrix value:	Not Ranked
Comments:	The CC deferred to the TAG decision for Do Not Fund and did not evaluate the project.
Rank adjustment:	Maintains TAG ranking position

Project:	09-1616 Acheson Ranch – Yakima River Project
Matrix value:	0
Comments:	Most members felt this was a difficult project to evaluate using their matrix, and felt that there would be neither positive nor negative effect from a community standpoint, so they ranked this project as neutral.
Rank adjustment:	The CC moved this project up one ranking position from the TAG. Although they conceded that there are some uncertainties attached to the outcome of the design, the project is well put together with a willing landowner and a sponsor with a solid track record. It has more certainty and/or is more clearly outlined than the projects below it.

Project:	09-1520 Jack Creek Channel & Floodplain Restoration, RM 0-2
Matrix value:	0
Comments:	The CC defers to the TAG comments on this project – the major benefits in this proposal are the road relocation, the fact that it builds upon the culvert replacement project below it and its proximity to the Nation’s acclimation site, but it would not benefit the agricultural community because of the unresolved issue of cattle exclusion.

Rank adjustment:	The CC concurred with the TAG regarding the unresolved cattle management issues and kept this project in the same ranking position.
-------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Project:	09-1522 Carcass Analog Introduction to Yakima Tributaries
Matrix value:	-2
Comments:	CC members had a lot of questions regarding this project; many of these questions were similar to those raised by the TAG. Taneum Creek does not yet have a strong anadromous run, and the fish barriers low in the creek have not yet been resolved. It is also expensive relative to the benefits to so few fish. The committee would like to see more information regarding this project if something similar were to be proposed in the future.
Rank adjustment:	The CC conceded that there is potential for funding this project in the future, however, maintained this project in the same ranking slot.

Project:	09-1612 Teanaway – 3M Ditch Project
Matrix value:	12
Comments:	CC members feel that this is a strong project that has benefits for the Yakama Nation, agricultural community, and the community at large. It will help reduce ESA liabilities for several irrigators and save them money. The budget presented is reasonable, and will have high return for the dollars invested. All land owners are on board, and the project has momentum so it is advantageous to complete it now. The committee has confidence that the sponsor can complete the project as proposed, and the landowners have demonstrated commitment to the project.
Rank adjustment:	The CC agreed with the TAG that the top 4 ranked projects were clearly the strongest. Within this set of four, the CC rearranged these projects based on the CC's criteria. ; this project ranked 3 rd .

Project:	09-1527 Lower Yakima River Fish Screening
Matrix value:	13
Comments:	The CC strongly supports this project because they felt we have gone too long without proposing projects in the Lower Yakima River. This project will benefit the Yakama Nation and the agricultural community, and will relieve many irrigators of ESA liabilities. The sponsor is using the project as an opportunity for education and outreach to landowners. The project budget is reasonable, and the return for the dollars invested is high. Many of the fish screens in this section of the river are outdated, so it is important to get these replaced, as all anadromous fish in our basin will ultimately benefit. The sponsor has demonstrated

	landowner buy in, and irrigators will contribute cost share to the project.
Rank adjustment:	The CC agreed with the TAG that the top 4 ranked projects were clearly the strongest. Within this set of four, the CC rearranged these projects based on the CC's criteria; this project ranked 2nd They were pleased to see another project proposed from the Lower River and will continue to support solid projects from this end of the basin.

Project:	09-1572 Eschbach Park Levee Setback and Restoration
Matrix value:	7
Comments:	This project will benefit the community in that it will enhance a well used park. It will enhance recreational opportunities, and create educational/outreach opportunities for both children and their families. Committee members conceded that it appears expensive, but it seems reasonable for relocation of a large levee. They also reduced their request by taking out the cost of the bridge. They agree that this project is timely because the Naches will keep down cutting if they don't take restorative action. The applicant has a history of completing projects and garnering support from a variety of partners. The CC did have questions regarding YVCC – will they be able to keep their head works and get their water? Members would like to see written evidence of communication with YVCC regarding this issue.
Rank adjustment:	The CC was more favorable to this project than the TAG. They felt that the park is important to the community, and there is value in protecting it in addition to restoring the floodplain. They had some of the same questions as the TAG regarding design, but felt it was worth at least partial funding. They also felt that there was high certainty that the project would be completed.

Project:	09-1577 CCWUA Barrier Removal and Trust Water Project
Matrix value:	14
Comments:	This project is beneficial to numerous interests including the Yakama Nation, the agricultural community, YTID, and the community surrounding/investing in Cowiche Creek. It is in a highly visible and visited location, and children, families, and agricultural producers regularly visit the area for educational and recreational opportunities. The project budget is reasonable, and the returns are high for the investment. This project builds upon many in Cowiche Creek and has been in the development phase for many years and is ready to be implemented. Many partners and interests are involved in this project and have a strong desire to see that it is successful.
Rank adjustment:	The CC agreed with the TAG that the top 4 ranked projects were clearly the strongest. Within this set of four, the CC rearranged

	these projects based on the CC's criteria; this project ranked 1 st .
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Project:	09-1590 Matson Barrier Removal and Trust Water Project
Matrix value:	10
Comments:	This is a strong project that benefits agricultural interests and can relieve ESA liabilities for irrigators. The budget is reasonable and the resulting water savings are valuable. This project will benefit a steelhead stronghold and provide sizeable water savings in small streams where it is needed most for fish benefit. The committee was assured that the landowner where the pump station would be located would be agreeable to this – however, we do not have a signed landowner acknowledgement form yet.
Rank adjustment:	The CC agreed with the TAG that the top 4 ranked projects were clearly the strongest. Within this set of four, the CC rearranged these projects based on the CC's criteria; this project ranked 4 th .

Project:	09-1544 Swauk Creek Habitat Protection
Matrix value:	3
Comments:	Members acknowledge that this is well coordinated with projects upstream and downstream from the site, and partners such as the Yakama Nation, Nature Conservancy, and Cascade Land Conservancy all have projects that can provide a cumulative benefit in conjunction with this protection. The major question members have with this project is what additional protection is necessary beyond what is already provided with the PUD? There is already constrained development protection, so why is an easement necessary? After reviewing the draft easement document, they also questioned why grazing restrictions aren't named in the riparian corridor. The CC would like to see more documentation of the threat to the habitat. Many members question the urgency for implementation since there are already protections in place and the economy does not present an immediate threat of development.
Rank adjustment:	This project maintained the same position on the ranking list.

Project:	09-1613 Yakima River Church Property
Matrix value:	1
Comments:	Many CC members had questions regarding the real threats to this property. The proposed lot line adjustment does reduce the request, but can the riparian realistically be developed? Many members question the need to protect this property by purchasing it, especially when it appears to be functioning well without protection. Again, CC members would like to see a stronger case made for why this property needs protection

	outside of the protections already in place and a clearer estimate on the cost. Is there potential for the property to be managed with the current landowner?
Rank adjustment:	The CC dropped this project out of a potential funding position on the LE list because of the uncertainties associated with the need for protection and the actual cost of the project.

Project:	09-1725 Cowiche Creek Habitat Protection - Jennerjohn
Matrix value:	0
Comments:	Although some members of the CC felt that this proposal was at least worth a scope change approval, the majority did not. Several reason why this proposal was moved out of a potential funding slot: The proposal was sloppy – restoration dollars were secured before the property was acquired and an assessment critical to the restoration was submitted almost as an afterthought before the funding for the purchase of the property was secured. The applicants did not make a specific and clear case for why the property needs protection. The application should have been submitted during the same timeline as other applications rather than toward the end of the process – this isn't fair to other applicants.
Rank adjustment:	See comments

Project:	09-1569 Cowiche Creek Restoration - Jennerjohn
Matrix value:	0
Comments:	The CC agreed with the TAG. This proposal is out of order and should have been included with the restoration proposal.
Rank adjustment:	Maintains ranking.

The CC revisited the Cowiche Creek proposal discussion. Some members indicated that they would be okay with approving the scope change, however, Frank stood firm representing Bill's (and NYCD's) position of opposing acquisitions. The CC had traditionally acted on consensus, so the request would not be approved, nor would it be approved for funding on our list.

The CC agreed that the Board should clarify its policy on acquisitions. It was agreed that sponsors need to present stronger proposals that fully document the threat to the habitat if the property isn't purchased, and demonstrate that current protections aren't adequate, and that variances could be easily acquired. Sponsors should be encouraged to acquire letters of support from county commissioners and local government.

2009 SRFB Proposals: YBFWRB TAG Evaluation

PRISM #	Project/Sponsor	Request	Match	Total Cost	Final Score
09-1612	Teaway – 3M Ditch Project <i>Kittitas County Conservation District</i>	\$ 328,500	\$ 57,970	\$ 386,470	22
09-1577	CCWUA Barrier Removal and Water Trust Project <i>North Yakima Conservation District</i>	\$ 413,133	\$ 73,260	\$ 486,393	20
09-1590	Matson Barrier Removal and Water Trust Project <i>North Yakima Conservation District</i>	\$ 201,702	\$ 40,000	\$ 241,702	15
09-1527	Lower Yakima River Fish Screening <i>Benton Conservation District</i>	\$ 151,896	\$ 41,769	\$ 193,665	6
09-1613	Yakima River Church Property <i>Cascade Land Conservancy</i>	\$ 378,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 678,000	9
09-1544	Swauk Creek Riparian Habitat Protection <i>Kittitas Conservation Trust</i>	\$ 290,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 342,000	10
09-1725	Cowiche Creek Habitat Protection – Jennerjohn Property <i>Cowiche Canyon Conservancy</i>	\$ 43,200	\$ 20,000	\$ 63, 200	3
09-1611	Acheson Ranch – Yakima River Project <i>Kittitas County Conservation District</i>	\$ 105,003	(design only)	\$ 105,003	10
09-1572	Eschbach Park Levee Setback and Restoration <i>Yakima County Public Services</i>	\$ 444,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 579,000	7
09-1520	Jack Creek Channel and Floodplain Restoration, RM 0-2 <i>Mid Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group</i>	\$ 284,200	\$ 182,803	\$ 467,003	4
09-1522	Carcass Analog Introduction to Yakima Tributaries <i>Yakama Nation - YKFP</i>	\$ 81,313	\$ 14,350	\$ 95,663	0
09-1569	Cowiche Creek Restoration Jennerjohn Property <i>Mid Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group</i>	\$ 32,800	\$ 31,500	\$ 64,300	2
09-1616 (DNF)	Twin Bridges Island <i>Benton Conservation District</i>	\$ 42,622	\$ 6,890	\$ 49,510	0

Narrative:

The projects are grouped in priority according to color (or bolded line). The top 4 projects are highest priority, the next 3 second priority, etc. The last project (Twin Bridges Island) was not recommended for funding by the TAG because they felt it was more of a bank stabilization/flood control project than improving fish habitat.

There were a few adjustments made to the list after scores were awarded. The Lower Yakima River Fish Screening project was moved to the fourth position because the TAG felt that the matrix did not fully account for the value of the specific benefits of this project (fish screening projects tend to score low in our scoring matrix).

The Acheson Ranch project moved down the list a bit because of some of the uncertainties with the potential outcomes of the assessment.

The Cowiche Creek Habitat Protection (Jennerjohn) moved up on the list because although it in itself is a small parcel, combined with other acquisitions on Cowiche Creek, it protects a significant area from development on both sides of the creek.

2009 SRFB Proposals: YBFWRB CC Evaluation and Ranking

PRISM #	Project/Sponsor	Request	Match	Total Cost	Final Score
09-1577	CCWUA Barrier Removal and Water Trust Project <i>North Yakima Conservation District</i>	\$ 413,133	\$ 73,260	\$ 486,393	14
09-1527	Lower Yakima River Fish Screening <i>Benton Conservation District</i>	\$ 151,896	\$ 41,769	\$ 193,665	13
09-1612	Teaway – 3M Ditch Project <i>Kittitas County Conservation District</i>	\$ 328,500	\$ 57,970	\$ 386,470	12
09-1590	Matson Barrier Removal and Water Trust Project <i>North Yakima Conservation District</i>	\$ 201,702	\$ 40,000	\$ 241,702	10
09-1572	Eschbach Park Levee Setback and Restoration <i>Yakima County Public Services</i>	\$ 454,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 579,000	7
09-1544	Swauk Creek Riparian Habitat Protection*** <i>Kittitas Conservation Trust</i>	\$ 290,000	\$ 52,000	\$ 342,000	3
09-1611	Acheson Ranch – Yakima River Project <i>Kittitas County Conservation District</i>	\$ 105,003	(design only)	\$ 105,003	0
09-1613	Yakima River Church Property <i>Cascade Land Conservancy</i>	\$ 378,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 678,000	1
09-1725	Cowiche Creek Habitat Protection – Jennerjohn Property <i>Cowiche Canyon Conservancy</i>	\$ 43,200	\$ 20,000	\$ 63,200	0
09-1520	Jack Creek Channel and Floodplain Restoration, RM 0-2 <i>Mid Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group</i>	\$ 284,200	\$ 182,803	\$ 467,003	0
09-1522	Carcass Analog Introduction to Yakima Tributaries <i>Yakama Nation - YKFP</i>	\$ 81,313	\$ 14,350	\$ 95,663	-2
09-1569	Cowiche Creek Restoration Jennerjohn Property <i>Mid Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group</i>	\$ 32,800	\$ 31,500	\$ 64,300	0
09-1616 (DNF)	Twin Bridges Island <i>Benton Conservation District</i>	\$ 42,622	\$ 6,890	\$ 49,510	DNF

**with clarification that significant benefits above existing PUD restrictions; specification of grazing requirements, ideally appraisal completed incorporating other conditions

Yellow	The first tier of projects will be recommended for full funding.
Light Green	The second tier of projects will be recommended for partial to full funding based on negotiations with Klickitat Co.
Light Red	The third tier of projects will be submitted as our alternates
White	The last tier of projects will not be submitted for funding

APPENDIX F – LEAD ENTITY LIST

MEMORANDUM ~ 2009

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

TO: Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB)
 PO Box 40917
 Olympia, WA 98504-0917

FROM: Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board
(Lead Entity Name)

SRFB is hereby requested to consider the project list and applications for financial assistance for the salmon recovery projects described below. Applications are prepared with knowledge of, and in compliance with, SRFB's policies and procedures.

RANK (Starting with the highest priority)	PROJECT NAME	PROSPECTIVE SPONSOR	SRFB REQUEST \$\$\$	SPONSOR MATCH \$\$\$	INDIVIDUAL PROJECT SCORE (If scoring was used) TAG/CC
1	09-1577 CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water Project	North Yakima Conservation District	413,133	73,260	20/14
2	09-1527 Lower Yakima River Fish Screening	Benton Conservation District	151,896	41,769	6/13
3	09-1612 Teanaway – 3M Ditch	Kittitas County Conservation District	328,500	57,970	22/12
4	09-1590 Matson Barrier Removal & Trust Water Project	North Yakima Conservation District	201,702	40,000	15/10
5	09-1572 Eschbach Park Levee Setback and Restoration*	Yakima County Public Services	454,000	125,000	7/7
6	09-1544 Swauk Creek Habitat Protection**	Kittitas Conservation Trust	290,000	52,000	10/3
7	09-1611 Acheson Ranch – Yakima River Project**	Kittitas Conservation District	105,003	NA	10/0

*Partial funding – may be adjusted pending negotiations with Klickitat County

** These projects are our alternates.

As a lead entity, we certify, that to the best of our knowledge, the data in this application is true and correct and are the result of a citizen committee prioritization process.

Authorized Lead Entity Representative: Angela Begosh Sept. 1, 2009
(signature) *(date)*

Print Name and Title: Angela Begosh, YBFWRB Program Coordinator