



YAKIMA BASIN  
FISH AND WILDLIFE  
RECOVERY BOARD

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

September 15, 2010

Dear SRFB Staff and Review Panel,

We are pleased to present you with the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board's 2010 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  
SRFB Project Coordinator  
abegosh@ybfwrb.org

Alex Conley  
Executive Director  
aconley@ybfwrb.org

# 2010 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 \$ 1,983,870 for the 2010 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 currently not part of a Lead Entity; however, the YBFWRB has encouraged those with jurisdiction (Yakama Nation, Klickitat County and Benton County) to discuss making WRIA 31 part of the Klickitat 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.

The YBFWRB and the Klickitat Lead Entity agreed to submit separate Lead Entity lists for 2010 and to divide funding between the two lists based on an agreed-upon allocation. During the review process, it became apparent that the SRFB request from the Klickitat LE area would not exceed the 30% threshold that usually triggers funding negotiations. Additionally, with the increased funding amount from the state, the remaining dollars left for the Yakima Basin fairly funded our list. The total SRFB funding request for the Klickitat LE project list is \$486,200 (25%) of the money allocated for the Mid-Columbia Region, leaving \$1,497,670 (75%) for allocation by the YBFWRB in WRIAs 37, 38 and 39. The average allocation over the five funding cycles since regional allocations began is 75% Yakima Lead Entity, 25% 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 2010 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, USFWS, Restoration Biologist  
Dale Bambrick, NOAA Fisheries, Eastern Washington 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  
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  
Cameron Thomas, USFS Forest Fish Biologist  
Rebecca Wassell, MCRFEG, Project Manager  
David Child, Fish Biologist, Joint Irrigation Board

*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 2010 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 dated August 2009 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. In 2009-10, the Board worked with WDFW and the Yakama Nation to develop a new BPA-funded Steelhead VSP monitoring Project that will focus on evaluating the status of Yakima Basin steelhead.

*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;
- how reasonable the costs are 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. As in previous years, 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 2010. We posted the RFP on the YBFWRB website and distributed it via email networks that we expanded from previous years. On May 3, 2010, the Board received 13 pre-applications.

#### 2010 Yakima Basin SRFB Pre-Applications

Yakima River Delta Habitat Assessment	Mid Columbia RFEG
Jack Creek Channel & Floodplain Restoration	Mid Columbia RFEG
Lower Cowiche Creek Conservation Easement	Yakima County Public Services
Boise Cascade Levee Setback Revegetation	Yakima County Public Services
Eschbach Park Levee Setback & Restoration	Yakima County Public Services
Swiftwater Ranch Acquisition	Cascade Land Conservancy
Horse Heaven River Ranch Streambank Restoration	North Yakima Conservation District
Herke Fish Screening Project	North Yakima Conservation District
La Salle High School Riparian Enhancement	North Yakima Conservation District
North Fork Ahtanum Road Relocation Project	North Yakima Conservation District
Yakima Beaver Project	WDFW
Manastash Barrier Removal	Kittitas County Conservation District
Coleman Creek – Ellensburg Water Company	Kittitas County Conservation District

Board staff compiled these proposals, and scheduled pre-application conferences with the proponents May 10-11. The pre-application review committee was:

Angie Begosh, Program Coordinator, YBFWRB  
Alex Conley, Executive Director, YBFWRB  
Yuki Reiss, Recovery Coordinator, YBFWRB  
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 7, 2010, applicants submitted 9 of the pre-applications and 3 additional proposals.

### **2010 Yakima Basin SRFB Applications**

10-1595	Yakima Beaver Project	WDFW
10-1753	La Salle High School Riparian Enhancement	North Yakima Conservation District
10-1764	Herke Fish Screening – Ahtanum Creek	North Yakima Conservation District
10-1765	Eschbach Park Levee Setback & Restoration	Yakima County, Public Services
10-1785	Yakima River Delta Habitat Assessment	Mid Columbia RFEG
10-1786	Jack Creek Channel & Floodplain Restoration	Mid Columbia RFEG
10-1971	Yakima River Church Property	Cascade Land Conservancy
10-1837	Coleman Creek – Ellensburg Water Co. Project	Kittitas County Conservation District
10-1838	Manastash Creek Barrier Removal	North Yakima Conservation District
10-1841	Currier Creek Restoration	Kittitas County Conservation District
10-1847	Teanaway – Red Bridge Road	Kittitas County Conservation District
10-1855	Lower Cowiche Creek Riparian Easement	Yakima County, Public Services

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 14 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.

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 June 29-30, 2010. The panel members selected to visit the Yakima Basin projects were Pat Powers and Patty Michak, with Kay Caromile of the RCO joining them. Panel members received copies of the application binders to review prior to the tour. They visited 6 of 12 project sites:

10-1753	La Salle High School Riparian Enhancement
10-1837	Coleman Creek – Ellensburg Water Co. Project
10-1838	Manastash Creek Barrier Removal
10-1841	Currier Creek Restoration
10-1847	Teanaway – Red Bridge Road
10-1855	Lower Cowiche Creek Riparian Easement

Of the remaining proposals, Pat and Patty had either visited the site already, or the project did not lend itself for a site visit. We agreed before the visit that sponsors would prepare a presentation for these projects:

10-1595	Yakima Beaver Project
10-1764	Herke Fish Screening – Ahtanum Creek
10-1765	Eschbach Park Levee Setback & Restoration
10-1785	Yakima River Delta Habitat Assessment
10-1786	Jack Creek Channel & Floodplain Restoration
10-1837	Coleman Creek – Ellensburg Water Co. Project

Board staff invited TAG and CC members to participate in this process. Anna Lael and Richard Visser (TAG) accompanied us for the first day, and Richard Visser (TAG) participated for part of the second day. The panel members asked questions and addressed their concerns with project applicants and Board staff. Kay Caromile forwarded the panel's written comments to the YBFWRB staff on July 16. These comments were shared with applicants and TAG and CC members, and applicants were asked to address these issues to strengthen their proposals as they entered them into PRISM.

Between July 1 and July 20, 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.

See Appendix C: SRFB Site Visit Agenda

### **Technical Advisory Group Review Process**

The TAG met on July 21 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 before the meeting, and were reviewed before each project evaluation.

## **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 D: TAG Matrix

See Appendix E: TAG Evaluation Sheets

See Appendix F: TAG 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.

### **2010 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

Tony Monroe, Yakama Nation, Northwest Native Architecture

Jim Schnebly, Kittitas County, agricultural producer

The Citizens Committee used the same criteria for ranking projects as last year.

See Appendix G: Community Evaluation and Ranking Matrix

The Citizens Committee convened on August 12, 2010, 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.

See Appendix H: CC Criteria and Scoring  
See Appendix I: CC Meeting Minutes

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, if necessary, 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 June 29-30<sup>th</sup>. 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. Patty attended our TAG review on July 21. 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 August 2009 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 19, the Board met and reviewed the ranked Lead Entity list submitted by the Citizen's Committee, and approved it unanimously.

## **Appendices**

- Appendix A: Regional Area Project Matrix (Matrix M)
- Appendix B: Presentations/TAG&CC Joint Meeting Minutes
- Appendix C: Yakima Basin SRFB Site Visits Agenda and Attendance
- Appendix D: TAG Scoring Matrix
- Appendix E: TAG Evaluation Sheets
- Appendix F: TAG Minutes
- Appendix G: Community Evaluation and Ranking Matrix
- Appendix H: CC Criteria and Scoring
- Appendix I: CC Meeting Minutes
- Appendix J: 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	10-1765	Eschbach Park Levee Setback & Restoration	Yakima County Public Services	Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead, bull trout	coho, spring Chinook	N/A	Naches Action #5: Restore lower Naches River floodplain. Page 160 Naches Action #6: Improve sediment transport in lower Naches River. Page 161	25%	4 Awarded 2 Completed 2 Active	No
2	10-1595	Herke Fish Screening – Ahtanum Creek	North Yakima Conservation District	Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead, bull trout	coho, spring Chinook	N/A	Basinwide Action #2: Adequately screen all water diversions. Page 143	22%	9 Awarded 5 Completed 4 Active	No
3	10-1764	Manastash Creek Barrier Removal	Kittitas County Conservation District	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	coho, spring Chinook	N/A	Upper Yakima Action #5: Provide passage and instream flow in lower Manastash Creek. Page 192	15%	11 Awarded 7 Completed 4 Active	No
4	10-1786	Yakima River Delta Habitat Assessment	Mid Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	Upper Yakima, Naches, Satus, and Toppenish steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead,	coho, fall Chinook, spring Chinook	N/A	This project has the potential to address two of the limiting factors identified in the Yakima Steelhead plan, lower mainstem water temperature and lower mainstem water quality (Conley et al., 2009, p. 107). This project has the potential to address uncertainty in how	15%	4 Awarded 2 Completed 3 Active	No

								mainstem conditions impact smolt survival (identified as 7.2.3 in Conley et al., 2009, p. 219).			
5	10-1909	Lower Cowiche Creek Riparian Easement	Yakima County Public Services	Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead, bull trout	coho, spring Chinook	20 acres riparian, 15.5 acres upland	Naches Action #20: Protect Cowiche Creek watershed from increasing development pressure. Page 172	15%	4 Awarded 2 Complete 2 Active	No
6	10-1838	Teaway – Red Bridge Road	Kittitas County Conservation District	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	coho, spring Chinook	N/A	This project will address factors that inhibit movement of steelhead in the Teaway River.” (page 114). Maintaining these spawning areas is required to meet the Upper Yakima recovery threshold.” (page 137)	15%	11 Awarded 7 Completed 4 Active	No
7	10-1785	Yakima Beaver Project	WDFW	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead. bull trout	coho, spring Chinook	N/A	Basinwide Action #11: Restore beaver populations. Page 151 Reduction in Beaver Activity. Page 102	17%	3 Awarded 1 Completed 1 Active 1 Incomplete	No
8	10-1847	Jack Creek Channel & Floodplain Restoration	Mid Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	spring Chinook	N/A	Upper Yakima Action #14: Restore instream and floodplain habitat complexity in Swauk and Taneum Creeks and Teaway and lower Cle Elum Rivers page 192	17%	4 Awarded 2 Complete 2 Active	No
9	10-1841	Currier Creek Restoration	Kittitas Conservation Trust	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	coho, spring Chinook	N/A	Upper Yakima Action #15: Restore tributary riparian areas. Page 199	15%	7 Awarded 1 Complete 3 Active 3 Incomplete	No

10	10-1753	La Salle High School Riparian Enhancement	North Yakima Conservation District	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead, bull trout	coho, spring Chinook	N/A	Naches Action #27: Ahtanum Creek floodplain and side channel restoration	16%	9 Awarded 5 Completed 4 Active	No
12	10-1837	Coleman Creek –EWC	Kittitas County Conservation District	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	coho, spring Chinook	N/A	Basinwide Action #2: Adequately screen all water diversions. p. 142 Upper Yakima Action #11: Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg area tributaries, p. 189	41%	11 Awarded 7 Completed 4 Active	No

Appendix B: Presentations/TAG&CC Joint Meeting Agenda Minutes

**2010 TAG/CC SRFB Proposal Presentations**

June 24, 2010

9:00 am – 5:00 pm

1110 West Lincoln Avenue, YBFWRB Office

9:00 – 9:45 am	Overview of current grant round Updates on past scope amendments Scope Amendment discussion
9:45 – 10:15	10-1764 Herke Fish Screening – Justin Bader & Mike Tobin
10:20 – 10:40	10-1753 La Salle HS Riparian – Justin Bader & Brian Schmidt
10:45 – 11:05	10-1785 Yakima R. Delta Habitat Assessment – Margaret Neuman
11:10 – 11:30	10-1786 Jack Crk Channel & Floodplain – Margaret Neuman
11:35 – 11:55	10-1841 Currier Creek Restoration – David Gerth
12:00 – 12:30 pm	Lunch
12:35 – 12:55	10-1971 Yakima River Church Property – Jill Arango
1:00 – 1:20	10-1595 Yakima Beaver Project – William Meyer
1:25 – 1:45	10-1837 Coleman Creek – EWC – Anna Lael
1:50 – 2:10	10-1838 Manastash Creek Diversion Consolidation – Anna Lael
2:15 – 2:35	10-1847 Teanaway – Red Bridge Rd. – Anna Lael
2:40 – 3:00	10-1765 Eschbach Park Levee Setback/Rest – Joel Freudenthal
3:05 – 3:25	10-1855 L. Cowiche Riparian Easement – Joel Freudenthal
3:25 – 5:00	Additional discussion and wrap up

## 2010 TAG/CC SRFB Proposal Presentations – Minutes

Those present:

CC members: Bill Gillespie, Jack Clark

TAG members: Pat Monk, John Easterbrooks, Joel Freudenthal, David Lind, David Child, Richard Visser, Anna Lael, Paul LaRiviere, Scott Nicolai, Cameron Thomas

Sponsors: Justin Bader, Mike Tobin, Brian Schmidt, Margaret Neuman, David Gerth, Jill Arango, William Meyer

Staff – Angie Begosh, Alex Conley, Yuki Reiss

Angie reviewed the scope amendment process with the group. Sponsors proposed several scope amendments in the past year, and she wanted to clarify the process and explain why some amendments were approved by RCO and others were not. She also thanked the group for their input into the process.

There are three more potential scope amendments the TAG/CC may be asked to evaluate:

Jack and Indian Creeks Culvert Removal – sponsor would like to use the remaining fund (\$ 140,000) towards re-establishing passage at the Red Bridge Road pump intake.

Wade Road Farm: it appears that negotiations with the landowner have stalled, and the sponsor would like to propose the funds for another property.

Manastash Creek Consolidation: the sponsor may ask for a cost increase on the Hatfield & Reed diversions.

Angie asked for any suggestions/comments regarding the scope amendment process. Some suggestions:

- Would it be possible to schedule them for review quarterly? This is possible; however, some requests are time sensitive and may not be able to wait. For more involved discussions, Angie suggested a conference call, and TAG/CC members were agreeable.
- At times, Angie is asked if the LE approves a scope amendment such as a transfer of sponsorship or time extension. Angie asked members if they wished to continue having these requests sent to them, or if they were comfortable with a blanket approval so she could approve these quickly. All members agreed it was more efficient to have Angie review and approve these types of requests. If she felt some might be controversial or need specific approval, she would send it out to the group for review.

- Some members were concerned with consistency in decisions on scope amendments. The group discussed this, and asked, when necessary, if Angie could provide them with the details of past decisions/discussions on similar scope amendments requests. She confirmed that she has an email record of all previous discussions and would do this if requested.
- Members requested that if RCO rejects the Indian & Jack Creek/Red Bridge Road scope amendment, so see if the money could be used for the Jack Creek Channel & Floodplain restoration project.

### **Yakima Beaver Project:**

The sponsor was asked to discuss why there has been limited recolonization of beaver into areas that appear to be ideal habitat. His theory is that the mainstem Yakima (source population) is depressed due to decreased amount of floodplain, so there are less beavers in the basin to populate unoccupied tributaries. One member expressed concern that given the extent a family of beavers is capable of moving around in the watershed, will their new locations allow them that freedom?

Several members expressed doubts about whether this project could keep 3 techs busy for 6 months each year. There was a question regarding if there would be monitoring of restoration as well as successful relocation. The sponsor indicated he would start with water temperature monitoring.

### **La Salle High School Riparian Enhancement**

Several committee members expressed concern about how expensive this project was on a per acre basis. The sponsor emphasized that the extra money insures success (larger plants, more plant maintenance, intensive weed management, and emphasis on mulch.) Success will also be based on site specific plants (i.e. locally adapted P. pine) and soil testing to determine the best location for certain plants in challenging areas. One member wanted to see a more detailed description of the fish benefits of the project. Another questions was if the site would benefit from regarding prior to planting, or is the goal to count on natural avulsions over time? The sponsor indicated that the landowner (La Salle High School) was willing to let the property flood.

### **Herke Fish Screening – Ahtanum Creek**

Concerns: If landowner has to switch to a pump later, would the screen still be relevant? The sponsor says yes.

How will the landowner go from 8-9 cfs to 1 and still be able to properly irrigate his land? Discussion of design for instream work – desire to do more than just grade control for the diversion, also move stream away from road etc. Would the proposed budget allow for this?

NYCD: Design will be done with the help of the YTAHP Review Team, and NYCD has a good history of finding money to complete projects (in case budget went over).

Note that for the south side diversion Herke is working with Brandon Rodgers and the Yakama Nation. It is important to coordinate with any work done for this.

### **Eschbach Park Levee Setback & Restoration**

County wants to turn over the park to Yak Youth Soccer Assoc – plan would be to fill in the swim ponds and build soccer fields on top.

The group had a long discussion regarding the levee setback – what are we protecting? How necessary is it to setback the levee instead of completely removing it. What do we predict the river will do when the current levee is removed?

New levee would be 4-5 ft tall, designed to allow some channel migration but control flooding, would overtop in a 5 yr event. Soccer fields could be flooded no problem.

### **Yakima River Delta Habitat Assessment**

There was discussion over how to proceed with this project. It would be good to sample fish for the entire smolt outmigration window – start in March vs June, and for overwintering. The sponsor should coordinate with the lamprey program for ammocete sampling and with the Columbia River Predation Study. In the backwater area there is commercial catfish/carp fisheries, they also collect data on non-target by-catch, which could provide additional fish data.

Discussion of possible negative effects of removing causeway (ie. Increased predation from McNary pool) – but this is the point of doing an assessment.

### **Jack Creek Channel & Floodplain Restoration**

Improvements with this year's proposal: More match \$ and fencing agreements secured.

This project could protect the culvert that was just built. It could reduce headcut risk to passage at new culvert.

For Reach 1 they have chosen the less intensively manipulative restoration option.

Are there opportunities for coordination with a larger Teanaway floodplain project (since Reach 1 of Jack is in Teanaway floodplain)?

### **Yakima River Church Property**

This project proposal has improved since last year's submission; landowner willingness is more apparent. Will there be a price reduction due to separating out 3 acres to keep? Discussion of large price tag; the sponsor is working on finding private or other funding sources to reduce SRFB ask. There was a question of the fate of the water rights and how that would affect appraised values.

### **Manastash Creek Barrier Removal**

This project has been discussed at great length among TAG members when it was submitted as a scope amendment. All agree something has to be done, but there are concerns about what the best course of action is given potential constraints. Yuki would like to bring information from the VSP Program to the table; is this the barrier that is being used for WDFW Ecological Interaction Team's resident-anadromous study purposes? If so, does he know the potential timeline for removal? When and where would a PIT tag detector be installed? There will be before and after sampling, this is important coordination.

### **Currier Creek Restoration**

This project proposal is building upon the benefits of 10 barriers removed between 2006-2009.

Reach A : Meander the creek and riparian restoration

Reach B and C: riparian restoration only

Conservation easement on 200 ft buffer on the creek in all 3 reaches proposed.

Discussion of plats – right now sketched out as 1 acre lots, many of which would be quite impacted by the proposed easement. Is there potential for this to cause a problem? Potential to have the entire buffer as one unit zoning/planning wise?

### **Lower Cowiche Creek Riparian Easement**

The group discussed the history of the Yakima reach near Fruitvale diversion:

Downcutting in that reach has forced the city to periodically move their diversion point upstream. Newest plan is to move it all the way to Nelson Dam (which will also be upgraded to allow for sediment to pass through). How will this impact the use of canals?

This is what will allow for lower Cowiche and the adjacent Yakima floodplain to be restored and reconnected.

## Appendix C: Yakima Basin SRFB Site Visits Agenda and Attendance

### 2010 Yakima Basin Site Visits

\* Denotes presentation rather than site visit

Tuesday, June 29

Those present: *Staff:* Alex Conley, Angie Begosh *TAG members:* Richard Visser, Anna Lael *State Review Panel:* Pat Powers, Patty Michak, Kay Caromile

9:30 am	Meet in Ellensburg at the Kittitas County Conservation District
9:45 – 10:15	*10-1837 Coleman Creek – EWC – Anna Lael
10:20 – 10:50	*10-1595 Yakima Beaver Project – William Meyer
10:55 – 11:25	*10-1786 Jack Crk Channel & Floodplain – Becca Wassell
11:30 – 12:00	*10-1785 Yakima River Delta Habitat Assessment – Becca Wassell
12:00 – 12:30	*10-1971 Yakima River Church Property - Jill Arango
12:30- 1:00	Drive to Manastash
1:00 – 2:00	10-1838 Manastash Creek Barrier Removal – Anna Lael
2:00 – 2:30	Drive to Currier
2:30 – 3:15	10-1841 Currier Creek Restoration – David Gerth
3:15 – 3:45	Drive to Red Bridge Rd
3:45 – 4:30	10-1847 Teanaway - Red Bridge Rd – Anna Lael
~ 5:00	Back to Ellensburg

Wednesday, June 30

Those present: *Staff:* Angie Begosh *State Review Panel:* Pat Powers, Patty Michak, Kay Caromile

8:00 am	Meet at YBFWRB office in Yakima
8:15	To North Yakima Conservation District office
8:30 – 9:00	*10-1764 Herke Fish Screening – Ahtanum Crk – Justin Bader
9:15 – 9:30	To La Salle
9:30 – 10:00	10-1753 La Salle HS Riparian – Justin Bader/Brian Schmidt
10:00 – 10:30	To Cowiche

10:30 – 11:00 10-1855 L. Cowiche Crk Riparian Easement – Karen Hodges/Joel  
Freudenthal

11:00 – 11:15 To YBFWRB office

11:30 – 12:00 \*10-1765 Eschbach Park Levee Setback & Restoration – Karen  
Hodges/Joel Freudenthal

Appendix D: TAG Scoring Matrix

<b>TAG Biological Scoring Matrix</b>	
<b>Scoring Criteria</b>	<b>Possible Score</b>
<b><i>Species – Action in Priority Area</i></b>	
Steelhead	2
Bull Trout	2
Spring Chinook	1
Fall Chinook	1
Coho	1
<b>INSTREAM FLOW AND HYDROGRAPH</b>	
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
<b>WATER QUALITY (e.g. temperature, DO, suspended sediments, nutrients, toxics)</b>	
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
<b>IN-CHANNEL HABITAT (e.g. lwd, spawning gravel, pool/riffle ratios)</b>	
3 Improves degraded LWD densities (e.g. wood has been removed or natural recruitment has been altered)	3
4a Protects rearing habitat	4
4b Improves degraded rearing habitat	4
4c Assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs	3
5a Protects spawning habitat	4
5b Improves degraded spawning habitat	4
5c Assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs	3
<b>HABITAT ACCESS</b>	
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

<b>DIVERSION SCREENING</b>		
7a	Protects fish from entrainment, impingement and other diversion or screen induced mortality	5
7b	Assess/designs diversion screening	3
<b>FLOODPLAIN CONNECTIVITY/RIPARIAN CONDITION</b>		
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		
<b><i>Weighting Factors</i></b>		
<b>WF 1 = Quality and Quantity</b>		
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	
<b>WF 2 = Relative Certainty of Success (Biological Success)</b>		
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 E: TAG Evaluation Sheets

### 2010 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.

### 2010 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form

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

#### Certainty of Success Categories

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

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

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

<b>Strengths of Proposal:</b>
-------------------------------

<b>Weaknesses of Proposal:</b>
--------------------------------

<b>TAG recommended actions for improvement of proposal before official submission to SRFB:</b>
--

<b>Final Ranking and Rationale:</b>
-------------------------------------

## Appendix F: TAG Minutes

### 2010 SRFB Grant Round: TAG Project Evaluation Minutes July 21, 2010

#### 10-1595 Yakima Beaver Project : WDFW

Matrix Score: 20

#### Certainty of Success Categories

**Landowner Commitment:** High

**Project Sequence:** Medium

**Reasonable Budget:** High

**Organizational Capacity:** High

**Uncertainties and Constraints:** Medium

**Fit to Regional Plan:** High

**Value to Education/Outreach:** High

#### **Summary of Discussion**

Overall, the TAG felt this is a strong project. Its primary strength is that it will reintroduce a natural process into the ecosystem. It is an intentional relocation in which socialized beaver groups are moved together and provided starting materials from their original locations. This approach has had a decent success rate in the Methow. Beaver presence can both warm and cool stream temperatures, but both can be beneficial as they add complexity to the thermal regime. Members discussed how successful beaver reintroduction could improve the hydrograph in a system; one member cited analyses that found that there was a 1 ac/ft of shift of flow from spring to base flow periods for every 5 acre pond. The group noted that if the project could establish 20 new dams three years running, the 60 dams could result in a cumulative flow of an additional .5 cfs spread over 60 days during low flow periods. Dam complexes can also mitigate winter peak flow, thus creating year round flow benefits. Documented benefits don't necessarily extend to rearing habitat for all fish species, but it is known to be significant for coho. Spawning benefit wasn't mentioned in the presentation, but TAG members noted that beaver presence has shown to improve nearby spawning habitat and create adult holding habitat. This project could be a nice complement to the Large Wood Replenishment project funded in 2008.

TAG members expressed concern over the uncertainty of the long term benefits of the project. How long will reintroduced beavers remain in the system? Why will they remain in a location they didn't inhabit naturally? Some members felt it would have been helpful for the sponsor to have mapped historic beaver presence and potential areas for relocation. Some members felt the application didn't express project intent clearly. There was also concern whether the sponsor had enough time, considering his workload, to supervise this project. Other concerns mentioned included 1) whether the relocation sites would create conflicts with the placement of roads, both current and future, and 2) whether reintroduced beavers would be subject to trapping in new locations. Many of the uncertainties were tempered by the success of the Methow project, but the TAG noted that it would be good to see some type of monitoring for this project.

The sponsor has done an admirable job responding to questions and suggestions over the course of the evaluation. The sponsor is considering Ecology water quality funds. Overall, TAG members would be pleased to see this project funded. This is viewing salmon recovery from an ecosystem approach, and they felt it was well worth the funds to see what happens.

**10-1753 La Salle High School Riparian Enhancement Project: NYCD**

Matrix Score: 5

**Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment:** High

**Project Sequence:** Medium

**Reasonable Budget:** Low

**Organizational Capacity:** High

**Uncertainties and Constraints:** Medium

**Fit to Regional Plan:** Medium

**Value to Education/Outreach:** High

**Future Stewardship:** High

**Summary of Discussion**

TAG members understand and concede that this site is a challenge to revegetate, and that the lack of planting success in the past is evidence of this. There are alkaline soils with high salt content and high weed pressure. Some members with more riparian planting experience acknowledge it is an expensive proposal – but not ridiculously so given site conditions. Some questioned the approach – with such high weed pressure, shouldn't there be intensive weed treatment several years before planting? Are these the correct methods for such a challenging site? The TAG agreed that restoring native floodplain and riparian vegetation on this site is a valuable goal, but discussed how high a priority it is for funding specifically focused on benefit for anadromous fish. There are fish benefits; the project has potential to have some positive effect on rearing and spawning habitat by addition of vegetative cover, and it will eventually contribute to improving potential for LWD recruitment and water quality. It is critical habitat for bull trout. However, the cost relative to benefit is high and even though the landowner commitment to the project is ideal, there is serious concern about the certainty of success. The TAG discussed if riparian restoration should be a high priority in an area with significant flow limitations. Maximum temperature is an issue at this site because of withdrawals (low flow). Local TAG members agreed with the state review panel suggestion to add large wood in order to provide more immediate benefits to fish habitat. There was overall agreement that this project could have long term benefits, but the cost relative to the potential benefits is high. TAG members suggested that the sponsor pursue other funding sources such as Ecology 319 (water quality), Community Salmon Fund and other sources that better accommodate the intrinsic value of the native vegetation.

## **10-1764 Herke Fish Screening – Ahtanum Creek**

Matrix Score: 19

### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment:** High

**Project Sequence:** High

**Reasonable Budget:** Medium

**Organizational Capacity:** High

**Uncertainties and Constraints:** Medium

**Fit to Regional Plan:** Medium

**Value to Education/Outreach:** Medium

### **Summary of Discussion**

The TAG had supported pursuing screening the Herke Diversions in the past, but had been uncomfortable with the legal uncertainties surrounding the amounts to be diverted. This year there is more certainty surrounding the excess water issues, and the TAG reiterated that there is a clear need for screening in this high priority area. The screen the sponsor proposes to install is the smallest WDFW constructs, so this alleviates some of the concerns regarding how much excess water the landowner can divert, as the same screen could accommodate both the lowest and highest flow alternatives currently being proposed in the legal process. From a water quality standpoint, the consolidation and grade structures reduce the need for instream work, and the structures also improve pool habitat. The metering portion of the project provides accountability which is a nice improvement over the previous proposal. There is some uncertainty surrounding the budget as there hasn't been a clear design proposed for the instream structures. There is a lot of work proposed for just over 1 cfs of water. The TAG recognizes that final designs will be determined through the YTAHP process; however, without them, the budget is speculative and may require adjustment if approved as proposed. There was some discussion about asking for a design first, and then funding construction in an alternate grant round, but TAG members acknowledged that this would set back the potential construction timeline. The sponsor has proven in the past that they can find funds to augment the budget if necessary. The TAG would like to see this project completed. If possible, the sponsor should refine the instream design portion of the proposal, including the budget, and incorporate the restoration of the site more explicitly into the proposal with an emphasis on reducing stream channel confinement at the site.

## **10-1765 Eschbach Park Levee Setback & Restoration**

Matrix Score: 30

### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment:** High

**Project Sequence:** High

**Reasonable Budget:** High

**Organizational Capacity:** High

**Uncertainties and Constraints:** Medium

**Fit to Regional Plan:** High

**Value to Education/Outreach:** Medium

**Future Stewardship:** High

### **Summary of Discussion**

This project scored well in the matrix because it addresses several limiting factors and improves overall floodplain function in a high priority reach. TAG members agreed that it should receive credit for sediment routing and improving instream flow. The project is in critical bull trout habitat and a high priority reach for steelhead and other species. Some members addressed concerns about the level of involvement of the Yakima Valley Canal Company. They would like the sponsor to provide documentation that the Yakima Valley Canal Company supports the proposal, and that there will be enough flow retained at the screening and headgate site for screen function. Ideally, this information should be provided for the Citizen's Committee ranking meeting. Members also discussed the need for the setback levee. Some questioned what the levee was protecting and if it was a necessary part of the project, although the concern was not enough to drop the project's ranking – we have supported levee setback proposals in the past. Some TAG members noted that if a setback levee was not constructed, it could become a significantly more expensive project because fill would have to be removed, but others emphasized that any alternative that further increased the extent of the restored floodplain would be desirable.

## **10-1785 Yakima River Delta Habitat Assessment**

Matrix Score: 8

### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment:** Medium

**Project Sequence:** High

**Reasonable Budget:** Medium

**Organizational Capacity:** High

**Uncertainties and Constraints:** High

**Fit to Regional Plan:** Medium

### **Summary of Discussion**

Many TAG members felt this assessment could result in several projects that could benefit fish survival as all Yakima Basin fish pass through this location. The property is owned by the US Army Corps of Engineers and leased by the city of West Richland. Although both expressed interest in the project, there was concern they may not cooperate in the future. A minority indicated that the design should only be done if all of the players were on board. There was also question if the causeway was breached if it would actually alleviate temperature and sediment issues. This project was difficult to

score because its main focus is improving survival rates rather than expanding habitat capacity; however, most members agreed that the potential benefits were worth the investment. Members discussed the proposed budget, and many were concerned that it was not adequate to pay for this type of assessment. This project presents some challenges, but the study is needed and the sponsors have demonstrated their ability to handle complicated projects in the past.

### **10-1786 Jack Creek Channel & Floodplain Restoration**

Matrix Score: 19

#### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment:** High

**Project Sequence:** High

**Reasonable Budget:** High

**Organizational Capacity:** High

**Uncertainties and Constraints:** Medium

**Fit to Regional Plan:** High

**Value to Education/Outreach:** Low

**Future Stewardship:** Medium

#### **Summary of Discussion**

TAG members agreed that this is a worthwhile project for funding and that the sponsor has addressed previous concerns with the proposal. They have reached an agreement with the landowner on fencing the riparian to exclude cattle and found additional funding for the road relocation. This project ties in closely with, and builds upon the benefits gained from the 2007 SRFB proposal to replace the Jack Creek culvert and restore access to the upper Jack Creek watershed. Additional strengths of the proposal: Jack Creek is listed as bull trout critical habitat and the project addresses habitat issues at a floodplain level. Several TAG members expressed concern that there is some uncertainty in how the channel will respond to the proposed work, but they trust the final design. Some TAG members would like to see the sponsor work with the landowner to further reduce cattle presence in the restoration area.

### **10-1841 Currier Creek Restoration**

Matrix Score: 9

#### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment:** Unknown

**Project Sequence:** High

**Reasonable Budget:** Medium

**Organizational Capacity:** High

**Uncertainties and Constraints:** High

**Fit to Regional Plan:** Medium

**Value to Education/Outreach:** Low

**Future Stewardship:** Medium

#### **Summary of Discussion**

TAG members noted that the primary strength of this proposal is that it builds on the success of efforts to remove barriers in Reecer and Currier Creeks and would improve newly accessible habitat. The project also addresses growth impacts on an urbanized stream. Members were concerned that this is a riparian corridor project only and does not address reconnecting the full floodplain. It was noted that floodplain function in this

reach is inherently constrained by development and the historic potential is limited. The current inverted hydrograph also inhibits normal floodplain function. This project proposes to add several elements to the system such as LWD and spawning gravels, but it does not address the issue of restoring ecological function so that the system will maintain LWD and gravel. TAG members also noted the challenges of working in an area dominated by invasive willows and reed canary grass and wondered how well the restoration work will persist. There is also question of whether or not the cost of this project is worth the potential habitat benefits. Parts of the application were confusing; TAG members recommend clarification on how the conservation easement will contribute to this project, and the level of landowner commitment to the project (note that the sponsor needs to include a landowner acknowledgement form.) They would also like to see clarification on what will be done in reach C (for which there was no design detail. The text implies that the only activity in that area is revegetation, but the budget includes grade control structures and gravels for that reach. Members agreed that the option proposed by the state review panel to create habitat features within the existing channel should be considered as an alternative to artificial channel construction. TAG members moved this project to the bottom of the medium priority group of projects because of the high cost relative to benefit and uncertainty surrounding restoration goals in this highly altered system.

### **10-1855 Lower Cowiche Creek Riparian Easement**

Matrix Score: 8

#### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment:** High  
**Project Sequence:** Medium  
**Reasonable Budget:** High  
**Organizational Capacity:** High  
**Appraisal:** Unknown

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

#### **Summary of Discussion**

After speaking with the state review panel, the sponsor opted to drop the restoration portion of this grant and make it acquisition only. Future restoration work is proposed within the property if the sponsor is successful in acquiring the easement, including re-routing the current channel of Cowiche Creek. The strengths of this proposal are that it is part of a larger priority effort to improve the Naches/Cowiche confluence, it relates to other projects planned in this area (relocation of diversion from Fruitvale to Nelson Dam), it preserves the agricultural function of the land for the landowner, and prevents development. There is a high certainty of success because the landowner is conservation minded and has a history of working with the sponsor. The sponsor needs to clarify the conservation zone around the riparian areas and indicate these on a map for both current and future proposed creek alignments. While some of the benefits of the project are dependent on completion of future restoration work, the TAG agreed that immediate benefits were sufficient to justify the proposal even if subsequent restoration

work did not immediately occur. This project was moved to the top of the medium priority group of projects because of the immediate development threat to the property.

### **10-1837 Coleman Creek EWC Project**

Matrix Score: 4

#### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment:** High

**Project Sequence:** Low

**Reasonable Budget:** High

**Organizational Capacity:** High

**Uncertainties and Constraints:** High

**Fit to Regional Plan:** High

**Value to Education/Outreach:** Medium

**Future Stewardship:** High

#### **Summary of Discussion**

This project builds upon a design only proposal funded by the SRFB in 2008. The design is solid; it is similar to comparable projects the sponsor has completed in the past, although TAG members feel it is expensive for .5 mile of access. This project could potentially provide fish passage and screening for resident fish and is a good example of positive work with the agricultural community. It also scored points for water quality as it would reduce the impact of sediment and contaminants from treating the canal. Several members questioned if the loss of ditch water would affect instream flows. The main concern with this project at this stage is low certainty of success. By the sponsors own admission, two barriers downstream have not been removed, and plans and landowner agreements have not been finalized. As such, there are no anadromous fish present in this reach of Coleman. It was the certainty of success weighting score that dropped this project to the bottom of the list. TAG members suggested that once these barriers are dealt with, it would be appropriate to resubmit the application.

### **10-1838 Manastash Creek Barrier Removal**

Matrix Score: 10

#### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment:** High

**Project Sequence:** High

**Reasonable Budget:** Unknown

**Organizational Capacity:** High

**Uncertainties and Constraints:** High

**Fit to Regional Plan:** High

**Value to Education/Outreach:** Low

**Future Stewardship:** Medium

#### **Summary of Discussion**

The primary strength of this proposal is it helps complete a major investment in the Manastash project, a high priority in the Upper Yakima. One of the challenges with evaluating this project is it is hard to determine what the budget should look like without a design. The design will be determined through the YTAHP process and the TAG discussed whether the sponsor should consider a design only grant at this time. There was discussion questioning if the proposed budget is adequate for the work needed to

complete this project. The TAG agrees with the state review panel's concern of the incision and sediment release once the structure is removed and the risk of a headcut. It appears that more stabilization will be needed than previously predicted. There was discussion regarding the sequence of work proposed in the proposal – would it be more appropriate to remove the Reed Diversion out of this proposal and focus on the Abandoned Dam? We will work with the sponsor to determine if these questions can be addressed prior to final SRFB approval.

### **10-1847 Teanaway – Red Bridge Road**

Matrix Score: 9

#### **Certainty of Success Categories**

**Landowner Commitment:** High

**Project Sequence:** Medium

**Reasonable Budget:** Unknown

**Organizational Capacity:** High

**Uncertainties and Constraints:** High

**Fit to Regional Plan:** Medium

**Value to Education/Outreach:** Low

**Future Stewardship:** Medium

#### **Summary of Discussion**

This project addresses a key priority in the basin; passage for spring Chinook into the Teanaway. It also builds upon existing infrastructure to maintain established benefits. The TAG recognizes that we need to take some sort of action at this site. This proposal, however, presents several challenges. The long term stability of the proposed rock weirs is uncertain as are the potential effects to the surrounding landscape. The uncertainty of the design and uncertain future of the solution create difficulty in evaluating this project for this year's grant round. The TAG could make a more informed decision if WSDOT proposed reach assessment was complete. The TAG suggested that the sponsor look at moving and/or lowering the inlet structure/pump (to reduce the head needed at the pump site) and identify any possible headcuts below the structure.

Scoring Criteria: 10-1595 Yakima Beaver Project		Project Scoring		
		Possible Score	Actual Score	Total Score
<b>Species - Action in Priority Area</b>				
	Steelhead	2	2.00	2.00
	Bull trout	2	1.00	1.00
	Spring Chinook	1	1.00	1.00
	Fall Chinook	1	0.00	0.00
	Coho	1	1.00	1.00
<b>Species Score (SS)</b>		7	5.00	5.00
<b>INSTREAM FLOW AND HYDROGRAPH</b>				
1a	Improves degraded instream flow and/or hydrograph for salmonid benefit (e.g. water rights placed in trust)	4	3.00	3.00
1b	assesses instream flow needs (IFIM) or designs project to improve instream flow and/or hydrograph	3	0.00	0.00
<b>WATER QUALITY (e.g., temperature, DO, suspended sediments, nutrients, toxics)</b>				
2a	improves degraded water quality by reducing or eliminating contaminant (i.e. increased water temp, sediment, nitrates, etc.)	4	2.50	2.50
2b	assess/design contaminant source fate and transport	3	0.00	0.00
<b>IN-CHANNEL HABITAT (e.g., lwd, spawning gravel, pool/riffle ratios)</b>				
* 3	improves degraded LWD densities (e.g. wood has been removed or natural recruitment has been altered)	3	3.00	3.00
4a	protects rearing habitat	4	0.00	0.00
4b	improves degraded rearing habitat	4	3.00	3.00
4c	assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
5a	protects spawning habitat	4	0.00	0.00
5b	improves degraded spawning habitat	4	2.00	2.00
5c	assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
<b>HABITAT ACCESS</b>				
6a	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to high quality habitat	5	0.00	0.00
6b	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to functional habitat	4	0.00	0.00
6d	assess/design habitat access/factors affecting upstream distribution	3	0.00	0.00
<b>DIVERSION SCREENING</b>				
7a	protects fish from entrainment, impingement and other diversion or screen induced mortality	5	0.00	0.00
7b	assess/designs diversion screening	3	0.00	0.00
<b>FLOODPLAIN CONNECTIVITY/RIPARIAN CONDITION</b>				
8a	protects functioning floodplain and riparian (e.g., acquisition)	4	0.00	0.00
8b	improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions (e.g., dike breaching)	4	4.00	4.00
8c	assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor & functions	3	0.00	0.00
*The word restore/improves is used in the context of moving toward more natural levels or condition				
		<b>Habitat Score (HS)</b>		<b>17.50</b>

WF 1 = Quality and Quantity	WF1	WF1	1.80
Quality			
	<u>&gt; 3 miles</u>	<u>1 to 2 miles</u>	<u>&lt; 1 mile</u>
High	2.0	1.8	1.4
Medium	1.8	1.6	1.2
Low	1.4	1.2	1.0
Comments			

WF2 = Relative Certainty of Success (Biological S)	WF2	WF2	0.60
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 %			
Comments: Methow example seems to be working, but many ?s remain. Here don't have same level of historic data...Lands council experience in NE WA is promising per Paul; lack of current/future beaver dist. Info and site locations is issue...			

<b>Total Score</b>	<b>20.41</b>
--------------------	--------------

Scoring Criteria: 10-1753 La Salle High School Riparian Enhancement		Project Scoring		
		Possible Score	Actual Score	Total Score
<b><u>Species - Action in Priority Area</u></b>				
	Steelhead	2	2.00	2.00
	Bull trout	2	1.00	1.00
	Spring Chinook	1	1.00	1.00
	Fall Chinook	1	0.00	0.00
	Coho	1	1.00	1.00
	Total	7	5.00	5.00
<b><u>INSTREAM FLOW AND HYDROGRAPH</u></b>				
1a	Improves degraded instream flow and/or hydrograph for salmonid benefit (e.g. water rights placed in trust)	4	0.00	0.00
1b	assesses instream flow needs (IFIM) or designs project to improve instream flow and/or hydrograph	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>WATER QUALITY (e.g., temperature, DO, suspended sediments, nutrients, toxics)</u></b>				
2a	improves degraded water quality by reducing or eliminating contaminant (i.e. increased water temp, sediment, nitrates, etc.)	4	1.00	1.00
2b	assess/design contaminant source fate and transport	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>IN-CHANNEL HABITAT (e.g., lwd, spawning gravel, pool/riffle ratios)</u></b>				
* 3	improves degraded LWD densities (e.g. wood has been removed or natural recruitment has been altered)	3	1.00	1.00
4a	protects rearing habitat	4	0.00	0.00
4b	improves degraded rearing habitat	4	1.00	1.00
4c	assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
5a	protects spawning habitat	4	0.00	0.00
5b	improves degraded spawning habitat	4	1.00	1.00
5c	assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>HABITAT ACCESS</u></b>				
6a	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to high quality habitat	5	0.00	0.00
6b	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to functional habitat	4	0.00	0.00
6d	assess/design habitat access/factors affecting upstream distribution	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>DIVERSION SCREENING</u></b>				
7a	protects fish from entrainment, impingement and other diversion or screen induced mortality	5	0.00	0.00
7b	assess/designs diversion screening	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>FLOODPLAIN CONNECTIVITY/RIPARIAN CONDITION</u></b>				
8a	protects functioning floodplain and riparian (e.g., acquisition)	4	0.00	0.00
8b	improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions (e.g., dike breaching)	4	4.00	4.00
8c	assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor & functions	3	0.00	0.00
*The word restore/improves is used in the context of moving toward more natural levels or condition				
			<b>Habitat Score</b>	<b>8.00</b>

WF 1 = Quality and Quantity	WF1	<b>WF1</b>	<b>1.20</b>
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
Comments			

WF2 = Relative Certainty of Success (Biological S)	WF2	<b>WF2</b>	<b>0.50</b>
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 %			
Comments:			

<b>Total Score</b>	<b>5.18</b>
--------------------	-------------

Scoring Criteria: 10-1764 Herke Fish Screening - Ahtanum Creek		Project Scoring		
		Possible Score	Actual Score	Total Score
<b><u>Species - Action in Priority Area</u></b>				
	Steelhead	2	2.00	2.00
	Bull trout	2	2.00	2.00
	Spring Chinook	1	0.50	0.50
	Fall Chinook	1	0.00	0.00
	Coho	1	1.00	1.00
	Total	7	5.50	5.50
<b><u>INSTREAM FLOW AND HYDROGRAPH</u></b>				
1a	Improves degraded instream flow and/or hydrograph for salmonid benefit (e.g. water rights placed in trust)	4	2.00	2.00
1b	assesses instream flow needs (IFIM) or designs project to improve instream flow and/or hydrograph	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>WATER QUALITY (e.g., temperature, DO, suspended sediments, nutrients, toxics)</u></b>				
2a	improves degraded water quality by reducing or eliminating contaminant (i.e. increased water temp, sediment, nitrates, etc.)	4	1.00	1.00
2b	assess/design contaminant source fate and transport	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>IN-CHANNEL HABITAT (e.g., lwd, spawning gravel, pool/riffle ratios)</u></b>				
* 3	improves degraded LWD densities (e.g. wood has been removed or natural recruitment has been altered)	3	0.00	0.00
4a	protects rearing habitat	4	0.00	0.00
4b	improves degraded rearing habitat	4	1.00	1.00
4c	assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
5a	protects spawning habitat	4	0.00	0.00
5b	improves degraded spawning habitat	4	0.00	0.00
5c	assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>HABITAT ACCESS</u></b>				
6a	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to high quality habitat	5	0.00	0.00
6b	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to functional habitat	4	0.00	0.00
6d	assess/design habitat access/factors affecting upstream distribution	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>DIVERSION SCREENING</u></b>				
7a	protects fish from entrainment, impingement and other diversion or screen induced mortality	5	5.00	5.00
7b	assess/designs diversion screening	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>FLOODPLAIN CONNECTIVITY/RIPARIAN CONDITION</u></b>				
8a	protects functioning floodplain and riparian (e.g., acquisition)	4	0.00	0.00
8b	improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions (e.g., dike breaching)	4	0.00	0.00
8c	assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor & functions	3	0.00	0.00
*The word restore/improves is used in the context of moving toward more natural levels or condition				
		<b>Habitat Score</b>		<b>9.00</b>

WF 1 = Quality and Quantity	WF1	<b>WF1</b>	<b>1.80</b>
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
Comments			

WF2 = Relative Certainty of Success (Biological S)	WF2	<b>WF2</b>	<b>1.00</b>
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 %			
Comments:			

<b>Total Score</b>	<b>19</b>
--------------------	-----------

Scoring Criteria: 10-1765 Eschbach Park Levee Setback & Restoration		Project Scoring		
		Possible Score	Actual Score	Total Score
<b><u>Species - Action in Priority Area</u></b>				
	Steelhead	2	2.00	2.00
	Bull trout	2	2.00	2.00
	Spring Chinook	1	1.00	1.00
	Fall Chinook	1	1.00	1.00
	Coho	1	1.00	1.00
	Total	7	7.00	7.00
<b><u>INSTREAM FLOW AND HYDROGRAPH</u></b>				
1a	Improves degraded instream flow and/or hydrograph for salmonid benefit (e.g. water rights placed in trust)	4	1.00	1.00
1b	assesses instream flow needs (IFIM) or designs project to improve instream flow and/or hydrograph	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>WATER QUALITY (e.g., temperature, DO, suspended sediments, nutrients, toxics)</u></b>				
2a	improves degraded water quality by reducing or eliminating contaminant (i.e. increased water temp, sediment, nitrates, etc.)	4	1.00	1.00
2b	assess/design contaminant source fate and transport	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>IN-CHANNEL HABITAT (e.g., lwd, spawning gravel, pool/riffle ratios)</u></b>				
* 3	improves degraded LWD densities (e.g. wood has been removed or natural recruitment has been altered)	3	1.00	1.00
4a	protects rearing habitat	4	0.00	0.00
4b	improves degraded rearing habitat	4	3.00	3.00
4c	assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
5a	protects spawning habitat	4	0.00	0.00
5b	improves degraded spawning habitat	4	2.00	2.00
5c	assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>HABITAT ACCESS</u></b>				
6a	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to high quality habitat	5	0.00	0.00
6b	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to functional habitat	4	2.00	2.00
6d	assess/design habitat access/factors affecting upstream distribution	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>DIVERSION SCREENING</u></b>				
7a	protects fish from entrainment, impingement and other diversion or screen induced mortality	5	0.00	0.00
7b	assess/designs diversion screening	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>FLOODPLAIN CONNECTIVITY/RIPARIAN CONDITION</u></b>				
8a	protects functioning floodplain and riparian (e.g., acquisition)	4	0.00	0.00
8b	improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions (e.g., dike breaching)	4	4.00	4.00
8c	assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor & functions	3	0.00	0.00
*The word restore/improves is used in the context of moving toward more natural levels or condition				
			<b>Habitat Score</b>	<b>14.00</b>

WF 1 = Quality and Quantity	WF1	<b>WF1</b>	<b>1.80</b>
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
Comments			

WF2 = Relative Certainty of Success (Biological S)	WF2	<b>WF2</b>	<b>0.80</b>
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 %			
Comments: issues with setback levee; uncertainties of river response/timing			

<b>Total Score</b>	<b>30.48</b>
--------------------	--------------

Scoring Criteria: 10-1785 Yakima River Delta Habitat Assessment		Project Scoring		
		Possible Score	Actual Score	Total Score
<b><u>Species - Action in Priority Area</u></b>				
	Steelhead	2	2.00	2.00
	Bull trout	2	0.00	0.00
	Spring Chinook	1	1.00	1.00
	Fall Chinook	1	1.00	1.00
	Coho	1	1.00	1.00
	Total	7	5.00	5.00
<b><u>INSTREAM FLOW AND HYDROGRAPH</u></b>				
1a	Improves degraded instream flow and/or hydrograph for salmonid benefit (e.g. water rights placed in trust)	4	0.00	0.00
1b	assesses instream flow needs (IFIM) or designs project to improve instream flow and/or hydrograph	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>WATER QUALITY (e.g., temperature, DO, suspended sediments, nutrients, toxics)</u></b>				
2a	improves degraded water quality by reducing or eliminating contaminant (i.e. increased water temp, sediment, nitrates, etc.)	4	0.00	0.00
2b	assess/design contaminant source fate and transport	3	3.00	3.00
<b><u>IN-CHANNEL HABITAT (e.g., lwd, spawning gravel, pool/riffle ratios)</u></b>				
* 3	improves degraded LWD densities (e.g. wood has been removed or natural recruitment has been altered)	3	0.00	0.00
4a	protects rearing habitat	4	0.00	0.00
4b	improves degraded rearing habitat	4	0.00	0.00
4c	assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs	3	3.00	3.00
5a	protects spawning habitat	4	0.00	0.00
5b	improves degraded spawning habitat	4	0.00	0.00
5c	assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>HABITAT ACCESS</u></b>				
6a	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to high quality habitat	5	0.00	0.00
6b	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to functional habitat	4	0.00	0.00
6d	assess/design habitat access/factors affecting upstream distribution	3	2.00	2.00
<b><u>DIVERSION SCREENING</u></b>				
7a	protects fish from entrainment, impingement and other diversion or screen induced mortality	5	0.00	0.00
7b	assess/designs diversion screening	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>FLOODPLAIN CONNECTIVITY/RIPARIAN CONDITION</u></b>				
8a	protects functioning floodplain and riparian (e.g., acquisition)	4	0.00	0.00
8b	improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions (e.g., dike breaching)	4	0.00	0.00
8c	assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor & functions	3	0.00	0.00
*The word restore/improves is used in the context of moving toward more natural levels or condition				
		<b>Habitat Score</b>		<b>8.00</b>

WF 1 = Quality and Quantity	WF1	<b>WF1</b>	<b>1.20</b>
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
Comments			

WF2 = Relative Certainty of Success (Biological S)	WF2	<b>WF2</b>	<b>0.80</b>
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 %			
Comments:			

<b>Total Score</b>		<b>8.29</b>	
--------------------	--	-------------	--

Scoring Criteria: 10-1786 Jack Creek Channel & Floodplain Restoration		Project Scoring		
		Possible Score	Actual Score	Total Score
<b><u>Species - Action in Priority Area</u></b>				
	Steelhead	2	2.00	<b>2.00</b>
	Bull trout	2	1.00	<b>1.00</b>
	Spring Chinook	1	1.00	<b>1.00</b>
	Fall Chinook	1	0.00	<b>0.00</b>
	Coho	1	0.00	<b>0.00</b>
	Total	7	4.00	<b>4.00</b>
<b><u>INSTREAM FLOW AND HYDROGRAPH</u></b>				
1a	Improves degraded instream flow and/or hydrograph for salmonid benefit (e.g. water rights placed in trust)	4	1.00	<b>1.00</b>
1b	assesses instream flow needs (IFIM) or designs project to improve instream flow and/or hydrograph	3	0.00	<b>0.00</b>
<b><u>WATER QUALITY (e.g., temperature, DO, suspended sediments, nutrients, toxics)</u></b>				
2a	improves degraded water quality by reducing or eliminating contaminant (i.e. increased water temp, sediment, nitrates, etc.)	4	2.00	<b>2.00</b>
2b	assess/design contaminant source fate and transport	3	0.00	<b>0.00</b>
<b><u>IN-CHANNEL HABITAT (e.g., lwd, spawning gravel, pool/riffle ratios)</u></b>				
* 3	improves degraded LWD densities (e.g. wood has been removed or natural recruitment has been altered)	3	3.00	<b>3.00</b>
4a	protects rearing habitat	4	0.00	<b>0.00</b>
4b	improves degraded rearing habitat	4	4.00	<b>4.00</b>
4c	assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	<b>0.00</b>
5a	protects spawning habitat	4	0.00	<b>0.00</b>
5b	improves degraded spawning habitat	4	3.00	<b>3.00</b>
5c	assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	<b>0.00</b>
<b><u>HABITAT ACCESS</u></b>				
6a	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to high quality habitat	5	0.00	<b>0.00</b>
6b	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to functional habitat	4	0.00	<b>0.00</b>
6d	assess/design habitat access/factors affecting upstream distribution	3	0.00	<b>0.00</b>
<b><u>DIVERSION SCREENING</u></b>				
7a	protects fish from entrainment, impingement and other diversion or screen induced mortality	5	0.00	<b>0.00</b>
7b	assess/designs diversion screening	3	0.00	<b>0.00</b>
<b><u>FLOODPLAIN CONNECTIVITY/RIPARIAN CONDITION</u></b>				
8a	protects functioning floodplain and riparian (e.g., acquisition)	4	0.00	<b>0.00</b>
8b	improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions (e.g., dike breaching)	4	4.00	<b>4.00</b>
8c	assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor & functions	3	0.00	<b>0.00</b>
*The word restore/improves is used in the context of moving toward more natural levels or condition				
			<b>Habitat Score</b>	<b>17.00</b>

WF 1 = Quality and Quantity	WF1	<b>WF1</b>	<b>1.60</b>
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
Comments			

WF2 = Relative Certainty of Success (Biological S)	WF2	<b>WF2</b>	<b>0.80</b>
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 %			
Comments:			

<b>Total Score</b>	<b>18.80</b>
--------------------	--------------

Scoring Criteria: 10-1837 Coleman Creek - EWC		Project Scoring		
		Possible Score	Actual Score	Total Score
<b>Species - Action in Priority Area</b>				
	Steelhead	2	2.00	2.00
	Bull trout	2	0.00	0.00
	Spring Chinook	1	1.00	1.00
	Fall Chinook	1	0.00	0.00
	Coho	1	1.00	1.00
	Total	7	4.00	4.00
<b>INSTREAM FLOW AND HYDROGRAPH</b>				
1a	Improves degraded instream flow and/or hydrograph for salmonid benefit (e.g. water rights placed in trust)	4	0.00	0.00
1b	assesses instream flow needs (IFIM) or designs project to improve instream flow and/or hydrograph	3	0.00	0.00
<b>WATER QUALITY (e.g., temperature, DO, suspended sediments, nutrients, toxics)</b>				
2a	improves degraded water quality by reducing or eliminating contaminant (i.e. increased water temp, sediment, nitrates, etc.)	4	3.00	3.00
2b	assess/design contaminant source fate and transport	3	0.00	0.00
<b>IN-CHANNEL HABITAT (e.g., lwd, spawning gravel, pool/riffle ratios)</b>				
* 3	improves degraded LWD densities (e.g. wood has been removed or natural recruitment has been altered)	3	0.00	0.00
4a	protects rearing habitat	4	0.00	0.00
4b	improves degraded rearing habitat	4	0.00	0.00
4c	assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
5a	protects spawning habitat	4	0.00	0.00
5b	improves degraded spawning habitat	4	0.00	0.00
5c	assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
<b>HABITAT ACCESS</b>				
6a	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to high quality habitat	5	0.00	0.00
6b	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to functional habitat	4	4.00	4.00
6d	assess/design habitat access/factors affecting upstream distribution	3	0.00	0.00
<b>DIVERSION SCREENING</b>				
7a	protects fish from entrainment, impingement and other diversion or screen induced mortality	5	5.00	5.00
7b	assess/designs diversion screening	3	0.00	0.00
<b>FLOODPLAIN CONNECTIVITY/RIPARIAN CONDITION</b>				
8a	protects functioning floodplain and riparian (e.g., acquisition)	4	0.00	0.00
8b	improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions (e.g., dike breaching)	4	0.00	0.00
8c	assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor & functions	3	0.00	0.00
*The word restore/improves is used in the context of moving toward more natural levels or condition				
			<b>Habitat Score</b>	<b>12.00</b>

WF 1 = Quality and Quantity	WF1	<b>WF1</b>	<b>1.20</b>
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
Comments			

WF2 = Relative Certainty of Success (Biological S)	WF2	<b>WF2</b>	<b>0.30</b>
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 %			
Comments: uncertainty due to sequencing; at this time lower barriers are not addressed; unscreened areas exist-			

<b>Total Score</b>	<b>3.73</b>
--------------------	-------------

Scoring Criteria: 10-1838 Manastash Creek Barrier Removal		Project Scoring		
		Possible Score	Actual Score	Total Score
<b>Species - Action in Priority Area</b>				
	Steelhead	2	2.00	2.00
	Bull trout	2	0.00	0.00
	Spring Chinook	1	1.00	1.00
	Fall Chinook	1	0.00	0.00
	Coho	1	0.50	0.50
	Total	7	3.50	3.50
<b>INSTREAM FLOW AND HYDROGRAPH</b>				
1a	Improves degraded instream flow and/or hydrograph for salmonid benefit (e.g. water rights placed in trust)	4	0.00	0.00
1b	assesses instream flow needs (IFIM) or designs project to improve instream flow and/or hydrograph	3	0.00	0.00
<b>WATER QUALITY (e.g., temperature, DO, suspended sediments, nutrients, toxics)</b>				
2a	improves degraded water quality by reducing or eliminating contaminant (i.e. increased water temp, sediment, nitrates, etc.)	4	0.00	0.00
2b	assess/design contaminant source fate and transport	3	0.00	0.00
<b>IN-CHANNEL HABITAT (e.g., lwd, spawning gravel, pool/riffle ratios)</b>				
* 3	improves degraded LWD densities (e.g. wood has been removed or natural recruitment has been altered)	3	0.00	0.00
4a	protects rearing habitat	4	0.00	0.00
4b	improves degraded rearing habitat	4	1.00	1.00
4c	assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
5a	protects spawning habitat	4	0.00	0.00
5b	improves degraded spawning habitat	4	1.00	1.00
5c	assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
<b>HABITAT ACCESS</b>				
6a	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to high quality habitat	5	5.00	5.00
6b	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to functional habitat	4	0.00	0.00
6d	assess/design habitat access/factors affecting upstream distribution	3	0.00	0.00
<b>DIVERSION SCREENING</b>				
7a	protects fish from entrainment, impingement and other diversion or screen induced mortality	5	0.00	0.00
7b	assess/designs diversion screening	3	0.00	0.00
<b>FLOODPLAIN CONNECTIVITY/RIPARIAN CONDITION</b>				
8a	protects functioning floodplain and riparian (e.g., acquisition)	4	0.00	0.00
8b	improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions (e.g., dike breaching)	4	1.00	1.00
8c	assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor & functions	3	0.00	0.00
*The word restore/improves is used in the context of moving toward more natural levels or condition				
		<b>Habitat Score</b>		<b>8.00</b>

WF 1 = Quality and Quantity	WF1	<b>WF1</b>	<b>2.00</b>
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
Comments: at least 3 of 20 miles are good...			

WF2 = Relative Certainty of Success (Biological S)	WF2	<b>WF2</b>	<b>0.80</b>
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 %			
Comments: for abandoned, what will design look like? Is budget sufficient to get long-term solution?			

<b>Total Score</b>	<b>9.68</b>
--------------------	-------------

Scoring Criteria: 10-1841 Currier Creek Resoration		Project Scoring		
		Possible Score	Actual Score	Total Score
<b>Species - Action in Priority Area</b>				
	Steelhead	2	2.00	2.00
	Bull trout	2	0.00	0.00
	Spring Chinook	1	1.00	1.00
	Fall Chinook	1	0.00	0.00
	Coho	1	1.00	1.00
	Total	7	4.00	4.00
<b>INSTREAM FLOW AND HYDROGRAPH</b>				
1a	Improves degraded instream flow and/or hydrograph for salmonid benefit (e.g. water rights placed in trust)	4	0.00	0.00
1b	assesses instream flow needs (IFIM) or designs project to improve instream flow and/or hydrograph	3	0.00	0.00
<b>WATER QUALITY (e.g., temperature, DO, suspended sediments, nutrients, toxics)</b>				
2a	improves degraded water quality by reducing or eliminating contaminant (i.e. increased water temp, sediment, nitrates, etc.)	4	1.00	1.00
2b	assess/design contaminant source fate and transport	3	0.00	0.00
<b>IN-CHANNEL HABITAT (e.g., lwd, spawning gravel, pool/riffle ratios)</b>				
* 3	improves degraded LWD densities (e.g. wood has been removed or natural recruitment has been altered)	3	3.00	3.00
4a	protects rearing habitat	4	0.00	0.00
4b	improves degraded rearing habitat	4	4.00	4.00
4c	assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
5a	protects spawning habitat	4	0.00	0.00
5b	improves degraded spawning habitat	4	2.00	2.00
5c	assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
<b>HABITAT ACCESS</b>				
6a	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to high quality habitat	5	0.00	0.00
6b	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to functional habitat	4	0.00	0.00
6d	assess/design habitat access/factors affecting upstream distribution	3	0.00	0.00
<b>DIVERSION SCREENING</b>				
7a	protects fish from entrainment, impingement and other diversion or screen induced mortality	5	0.00	0.00
7b	assess/designs diversion screening	3	0.00	0.00
<b>FLOODPLAIN CONNECTIVITY/RIPARIAN CONDITION</b>				
8a	protects functioning floodplain and riparian (e.g., acquisition)	4	0.00	0.00
8b	improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions (e.g., dike breaching)	4	3.00	3.00
8c	assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor & functions	3	0.00	0.00
*The word restore/improves is used in the context of moving toward more natural levels or condition				
<b>Habitat Score</b>				<b>13.00</b>

WF 1 = Quality and Quantity	WF1	<b>WF1</b>	<b>1.20</b>
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
Comments			

WF2 = Relative Certainty of Success (Biological S)	WF2	<b>WF2</b>	<b>0.70</b>
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 %			
Comments: in channel work challenging; hybrid willows, inverted hydrograp raise question of whether channel will be maintained?			

<b>Total Score</b>	<b>9.43</b>
--------------------	-------------

Scoring Criteria: 10-1847 Teanway - Red Bridge Road		Project Scoring		
		Possible Score	Actual Score	Total Score
<b><u>Species - Action in Priority Area</u></b>				
	Steelhead	2	2.00	2.00
	Bull trout	2	1.00	1.00
	Spring Chinook	1	1.00	1.00
	Fall Chinook	1	0.00	0.00
	Coho	1	0.50	0.50
	Total	7	4.50	4.50
<b><u>INSTREAM FLOW AND HYDROGRAPH</u></b>				
1a	Improves degraded instream flow and/or hydrograph for salmonid benefit (e.g. water rights placed in trust)	4	0.00	0.00
1b	assesses instream flow needs (IFIM) or designs project to improve instream flow and/or hydrograph	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>WATER QUALITY (e.g., temperature, DO, suspended sediments, nutrients, toxics)</u></b>				
2a	improves degraded water quality by reducing or eliminating contaminant (i.e. increased water temp, sediment, nitrates, etc.)	4	1.00	1.00
2b	assess/design contaminant source fate and transport	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>IN-CHANNEL HABITAT (e.g., lwd, spawning gravel, pool/riffle ratios)</u></b>				
* 3	improves degraded LWD densities (e.g. wood has been removed or natural recruitment has been altered)	3	0.00	0.00
4a	protects rearing habitat	4	0.00	0.00
4b	improves degraded rearing habitat	4	0.00	0.00
4c	assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
5a	protects spawning habitat	4	0.00	0.00
5b	improves degraded spawning habitat	4	0.00	0.00
5c	assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>HABITAT ACCESS</u></b>				
6a	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to high quality habitat	5	5.00	5.00
6b	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to functional habitat	4	0.00	0.00
6d	assess/design habitat access/factors affecting upstream distribution	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>DIVERSION SCREENING</u></b>				
7a	protects fish from entrainment, impingement and other diversion or screen induced mortality	5	0.00	0.00
7b	assess/designs diversion screening	3	0.00	0.00
<b><u>FLOODPLAIN CONNECTIVITY/RIPARIAN CONDITION</u></b>				
8a	protects functioning floodplain and riparian (e.g., acquisition)	4	0.00	0.00
8b	improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions (e.g., dike breaching)	4	0.00	0.00
8c	assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor & functions	3	0.00	0.00
*The word restore/improves is used in the context of moving toward more natural levels or condition				
		<b>Habitat Score</b>		<b>6.00</b>

WF 1 = Quality and Quantity	WF1	<b>WF1</b>	<b>2.00</b>
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
Comments			

WF2 = Relative Certainty of Success (Biological S)	WF2	<b>WF2</b>	<b>0.80</b>
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 %			
Comments:			

<b>Total Score</b>	<b>9.33</b>
--------------------	-------------

Scoring Criteria: 10-1909 Lower Cowiche Creek Riparian Easement		Project Scoring		
		Possible Score	Actual Score	Total Score
<b>Species - Action in Priority Area</b>				
	Steelhead	2	2.00	2.00
	Bull trout	2	0.00	0.00
	Spring Chinook	1	1.00	1.00
	Fall Chinook	1	0.00	0.00
	Coho	1	1.00	1.00
	Total	7	4.00	4.00
<b>INSTREAM FLOW AND HYDROGRAPH</b>				
1a	Improves degraded instream flow and/or hydrograph for salmonid benefit (e.g. water rights placed in trust)	4	0.00	0.00
1b	assesses instream flow needs (IFIM) or designs project to improve instream flow and/or hydrograph	3	0.00	0.00
<b>WATER QUALITY (e.g., temperature, DO, suspended sediments, nutrients, toxics)</b>				
2a	improves degraded water quality by reducing or eliminating contaminant (i.e. increased water temp, sediment, nitrates, etc.)	4		0.00
2b	assess/design contaminant source fate and transport	3	0.00	0.00
<b>IN-CHANNEL HABITAT (e.g., lwd, spawning gravel, pool/riffle ratios)</b>				
* 3	improves degraded LWD densities (e.g. wood has been removed or natural recruitment has been altered)	3	0.00	0.00
4a	protects rearing habitat	4	3.00	3.00
4b	improves degraded rearing habitat	4	0.00	0.00
4c	assess/design rearing habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
5a	protects spawning habitat	4	3.00	3.00
5b	improves degraded spawning habitat	4	0.00	0.00
5c	assess/design spawning habitat conditions and needs	3	0.00	0.00
<b>HABITAT ACCESS</b>				
6a	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to high quality habitat	5	0.00	0.00
6b	restores access for juvenile and/or adult to functional habitat	4	0.00	0.00
6d	assess/design habitat access/factors affecting upstream distribution	3	0.00	0.00
<b>DIVERSION SCREENING</b>				
7a	protects fish from entrainment, impingement and other diversion or screen induced mortality	5	0.00	0.00
7b	assess/designs diversion screening	3	0.00	0.00
<b>FLOODPLAIN CONNECTIVITY/RIPARIAN CONDITION</b>				
8a	protects functioning floodplain and riparian (e.g., acquisition)	4	2.00	2.00
8b	improves degraded floodplain and/or riparian functions (e.g., dike breaching)	4	0.00	0.00
8c	assess/design floodplain connectivity and/or riparian corridor & functions	3	0.00	0.00
*The word restore/improves is used in the context of moving toward more natural levels or condition				
			<b>Habitat Score</b>	<b>8.00</b>

WF 1 = Quality and Quantity	WF1	<b>WF1</b>	<b>1.20</b>
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
Comments			

WF2 = Relative Certainty of Success (Biological S)	WF2	<b>WF2</b>	<b>1.00</b>
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 %			
Comments:			

<b>Total Score</b>	<b>8.29</b>
--------------------	-------------

## Appendix G: 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 H: Citizens Criteria Scores

Cultural and Social Benefits															
	Yakima Beaver Project	La Salle HS Riparian	Herke Fish Screening	Eschbach Park Levee S&R	Yakima River Delta Assess	Jack Creek Channel & Flood	Coleman Creek - EWC	Manastash Crk Barrier Rem	Currier Creek Restoration	Teanaway – Red Bridge	L. Cowiche Crk Easement	Yakima River Church			
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members?	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	X			
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community?	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	X			
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large?	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	X			
How will the project affect ESA liabilities for community members?	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	X			
How will the project affect recreational opportunities?	1	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0	X			
Will the project create defined educational/outreach opportunities?	.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X			

## Economic Considerations

	Yakima Beaver Project	La Salle HS Riparian	Herke Fish Screening	Eschbach Park Levee S&R	Yakima River Delta Assess	Jack Creek Channel & Flood	Coleman Creek - EWC	Manastash Crk Barrier Rem	Currier Creek Restoration	Teanaway – Red Bridge	L. Cowiche Crk Easement	Yakima River Church				
What is the potential impact of the project on the community's economy?	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	X				
How will the project affect recreational spending?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X				
Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable?	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	X				
How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?	0	-1	1	1	1	0	-1	1	0	0	1	X				

## Project Context & Organization

	Yakima Beaver Project	La Salle HS Riparian	Herke Fish Screening	Eschbach Park Levee S&R	Yakima River Delta Assess	Jack Creek Channel & Flood	Coleman Creek - EWC	Manastash Crk Barrier Rem	Currier Creek Restoration	Teanaway – Red Bridge	L. Cowiche Crk Easement	Yakima River Church				
If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature?	0	0	1	0	1	0	-1	1	0	1	1	X				
Is the project innovative?	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	X				
How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions?	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	.5	1	X				
Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties?	0	1	1	1	0	1	-1	1	0	0	1	X				

## Partnership & Community Support

	Yakima Beaver Project	La Salle HS Riparian	Herke Fish Screening	Eschbach Park Levee S&R	Yakima River Delta Assess	Jack Creek Channel & Flood	Coleman Creek - EWC	Manastash Crk Barrier Rem	Currier Creek Restoration	Teanaway – Red Bridge	L. Cowiche Crk Easement	Yakima River Church				
What is the breadth and strength of the community/citizen involvement in the project?	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	X				
What is the breadth and strength of the partnership supporting the project (technical support, financial and in-kind contributions, labor)?	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	X				
Will partner/citizen involvement increase the likelihood of the project's success or is this involvement lacking?	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	X				

## Appendix I: Citizens Committee Minutes

August 12, 2010

Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board Office

9:00 am – 12:00 pm

Those present: Kittitas County – Jim Schnebly; Yakima County - Don Chaplin, Bill Gillespie; Benton County - Jack Clark; Yakama Nation – Tony Monroe; Onni Perala of Yakima County submitted his comments via email and through discussion with Angie the previous day; TAG Representative – Becca Wassell; Staff – Angie Begosh, Alex Conley, Yuki Reiss

We started off the meeting with introductions.

Angie updated the group on Mid C funding negotiations with Klickitat County, scope amendments, and project updates.

<b>Project:</b>	10-1595 Yakima Beaver Project
<b>Matrix value:</b>	6
<b>Comments:</b>	The CC was uncomfortable with the TAG ranking the project as high as they did. Members felt that relocation sites should have been identified in the project proposal. They also felt the project was expensive for the amount of animals involved. They recognize the value of beavers to a riparian ecosystem, but feel more pre-work needed to be done for the proposal.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	This project dropped down on the list because evaluators would have liked to have seen project sites identified in the proposal and they felt it was expensive.

<b>Project:</b>	10-1753 La Salle High School Riparian Enhancement
<b>Matrix value:</b>	5
<b>Comments:</b>	Bill Gillespie recused himself from the evaluation of this project. The proposal wasn't clear on the fish benefit, and members would like to see more complexity as opposed to straight revegetation. They appreciated the approach to the project – soil testing and site analysis to determine the best locations for specific plants. Although CC members felt that his project has a high educational value and shows strong partnerships, they agreed with the TAG that this project does not have strong fish benefits.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC maintained the TAG ranking.

<b>Project:</b>	10-1764 Herke Fish Screening – Ahtanum Creek
<b>Matrix value:</b>	10
<b>Comments:</b>	Bill Gillespie recused himself from the evaluation of this project.

	The CC was pleased that the sponsor brought back this project with improvements; the diversions will be consolidated, the screen meets the reduced water right and there will be water metering. The committee would like to see this project funded and see immediate and high fish benefit.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC moved this project up the list because they felt it was important that this project is completed as soon as possible. High fish benefit for the money invested.

<b>Project:</b>	10-1785 Yakima River Delta Habitat Assessment
<b>Matrix value:</b>	9
<b>Comments:</b>	The CC has always strongly supported projects in the lower river. They feel that projects in the upper basin won't be as effective as they could be until issues in the lower river are addressed as all fish pass through here. They agree that there are thermal issues that need to be evaluated, and this assessment will help determine if there are any actions that could be taken to alleviate this issue. There are a lot of uncertainties associated with this project, but also high potential for projects that could see benefits. With proposed budget, high benefit for the cost.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC moved this project up the list because they feel that the project proposal is timely and the sooner we address lower river issues, the better.

<b>Project:</b>	10-1786 Jack Creek Channel & Floodplain Restoration
<b>Matrix value:</b>	7
<b>Comments:</b>	The CC was pleased to see that the sponsor improved the proposal by addressing cattle exclusion with the landowner. They were also pleased to see the reduction in the request resulting from the USFS contributing funds for the road abandonment. Good partnerships exhibited that will help the project succeed.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	This project dropped to a lower spot on the list because other projects were moved above it.

<b>Project:</b>	10-1837 Coleman Creek – Ellensburg Water Company
<b>Matrix value:</b>	-3
<b>Comments:</b>	The CC recognized that this is a well developed project – the designs are solid and thorough, and the sponsor has experience managing projects such as this one. However, given that the landowner agreements have not been established for the two barriers below this one, members felt it would be more appropriate to submit the proposal next year when the uncertainty has been addressed. A solid project, but premature.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC maintained the TAG ranking.

<b>Project:</b>	10-1838 Manastash Creek Barrier Removal
<b>Matrix value:</b>	11
<b>Comments:</b>	The CC was disappointed that this project wasn't completed several years before now. It has become more complicated over the last several years due to the incision and sediment deposition, and as such, the CC understands the state review panel's concern with the lack of design at this stage. However, members have confidence in the sponsor's ability to do the best thing. They also acknowledged the strength of the Manastash Steering Committee.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC moved this project up the list because they felt that work on this project should begin immediately, especially given the design challenges that get more complicated the longer work is delayed. There has been a lot of effort gone into this project and they want to see the benefit.

<b>Project:</b>	10-1841 Currier Creek Restoration
<b>Matrix value:</b>	3
<b>Comments:</b>	The CC recognizes the value of Currier Creek for coho recovery. Most believe that although this creek is essentially a wasteway, there is value in investing in restoration. There was discussion about how to maximize restoration benefits; several entities need to be included in this discussion, including the Yakama Nation, WDFW, agricultural community, and the city and county (for flood control issues.) The sponsor is willing to reduce the budget and showed how this could still produce benefits. The CC agreed to fund the project at the reduced budget. If more money were to become available, they would first like to see La Salle funded for its entire budget, then start building up the reduced Currier Creek budget.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC maintained the TAG ranking.

<b>Project:</b>	10-1847 Teanaway – Red Bridge Road
<b>Matrix value:</b>	9
<b>Comments:</b>	The CC recognized the importance of restoring passage in the Teanaway, and agreed that something needed to be done here to allow the water right holders access to their water without having to continually create a temporary berm and causing stream disturbance. CC members acknowledged that the design would be tricky, but we owe it to the irrigators to arrive at a reasonable solution.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC moved this project up the list because this issue can't remain unaddressed.

<b>Project:</b>	10-1909 Lower Cowiche Riparian Easement
<b>Matrix value:</b>	10
<b>Comments:</b>	The CC liked this project because it allows for restoration and also allows a landowner to continue his agriculture operation. It fits nicely with all of the work slated for this location (moving the Fruitvale diversion to Nelson Dam) and shows strong work between partners.
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	The CC maintained the TAG ranking.

<b>Project:</b>	09-1613 Yakima River Church Property
<b>Matrix value:</b>	Not Evaluated
<b>Comments:</b>	Sponsor withdrew the project. Will be purchased with YKFP funds (Yakama Nation).
<b>Rank adjustment:</b>	N/A

The CC decided that the Currier Creek Restoration project should be funded at the reduced amount. If more money were to become available, they would like to see the first alternate, La Salle High School Riparian Enhancement, funded up to its full request. If money was still available, it could then go to fill out the full Currier Creek request. The CC also recognized that the sponsor for the Yakima River Delta Habitat assessment had been requested by the TAG to call a few consultants to see if the budget was adequate for what was being proposed. The funds remaining at this point (~ \$14,000) could fill the potential gaps in this budget.

Alex informed the group that the Klickitat Lead Entity had a project in the White Salmon that the Lower Columbia region allocation was unable to fully fund. If we had money remaining that could not make one of our projects whole, would we be willing to backfill this deficit? The CC members agreed that we should do this as a goodwill gesture.

**Appendix J: YBFWRB Citizens Committee SRFB Project Ranking with TAG Ranking**

<b>PRISM #</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Request</b>	<b>TAG Rank</b>	<b>Final CC Rank</b>	<b>Fund Tally</b>	<b>Possible \$s</b>	<b>Reduced \$</b>
10-1765	Eschbach Park Levee Setback and Restoration	\$284,424.00	1		1 \$ 284,424	\$284,424.00	\$284,424.00
10-1764	Herke Fish Screening - Ahtanum Creek	\$130,817.00	3		2 \$ 415,241	\$130,817.00	\$415,241.00
10-1838	Manastash Creek Barrier Removal	\$112,959.00	6		3 \$ 528,200	\$112,959.00	\$528,200.00
10-1785	Yakima River Delta Habitat Assessment	\$114,055.00	7		4 \$ 642,255	\$114,055.00	\$642,255.00
10-1909	Lower Cowiche Creek Riparian Easement	\$84,190.00	5		5 \$ 726,445	\$84,190.00	\$726,445.00
10-1847	Teanaway - Red Bridge Road	\$243,877.00	8		6 \$ 970,322	\$243,877.00	\$970,322.00
10-1595	Yakima Beaver Project	\$187,025.00	2		7 \$ 1,157,347	\$187,025.00	\$1,157,347.00
10-1786	Jack Crk Channel & Floodplain Restoration	\$170,000.00	4		8 \$ 1,327,347	\$170,000.00	\$1,327,347.00
10-1841	Currier Creek Restoration	\$377,910.00	9		9 \$ 1,705,257	170,000	\$1,497,347.00
10-1753	La Salle High School Riparian Enhancement	\$127,834.00	10		10 \$ 1,833,091	32,000	\$1,529,347.00
10-1837	Coleman Creek - Ellensburg Water Company	\$500,022.00	11		11 \$ 2,333,113	\$500,022.00	\$2,029,369.00