



YAKIMA BASIN
FISH AND WILDLIFE
RECOVERY BOARD

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

September 13, 2011

Dear SRFB Staff and Review Panel,

We are pleased to present you with the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board's 2011 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,

Darcy Batura
Lead Entity Program Coordinator
dbatura@ybfwrb.org

Alex Conley
Executive Director
aconley@ybfwrb.org

2011 Yakima Basin Regional Area Funding Report

1. Internal Funding Allocations

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

The Mid-Columbia Region was allocated \$ 1,776,600 for the 2011 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, and this year the Klickitat Lead Entity was expanded to include WRIA 31. The Klickitat Lead Entity also includes part of WRIA 29, which is not in the Mid-Columbia Region. .

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 2011 and to divide funding between the two lists based on an agreed-upon allocation. The two groups initially planned around a 70/30% split, and worked together to adjust final project funding amounts to arrive at the proposed allocation of 67/33% . The total SRFB funding request for the Klickitat LE project list is \$583,400 (33%) of the money allocated for the Mid-Columbia Region, leaving \$1,193,200 (67%) 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.

The remainder of this report describes the process used to develop the Yakima ranked project list. A separate report submitted by the Klickitat Lead Entity provides information about the Klickitat Lead Entity process.

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 2011 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
Sean Gross, NOAA Fisheries, Fisheries Biologist
Rebecca Wassell, MCRFEG, Project Manager
David Child, Fish Biologist, Joint Irrigation Board

D. Were 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 2011 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. This work should be closely coordinated among NOAA Fisheries, the Interior Columbia Technical Recovery Team, WDFW, the Yakama Nation, and the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board.” A bull trout update to the Board’s 2005 Salmon Recovery Plan is in development in cooperation with U.S. Fish & Wildlife.

[See Appendix A: Regional Area Project Matrix \(Questions C-I; SRFB Appendix O\)](#)

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 determines if a budget is too high or low, and if it is reasonable relative to other similar projects and the proposal’s expected benefits derived. 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.

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 2011. We posted the RFP on the YBFWRB website and distributed it via email networks that we expanded from previous years. On May 3, 2011, the Board received 11 pre-applications.

2011 Yakima Basin SRFB Pre-Applications

Steelhead Safe Passage – Toppenish Refuge	Yakama Nation & USFWS
Yakima River Streambank Enhancement Assessment	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group
Yakima River Floodplain Side-Channel Restoration	City of Yakima
Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration Design	Yakima County Public Services
Cowiche Creek Floodplain Reconnection	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group
CCWUA Pump Station and Barrier Removal	North Yakima Conservation District
Rattlesnake Creek Side Channel Restoration	Bob Inouye
Pott Habitat Parcel Restoration	YN & YKFP
Coleman Creek - Ellensburg Water Company Project	Kittitas County Conservation Trust
Cle Elum River Ph.2 Instream Habitat Design	Kittitas Conservation Trust
Teanaway Forks Large Wood Recruitment	Mid-Columbia RFEG

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

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, 2011, applicants submitted 10 of the 11 pre-applications. The Yakama Nation and US Fish & Wildlife decided not to submit their proposal titled Steelhead Safe Passage – Toppenish Refuge.

2011 Yakima Basin SRFB Applications

11-1373	Rattlesnake Creek Side Channel Restoration	Robert Inouye
11-1321	Teanaway Forks Large Wood Trapping	Mid-Columbia RFEG
11-1564	Cle Elum River PH-2 Instream Habitat Design	Kittitas Conservation Trust
11-1320	Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration, Phase 2	Mid-Columbia RFEG
11-1600	Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration Design	Yakima County
11-1595	Pott Habitat Parcel Restoration	Yakama Nation
11-1565	City of Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem Restoration	City of Yakima
11-1525	Coleman Creek - Ellensburg Water Company	Kittitas County Conservation District
11-1322	Horse Heaven River Ranch Riparian	Mid-Columbia RFEG

	Restoration	
11-1558	CCWUA Fish Screening and Barrier Removal Project	North Yakima Conservation District

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.

Site Tour with State Review Panel Representatives

The Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board invited the SRFB Review Panel to tour our 10 project sites on June 21-22, 2011. The panel members selected to visit the Yakima Basin projects were Pat Powers and Patty Michak, with Mike Ramsey of the RCO joining them. Panel members received copies of the application binders to review prior to the tour. They visited 9 of 10 project sites:

11-1373	Rattlesnake Creek Side Channel Restoration
11-1321	Teaway Forks Large Wood Trapping
11-1564	Cle Elum River PH-2 Instream Habitat Design
11-1320	Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration, Phase 2
11-1600	Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration Design
11-1595	Pott Habitat Parcel Restoration
11-1565	City of Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem Restoration
11-1322	Horse Heaven River Ranch Riparian Restoration
11-1558	CCWUA Fish Screening and Barrier Removal Project

The one remaining proposal was not visited, as Pat and Patty had visited the site already. We agreed before the visit that sponsor would prepare an office presentation for this project:

11-1525	Coleman Creek - Ellensburg Water Company
---------	--

Board staff invited TAG and CC members to participate in this process. David Child (TAG), Sean Gross (TAG), Pat Monk (TAG) and Richard Visser (TAG) joined us for the site visits. The panel members asked questions and addressed their concerns with project applicants and Board staff. A summary of on-site discussion and potential concerns was sent to project sponsors immediately following the site visits. Mike Ramsey forwarded the State Review Panel's official written comments to the YBFWRB staff on July 14. These comments were shared with applicants and TAG and CC members. Applicants were asked to address issues identified in the review comments to strengthen their project proposals in PRISM.

[See Appendix B: SRFB Site Visit Agenda & Attendee List](#)

Presentations to Reviewers

On June 29, applicants presented their projects to members of the TAG and CC. Each applicant had 30 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 C: Presentation & Joint TAG/CC Meeting Minutes](#)

Applicants had the opportunity to adjust their applications between June 23rd and July 16th. A packet containing amended applications was prepared for the TAG prior to their official review.

Technical Advisory Group Review Process

The TAG met on July 19 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 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 is selected by the Board to ensure 1) broad geographic representation from Yakima, Benton, and Kittitas Counties and the Yakama Nation and 2) representation of a wide variety of interests within the community.

2011 Yakima Basin Citizens Committee participants:

Jim Schnebly, Mark Charlton, & David Bowen	(Kittitas County)
Neil McClure, Bill Gillespie, & Don Chaplin	(Yakima County)
Tony Monroe, McClure Tosch, & Emily Washines	(Yakama Nation)
Jack Clark, & Kathryn Knutson	(Benton County)

David Child, of the TAG and Alex Conley & Darcy Batura (YBFWRB staff) also participated in the CC meeting.

The Citizens Committee used the same criteria for ranking projects that they have used in previous years.

[See Appendix G: Community Evaluation and Scoring Criteria](#)

The Citizens Committee convened on August 11, 2011, 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, notes and priority ranking from the TAG review.

[See Appendix H: Citizen's Committee Scoring Results](#)

[See Appendix I: Citizen's Committee Meeting Minutes](#)

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

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
Sean Gross, NOAA Fisheries, Fisheries Biologist
Rebecca Wassell, MCRFEG, Project Manager
David Child, Fish Biologist, Joint Irrigation Board

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 Review Panel participation started with the site visits on June 21 – 22nd. 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. Both Patty Michak and Pat Powers attended our TAG review on July 19. They were both tremendous assets to our process as they provided 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 ask for 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 that will contribute to reaching delisting and recovery goals for steelhead in the Yakima Basin. Project applicants were asked to identify the specific plan actions that pertained to their project in their application. The TAG also evaluated whether a project had a high, medium or low fit to the recovery plan. Corresponding actions for each project are included in the matrix (Appendix A).

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

Upon completion of the TAG's review and scoring, the Lead Entity's CC reviews and ranks the projects. Citizen's committee members may include individual citizens, local, state, federal and tribal government representatives, community groups, environmental and fisheries groups, conservation districts, and industry. The citizen's committee is critical to ensure that biological priorities and projects have the necessary community support for success. Citizen committee members are often the best judges of the community's social, cultural and economic values as they apply to salmon recovery, and of how to increase community support over time through the implementation of habitat projects. The CC uses the TAG's scoring for each project in conjunction with community value considerations to develop a ranked project list. Community values considered include: cultural, social, economic, efficient & effective resource use, community support, and partner support. The Citizens Committee makes the final recommendation for what projects get funded. The Committee takes the recommendations of the TAG into consideration, but they are not obligated to maintain the same ranking given to projects by the TAG if they feel a project's ranking needs to be adjusted based the Citizen's Committees evaluation.

On August 18, the Board of Directors of the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board met and reviewed the ranked Lead Entity list submitted by the Citizen's Committee, and approved the list unanimously.

[See Appendix J: LE Ranked List](#)

Appendices

- [Appendix A: Regional Area Project Matrix \(SRFB Appendix O\)](#)
- [Appendix B: Yakima Basin SRFB Site Visits Agenda and Attendance](#)
- [Appendix C: Presentations/TAG&CC Joint Meeting Minutes](#)
- [Appendix D: TAG Scoring Matrix](#)
- [Appendix E: TAG Evaluation Sheets](#)
- [Appendix F: TAG Minutes](#)
- [Appendix G: Community Evaluation and Scoring Criteria](#)
- [Appendix H: Citizen's Committee Scoring Results](#)
- [Appendix I: Citizen's Committee Meeting Minutes](#)
- [Appendix J: LE Ranked List \(SRFB Appendix F\)](#)

Appendix A: Regional Area Project Matrix (SRFB Appendix O)

Regional Area Project Matrix

For more information on questions 3C-3I, see Appendix N.

Region: Middle Columbia River - 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 percentage	3 G. Sponsor record of SRFB project implementation	3 H. Veterans involved
1	11-1373	Rattlesnake Creek Side Channel Restoration	Robert Inouye	Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead bull trout	Coho, spring Chinook, Cutthroat	N/A	Naches Action #31: Restore side channels and floodplain of Upper Naches River (p. 178).	15%	No previous projects	No
2	11-1564	Cle Elum River Phase 2 Instream Habitat Design	Kittitas Conservation Trust	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead bull trout	Coho, spring Chinook, Rainbow, Sockeye	N/A	Upper Yakima Action #14: Restore instream and floodplain habitat complexity in Swauk and Tanum creeks and Teanaway and lower Cle Elum Rivers (p. 198).	Design Project: 0%	8 Awarded 1 Complete 4 Active 3 Incomplete	No
3	11-1320	Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration, Phase 2	Mid-Columbia RFEF	Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead bull trout	Coho, spring Chinook, Rainbow	N/A	Naches Action #19: Improve riparian and floodplain conditions along Cowiche Creek (p. 171). Naches Action #22: Restore floodplain connectivity in lower Cowiche Creek (p. 174).	15%	11 Awarded 2 Complete 9 Active	No
4	11-1600	Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration Design	Yakima County Public Services	Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead bull trout	Coho, spring Chinook	N/A	Naches Action #19: Improve riparian and floodplain conditions along Cowiche Creek (p. 171). Naches Action #22:	Design Project: 0%	4 Awarded	No

								Restore floodplain connectivity in lower Cowlitz Creek (p. 174).			
5	11-1595	Pott Habitat Restoration	Yakama Nation	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Cutthroat, Coho, spring Chinook	N/A	Upper Yakima Action #13: Protect & restore floodplain, riparian and in-channel habitats in Upper Yakima, Kittitas, and Easton/Clea Elum Reaches (p. 197). Upper Yakima Action #15: Restore tributary riparian areas (p. 199).	16%	6 Awarded 4 Complete 1 Active 1 Incomplete	No
6	11-1565	City of Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem Restoration	City of Yakima	Upper Yakima and Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Coho, spring Chinook, Rainbow, Cutthroat, Pacific Lamprey	N/A	Lower Mainstem Action #6: Restore mainstem and side channel habitats in the Union Gap reach (p. 156). Basinwide Action #12: Improve recruitment of Cottonwoods (p. 151).	36%	1 Awarded 1 Complete	No
7	11-1321	Teanaway Forks Large Wood Trapping	Mid-Columbia RFEG	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead bull trout	Spring Chinook, Rainbow, Cutthroat	N/A	Upper Yakima Action #14: Restore instream and floodplain habitat complexity in Swauk and Tanum creeks and Teanaway and lower Cle Elum Rivers (p. 198).	Design Project: 0%	11 Awarded 2 Complete 9 Active	No
8	11-1525	Coleman Creek - Ellensburg Water Company	Kittitas County Conservation Trust	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Spring Chinook, Coho	N/A	Upper Yakima Action #11: Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries (p. 195). Upper Yakima Action #19: Coordinate water quality improvements in Reecer, Wilson,	43%	13 Awarded 8 Complete 5 Active	No

								Naneum, Cherry, and Dry creeks.			
9	11-1322	Horse Heaven River Ranch Riparian Restoration	Mid-Columbia RFEG	Upper Yakima, Naches, and Toppenish steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Spring and Fall/Summer Chinook, Coho	N/A	Lower Mainstem Action #7: Protect and restore mainstem and floodplain habitats below Sunnyside Dam. Basinwide Action #12: Improve recruitment of cottonwoods.	16%	11 Awarded 2 Complete 9 Active	No

Appendix B: Yakima Basin SRFB Site Visits Agenda and Attendance

2011 YBFWRB SRFB Site Visit Schedule

June 21 - 22, 2011

** Denotes presentation rather than site visit*

Tuesday, June 21:

Yakima County

8:30 – 9:30 am	Site Visit Overview
9:30 am	Leave YBFWRB office
10:30 – 11:15 pm	11-1322 Horse Haven River Ranch Riparian Restoration
12:00 – 12:45pm	11-1565 City of Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem Restoration
Pick up lunch	(Quiznos, Taco Del Mar, or similar)
1:00 – 1:45 pm	11-1600 Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration Design
2:00 – 2:45 pm	11-1320 Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration, Phase 2
3:00 – 3:45 pm	11-1558 CCWUA Fish Screening & Barrier Removal Project
4:30 – 5:15 pm	11-1373 Rattlesnake Creek Side Channel Restoration

Wednesday, June 22:

Kittitas County

8:30 am	Leave Roslyn (Mountain Mermaid Coffee)
8:45 – 9:30 am	11-1564 Cle Elum River Phase 2 Instream Habitat Design
10:30 – 11:30 am	11-1321 Teanaway Forks Large Wood Trapping
11:30 – 12:00	Lunch (Mountain Mermaid Sandwiches)
12:30 – 1:15 pm	11-1595 Pott Habitat Parcel Restoration
1:25 – 2:15 pm	11-1525 Colman Creek – Ellensburg Water Co Project*

Site Visit Attendees:

State Review Panel:

Mike Ramsey, RCO
Patty Michak
Pat Powers

TAG:

Pat Monk, USF&WS
Sean Gross, NOAA Fisheries
Richard Visser, US Fish & Wildlife Service
David Child, Yakima Basin Joint Board

CC:

None

Staff:

Alex Conley
Yuki Reiss
Darcy Batura

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

2011 TAG/CC SRFB Proposal Presentations

June 29, 2011 • 9:00 am – 5:00 pm

1110 West Lincoln Avenue, YBFWRB Office

9:00 – 9:45 am	Introductions Overview of current grant round Updates on past scope amendments Scope Amendment discussion
9:45 – 10:15	11-1564 Cle Elum River PH-2 Instream Habitat Design David Gerth
10:20 – 10:50	11-1595 Pott Habitat Parcel Restoration Scott Nicolai & John Marvin
10:55 – 11:25	11-1373 Rattlesnake Creek Side Channel Restoration Bob Inouye
11:30 – 12:00	11-1525 Colman Creek – Ellensburg Water Co. Project Anna Lael
12:00 – 12:30 pm	Lunch
12:35 – 1:05	11-1558 CCWUA Fish Screening & Barrier Removal Project Mike Tobin
1:10 – 1:40	11-1600 Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration Design Karen Hodges
1:45 – 2:15	11-1322 Horse Heaven River Ranch Riparian Restoration Becca Wassell
2:20 – 2:50	11-1320 Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration, Phase 2 Becca Wassell
2:55 – 3:25	11-1321 Teanaway Forks Large Wood Trapping Becca Wassell
3:30 – 4:00	11-1565 City of Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem Restoration Ryan Anderson
4:00 – 5:00	Additional discussion and wrap up

2011 TAG/CC SRFB Proposal Presentations – Minutes

Those present:

CC members: Bill Gillespie, Jack Clark, Neil McClure, Kathryn Knutson, David Bowen, Don Chaplin

TAG members: Pat Monk, John Easterbrooks, Joel Freudenthal, David Lind, Richard Visser, Anna Lael, Paul LaRiviere, Scott Nicolai, Sean Gross, Dale Bambrick, Jeff Thomas, Becca Wassell

Sponsors: David Gerth, Scott Nicolai, Bob Inouye, Anna Lael, Justin Bader, Mike Tobin, Joel Freudenthal, Becca Wassell, Ryan Anderson

Staff – Darcy Batura, Alex Conley, Yuki Reiss

The meeting began with introductions and a review of the agenda. Darcy reviewed the status of current projects and discussed the Wade Road scope amendment process with the group.

Cle Elum River Instream Habitat Design

David Gerth provided an overview of the design project and discussed the Cle Elum River 2010 Water Quality Monitoring Report, including water temperature data. He still needs to complete an analysis of fish use of the side channels; however the Dittman map identified redds in one restored side channel location. Reviewers asked if the side channels will be at risk of blow-out/avulsion during peak flow. Gerth responded that the ELJs were built to withstand reservoir overflow and have performed consistent with their design. High flow impact to the side channels with additional ELJs will be an aspect of the design considerations.

Pott Habitat Parcel Restoration

Scott Nicolai explained the project's objectives and methods including the "CREP-style" planting and weed barrier. Reviewers asked if the black plastic will eventually be removed and Nicolai responded that labor crews will remove the weed barrier after 3 – 5 years. The group asked why this is not a CREP project, to which Nicolai responded that it is CREP eligible; however, CREP funds are currently unavailable. The last point of discussion was in regard to the crack willow removal and the possibility of it being listed as a class 3 invasive species.

Rattlesnake Creek Side Channel Restoration

Mr. Inouye described his updated proposal, which is significantly different from the original proposal submitted for consideration. Reviewers were pleased to see a more cost-effective and simplified strategy that can have a positive impact on Rattlesnake Creek.

Coleman Creek

Anna Lael gave an overview of the project and the results of 2010 YTAHP monitoring, which identified spring Chinook and trout. Sponsor is continuing to work with downstream landowners on addressing barriers. Lael is looking for additional funds (CREP, 319, YTAHP) to help solve downstream issues. The sponsor would like to move ahead to take advantage of the EWC commitment and address the instream diversion.

CCWUA Fish Screen & Barrier Removal

Mike Tobin and Justin Bader described the CCWUA project and their proposed alternatives 1 & 2. Group discussed the 2004 or 2005 low flow period when there was only ¼ cfs running. The cost estimate in PRISM is for alternative 1.

Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration Design

Joel Freudenthal discussed Yakima County's approach to this design proposal. Reviewers asked if they anticipate culvert removal as part of the implementation project. The sponsor responded that culvert removal would not be included as fish will need to use it until Fruitvale is removed. He does not anticipate a problem with this approach as the culvert is large. The sponsor also mentioned that the trestle removal is a high priority. Reviewers asked the sponsor to update the maps provided as they were inaccurate.

Horse Heaven River Ranch Riparian Restoration

Becca Wassell provided an overview of the project and the tangible benefits as a gaining reach. The landowner is checking with the EPA about using herbicides to eliminate the Russian Olive adjacent to her organic farm. The proposed restoration area was in hay cultivation until about five years ago. Sponsor plans to use a cluster planting method utilizing a water jet rather than a backhoe. She is also exploring a more cost-effective fencing option as the \$39k is high. Reviewers suggested that she focus on planting rose, current, and cottonwood to keep costs down.

Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration, Phase 2

The project sponsor discussed the project objectives and methods which will remove 500 feet of levee and concrete along Cowiche Creek, reactivating the floodplain. She mentioned that the sponsor does not want the proposed pedestrian trail alignment to cross their property.

Teanaway Forks Large Wood Trapping

Becca Wassell discussed the pilot approach to trapping large wood in the Teanaway River's West, Middle, and North forks. Project will include 12 – 18 structures – maybe less. Her approach will be to assess the reaches, identify the specific locations for the trapping structures, then install. Reviewers asked for clarification between wood retention objectives and floodplain habitat objectives. They also hoped for clarification about target wood loading vs. geomorphology.

City of Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem Restoration

Ryan Anderson described the three-phase approach to prepare for breaching the levee as part of the Gap to Gap initiative. The former spray field has lots of upwelling feeding Billy's pond. The pond releases 2 – 6 cfs during high flow events. Sponsor wants to roughen the floodplain and address the re-route of the greenway trail through the City's property.

Appendix D: TAG Scoring Matrix

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

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

Appendix E: TAG Evaluation Sheets

2011 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.

2011 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form

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

Certainty of Success Categories

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

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

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

Strengths of Proposal:

Weaknesses of Proposal:

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

Final Ranking and Rationale:

Appendix F: TAG Minutes

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

Matrix Score: 10.3

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: High

Project Sequence: High

Reasonable Budget: High

Organizational Capacity: High

Appraisal: N/A

Uncertainties and Constraints: Medium

Fit to Regional Plan: High

Value to Education/Outreach: N/A

Future Stewardship: Low

Threat to Habitat Values: N/A

Summary of Discussion

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

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

Recommendations to Improve Project:

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

11-1321 Teanaway Forks Large Wood Trapping: Mid-Columbia RFE

Matrix Score: 18.1

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: Medium

Project Sequence: High

Reasonable Budget: Medium

Organizational Capacity: High

Appraisal: N/A

Uncertainties and Constraints: Low

Fit to Regional Plan: High

Value to Education/Outreach: High

Future Stewardship: High

Threat to Habitat Values: N/A

Summary of Discussion

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

Uncertainties articulated during review were in regard to the limited information provided in the application about the location of the structures in regard to floodplain connectivity, though this may be mitigated by the plan to survey the river to identify project sites. Additional concerns were raised in regard to public scoping and how the Kittitas County Planning Department will respond with consideration to the county shorelines plan. Will WDFW allow this project under the streamlined HPA process? If not, will the county issue shorelines permits for this project?

Recommendations to Improve Project:

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

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

Matrix Score: 1.3

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: High

Project Sequence: High

Reasonable Budget: Medium

Organizational Capacity: High

Appraisal: N/A

Uncertainties and Constraints: Medium

Fit to Regional Plan: Low/Medium

Value to Education/Outreach: N/A

Future Stewardship: Low

Threat to Habitat Values: N/A

Summary of Discussion

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

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

Recommendations to Improve Project:

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

11-1373 Rattlesnake Creek Side Channel Restoration - Inouye

Matrix Score: 18.9

Certainty of Success Categories

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

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

Summary of Discussion

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

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

Recommendations to Improve Project:

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

11-1525 Coleman Creek EWC – Kittitas County Conservation District

Matrix Score: 5

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: High

Project Sequence: Low

Reasonable Budget: High

Organizational Capacity: High

Appraisal: N/A

Uncertainties and Constraints: Low

Fit to Regional Plan: High

Value to Education/Outreach: N/A

Future Stewardship: High

Threat to Habitat Values: N/A

Summary of Discussion

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

Recommendations to Improve Project:

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

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

Matrix Score: 19.8

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: High

Project Sequence: Low

Reasonable Budget: Medium

Organizational Capacity: High

Appraisal: N/A

Uncertainties and Constraints: Low

Fit to Regional Plan: High

Value to Education/Outreach: N/A

Future Stewardship: ?

Threat to Habitat Values: N/A

Summary of Discussion:

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

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

Recommendations to Improve Project:

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

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

Matrix Score: 12.4

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: High

Project Sequence: High

Reasonable Budget: High

Organizational Capacity: High

Appraisal: N/A

Uncertainties and Constraints: Medium

Fit to Regional Plan: High

Value to Education/Outreach: N/A

Future Stewardship: High

Threat to Habitat Values: N/A

Summary of Discussion:

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

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

Recommendations to Improve Project:

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

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

Matrix Score: 9.3

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: High

Project Sequence: Medium

Reasonable Budget: Low

Organizational Capacity: Medium

Appraisal: N/A

Uncertainties and Constraints: Low

Fit to Regional Plan: High

Value to Education/Outreach: N/A

Future Stewardship: Medium

Threat to Habitat Values: N/A

Summary of Discussion

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

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

Recommendations to Improve Project:

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

11-1595 Pott Habitat Parcel Restoration – Yakama Nation

Matrix Score: 8.6

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: High

Project Sequence: Medium

Reasonable Budget: High

Organizational Capacity: High

Appraisal: N/A

Uncertainties and Constraints: Medium

Fit to Regional Plan: High

Value to Education/Outreach: N/A

Future Stewardship: High

Threat to Habitat Values: N/A

Summary of Discussion:

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

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

Recommendations to Improve Project:

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

11-1600 Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration Design – Yakima County

Matrix Score: 10.3

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: High

Project Sequence: Low

Reasonable Budget: High

Organizational Capacity: High

Appraisal: N/A

Uncertainties and Constraints: Low

Fit to Regional Plan: High

Value to Education/Outreach: N/A

Future Stewardship: Medium

Threat to Habitat Values: N/A

Summary of Discussion

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

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

Recommendations to Improve Project:

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

Appendix G: Community Evaluation and Scoring Criteria

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															
	Lower Cowiche Rest. Ph. 2	Teanaway Forks Lg Wood	Horse Heaven Riparian Rest	Rattlesnake Creek	Coleman Creek - EWC	CCWUA Fish Screen	Cle Elum River Design	City of Yakima Floodplain	Pott Habitat Restoration	Lower Cowiche Design					
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members?	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0					
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community?	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0					
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large?	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0					
How will the project affect ESA liabilities for community members?	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0					
How will the project affect recreational opportunities?	1	-1	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0					
Will the project create defined educational/outreach opportunities?	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0					

Economic Considerations

	Lower Cowiche Rest. Ph. 2	Teanaway Forks Lg Wood	Horse Heaven Riparian Rest	Rattlesnake Creek	Coleman Creek - EWC	CCWUA Fish Screen	Cle Elum River Design	City of Yakima Floodplain	Pott Habitat Restoration	Lower Cowiche Design						
What is the potential impact of the project on the community's economy?	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0						
How will the project affect recreational spending?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable?	1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1						
How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1						

Project Context & Organization

	Lower Cowiche Rest. Ph. 2	Teanaway Forks Lg Wood	Horse Heaven Riparian Rest	Rattlesnake Creek	Coleman Creek - EWC	CCWUA Fish Screen	Cle Elum River Design	City of Yakima Floodplain	Pott Habitat Restoration	Lower Cowiche Design						
If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature?	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Is the project innovative?	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0						
How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions?	1	0	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1						
Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties?	1	-1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1						

Partnership & Community Support

	Lower Cowiche Rest. Ph. 2	Teanaway Forks Lg Wood	Horse Heaven Riparian Rest	Rattlesnake Creek	Coleman Creek - EWC	CCWUA Fish Screen	Cle Elum River Design	City of Yakima Floodplain	Pott Habitat Restoration	Lower Cowiche Design						
What is the breadth and strength of the community/citizen involvement in the project?	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1						
What is the breadth and strength of the partnership supporting the project (technical support, financial and in-kind contributions, labor)?	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1						
Will partner/citizen involvement increase the likelihood of the project's success or is this involvement lacking?	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1						

Appendix I: Citizens Committee Minutes

Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board Citizen Committee Minutes

August 11, 2011
9:00 am – 1:00 pm

We began the meeting with introductions. Darcy reviewed the CC ranking process, applicable bylaws, and updated the group on Mid-Columbia funding negotiations with Klickitat County, scope amendments, and project updates.

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

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

Project:	11-1322 Horse Heaven River Ranch Riparian Restoration
Matrix value:	3
Comments:	Group consensus concluded this is a valuable habitat project, with little benefit to fish.
Rank adjustment:	The CC moved this project into the do not fund category and would support efforts to assist the sponsor in finding alternate funding sources for habitat.

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

Project:	11-1558 CCWUA Fish Screening and Barrier Removal Project
Matrix value:	8
Comments:	The DNF designation issues were discussed at the beginning of the meeting, and then the project ranked was completed in the same manner as the other projects despite the CC's conclusion to maintain the DNF designation. <i>Early conversation:</i> Committee weighed comments provided by the TAG and considered the project history. After discussion, the CC checked in around the table. Of the ten members present, six were in favor of maintaining the DNF designation; four recommended reversing the DNF designation. <i>Discussion during ranking:</i> YN perspective is in support of the YTID option. Spread of opinion on the cost/benefits – compromised on a 0. Broadly, the CC members reminded others that the proposal needed to be evaluated as it stands. The CC agreed to another year of trying to reach agreement on the YTID option – if the agreement is not obtained, they would like to see an alternate (2011) proposal funded following the 2012 SRFB process and timeline.
Rank adjustment:	The CC maintained the TAG's "do not fund" designation

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

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

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

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

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

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

Lead Entity: Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board

Lead Entity Allocation: \$1,243,200

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

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Prospective Sponsor	SRFB Request	Sponsor Match	Project Total Cost	Project Status	Response to Review Panel Comments (include attachment # in PRISM)
1	11-1373	Rattlesnake Creek Side Channel Restoration	Robert Inouye	\$37,733	\$6,800	\$44,533		Attachments #38 & 39
2	11-1564	Cle Elum River Phase 2 Instream Habitat Design	Kittitas Conservation Trust	\$172,000	\$0	\$172,000		None
3	11-1320	Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration, Phase 2	Mid-Columbia RFEG	\$90,754	\$16,037	\$106,791		Attachment #8
4	11-1600	Lower Cowiche Creek Restoration Design	Yakima County Public Services	\$105,000	\$5,000	\$105,000		Attachments #9 - 12, 14 and 15
5	11-1595	Pott Habitat Restoration	Yakama Nation	\$98,500	\$18,500	\$117,000		Attachment #8
6	11-1565	City of Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem Restoration	City of Yakima	\$275,400	\$157,000	\$432,400		Attachments #11 - 16
7	11-1321	Teanaway Forks Large Wood Trapping	Mid-Columbia RFEG	\$80,500	\$0	\$80,500		Attachments #17 and 18
8	11-1525	Coleman Creek - Ellensburg Water Company	Kittitas County Conservation Trust	\$500,665	\$375,330	\$875,995	Partial Funding	Attachment #17
9	11-1322	Horse Heaven River Ranch Riparian Restoration	Mid-Columbia RFEG	\$78,871	\$14,627	\$93,498	Alternate	Attachments #11 - 13

Totals: \$1,439,423 \$593,294 \$2,027,717