

Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region



Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board
1200 Chesterly Drive
Yakima, WA 98902
www.ybfwrb.org

Executive Director
Alex Conley
(509) 453-4104
aconley@ybfwrb.org

Klickitat County Lead Entity
127 West Court Street, Mail Stop CH-27
Goldendale, WA 98620
(509) 773-2410

Region Overview

Geography

The Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region is comprised of salmon bearing streams in Benton, Kittitas, Yakima, and Klickitat Counties.

Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIA)

Klickitat (30), Rock-Glade (31), Lower Yakima (37), Naches (38), and Upper Yakima (39)

Federally Recognized Tribes

Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

Endangered Species Act Listings

Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region Listed Species

Species	Listed As	Date Listed
Steelhead	Threatened	March 25, 1999
Bull Trout	Threatened	1998

Salmon Recovery Plan

Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region Recovery Plan

Recovery Plan	
Regional Organization	Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board (for the Yakima basin; no recovery organization for Columbia Gorge populations in the middle Columbia region).
Plan Timeframe	15 years (Yakima steelhead recovery plan only)
Actions Identified to Implement Plan	94 (Yakima steelhead recovery plan only)
Estimated Cost (This does not include estimated cost from the Klickitat and Rock Creek plans prepared by the NOAA.)	\$269 million (Yakima steelhead recovery plan only)
Status	NOAA-Fisheries approved the Middle Columbia River Steelhead Recovery Plan in September 2009. This plan incorporates the Yakima board's <i>Yakima Steelhead Recovery Plan</i> and NOAA's recovery plans for steelhead populations in the Gorge Management Unit of the middle Columbia River steelhead distinct population segment.

Recovery Plan	
	The Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board released the <i>Yakima Bull Trout Action Plan</i> in September 2012. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is developing a bull trout recovery plan that will include a middle Columbia River planning unit.
Implementation Schedule Status	For the Yakima basin, basic elements of a 6-year implementation schedule are completed, providing details of planned actions, key partners, link of actions to limiting factors and plan strategies, time to implement and achieve benefits, and estimated costs. Additional information fields and a tracking and reporting system for the implementation schedule are being developed.
Web Information	Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board Web site Klickitat Lead Entity Web page Habitat Work Schedule

Region and Lead Entities

There are five WRIAs in the Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region. The Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board is the regional salmon recovery organization and lead entity for three of these WRIAs (37, 38, and 39). The Klickitat County Lead Entity’s geographic area is composed of WRIAs 29b, 30, and 31. The Klickitat County Lead Entity’s geographic area is not within the purview of a regional organization established under Revised Codes of Washington 77.85.090 or 77.85.200, but is contained within the Lower Columbia and Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Regions. Therefore, a portion of the SRFB project funding allocated to the Lower Columbia and Middle Columbia Salmon Recovery Regions is allocated to the Klickitat County Lead Entity’s geographic area based on a combination of historical funding allocations and anadromous stream miles.

Regional Area Summary Questions and Responses

1. Describe the process and criteria used to develop allocations across lead entities or watersheds within the region?

The mid-Columbia region was allocated \$1,776,600 for the 2014 SRFB grant round. 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 County 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 Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board and the Klickitat County Lead Entity submit separate lead entity lists and divide funding between the two lists based on an agreed upon allocation.

Funding and Requests

Funding and Requests	Totals	Percent
Total Allocation	\$1,776,600	100%
Yakima Basin Lead Entity List (without alternates)	\$1,263,450	71.1%
Klickitat Lead Entity List (without alternates)	\$513,150	28.9%
Remaining Balance	(\$0)	100%

2. Regional Technical Review Process

A. How was the regional technical review conducted?

The existing Yakima lead entity technical review group was used as the regional 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 already were serving on the lead entity review team, the Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board 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 and citizens' review?

The Yakima Technical Advisory Group evaluated Yakima basin projects using three sets of criteria:

- I. Salmon Recovery Matrix assesses:
 - o Species benefited by project.
 - o Project benefits to in-stream flow and the hydrograph.
 - o Project benefits to water quality.
 - o Project benefits to in-channel habitat.
 - o Improvements to degraded large woody material densities.
 - o Protection of functional rearing habitat.
 - o Improvements to degraded rearing habitat.

- Project benefits to habitat access.
- Improvement of access for juvenile or adult to high quality habitat.
- Improvement of access for juvenile or adult to functional habitat.
- Project benefits to diversion screening.
- Project benefits to floodplain connectivity and riparian condition.

Matrix scores are adjusted using weighting factors for:

- Quality and quantity.
 - Certainty of success.
 - Benefit to cost.
 - Longevity of benefit.
- II. Yakima Basin Technical Advisory Group Evaluation Form. This form is used to provide consistency in evaluating projects. It is used to generate discussion and provide additional guidance to Technical Advisory Group members for how to rank projects. These also are provided to the Citizen Committee so members are aware of how the Technical Advisory Group evaluated the proposals. Form elements include:
- Landowner commitment.
 - Certainty of valuation (protection projects only).
 - Project sequencing.
 - Reasonableness of the budget.
 - Threats to habitat values.
 - Organizational capacity of sponsor.
 - Presence of uncertainties and constraints.
 - Plans for future stewardship.
 - Fit to regional plan.
 - Adequacy of design.
 - Value to education and outreach.
- III. Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board’s Focus Project List: The Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board’s [Focus Project List](#) is a tool developed by the

Technical Advisory Group to help identify high priority SRFB projects and apply those funding resources to projects that represent the most immediate needs of priority species. The list is used to:

- Give the Technical Advisory Group a way to proactively guide Yakima Basin SRFB funding towards high priority actions.
- Provide guidance to sponsors deciding what types of projects to pursue and propose.
- Strengthen the link between the SRFB project review criteria and recovery plan priorities.

Projects that clearly implement priority actions identified in the list receive 10 bonus points in the matrix. If a proposal does not address a next step related to a priority action, zero bonus points are awarded. It is important to emphasize that the Technical Advisory Group uses this approach as a way to recognize and reward proposals that implement identified priorities, but not as a way to exclude other SRFB proposals.

The Yakima Citizen Committee evaluated ranking based on the following criteria:

- Cultural and social benefits:
 - Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation and 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 Endangered Species Act liabilities for community members?
 - How will the project affect recreational opportunities?
 - Does the project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component?
- Economic considerations:
 - What is the potential short-term impact on the community's economy?
 - What is the potential long-term impact on the community's economy?
 - Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable?
 - How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

- Project context and organization:
 - If the project is not funded now, are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature?
 - Is the project innovative, standard, or problematic?
 - 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 and community support:
 - Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community and citizen involvement in the project?
 - Are the right partners involved to make the project successful?
 - Is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources?

C. Who completed the regional review (name, affiliation and expertise) and are they part of the regional organization or independent?

Participants in the 2014 Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board 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. The Technical Advisory Group is a long-standing committee that the lead entity has used in past SRFB project reviews and other processes. 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 Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board Technical Advisory Group

Name	Affiliation	Expertise
Dale Bambrick	NOAA-Fisheries	Supervisory fish biologist
David Child	Yakima Basin Joint Board	Fish biologist
John Easterbrooks	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Regional fish program manager
Joel Freudenthal	Yakima County	Fish and wildlife biologist
Sean Gross	NOAA-Fisheries	Fisheries biologist
Anna Lael	Kittitas County Conservation District	District manager

Name	Affiliation	Expertise
Paul LaRiviere	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	In-stream flow biologist
John Marvin	Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation	Habitat biologist
Tom Ring	Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation	Hydrogeologist
Heather Simmons	Department of Ecology	Activities Grants & Loans Specialist
Arden Thomas	Bureau of Reclamation	Fish biologist
Jeff Thomas	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Fisheries biologist
Richard Visser	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Restoration biologist
Rebecca Wassell	Mid Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	Project manager

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 but considered a low priority or is a low priority area, please provide justification.)

All of the projects submitted for this 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. We are working to incorporate both bull trout and steelhead actions into a joint implementation schedule.

3. Criteria the SRFB considers in funding regional project lists:

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, SaSI, and SSHIAP¹, what stock assessment work has been done to date to further characterize the status of salmonid species in the region?

¹ SaSI = Salmon and Steelhead Stock Inventory; SSHIAP=Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Inventory and Assessment Program

Steelhead and bull trout are the Endangered Species Act listed species in the Yakima basin, and all stocks are high priority for recovery actions. The [Yakima Steelhead Recovery Plan](#) (2009) contains the most current data and local knowledge of the status of steelhead populations. The plan incorporates the Internal Columbia Technical Review Team population designations and stock status reports, assesses limiting factors, sets specific recovery goals and identifies the actions needed to meet them. The draft [Yakima Bull Trout Action Plan](#) was completed in 2012 in cooperation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as an update to the board's *2005 Salmon Recovery Plan*. The Technical Advisory Group assesses the fit of proposed projects to the priority actions identified in these plans, and uses a matrix that is designed to prioritize projects based on their specific contributions to recovery goals. The matrix also gives projects credit for parallel benefits to non-listed focal species.

B. Addresses cost effectiveness?

Both the Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board Technical Advisory Group and Citizen Committee evaluated project budgets as a part of the ranking process. The Technical Advisory Group 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.

The Technical Advisory Group also benefit-to-cost weighting factor, which was developed by our Technical Advisory Group. This weighting factor asks Technical Advisory Group members to consider if the proposed cost of the project is reasonable with respect to the expected biological outcomes? This weighting factor is a qualitative evaluation of the biological benefit of the project compared to the cost to SRFB and is not intended to require quantification of biological benefits.

The Citizen Committee also scores a project based on its assessment of whether a budget is reasonable relative to other similar projects and the proposal's expected benefits.

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.

- C. Provides benefit to listed and non-listed fish species. Identify projects on the regional list that primarily benefit listed fish. Identify projects on the regional list that primarily benefit non-listed species.

- D. Preserves high quality habitat. Identify the projects on your list that will preserve high quality habitat.

- E. Implements a high priority project or action in a region- or watershed-based salmon recovery plan. Identify where and how the project is identified as a high priority in the referenced plan.

- F. Provides for match above the minimum requirement percentage. Identify the project's match percentage and the regional match total.

- G. Is sponsored by an organization that has a successful record of project implementation. For example, identify the number of previous SRFB projects funded and completed.

- H. Involves members of the veterans conservation corps established in Revised Code of Washington 43.60A.150.

4. Local Review Processes

- A. Provide project evaluation criteria and documentation of your local Citizen's Advisory Group and Technical Advisory Group ratings for each project, including explanations for differences between the two groups' ratings.**

Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board

The Technical Advisory Group and the Citizen Committee each have distinctive roles in the evaluation of projects. The Technical Advisory Group is responsible for determining the technical validity of a project, and how valuable the project is to salmonid populations. The Citizen Committee is responsible for evaluating how the project might affect the community, and how much community support the project garnered. The final rank is determined by the Citizen Committee and approved by the board. The Technical Advisory Group develops a recommended ranking by considering the Technical Advisory Group matrix score and ten different certainty of success criteria, which include items such as project sequencing, uncertainties and constraints, organizational capacity, and reasonable budget. The Technical Advisory Group then submits its recommended ranking to the Citizen Committee for review. The Citizen Committee then evaluates the project based on its set of criteria, and adjusts the Technical Advisory Group's proposed ranking based on its evaluation. The Citizen Committee's proposed project ranking then is submitted to the board for review. The board can either approve the list as submitted or remand the list to the Citizen Committee for reconsideration, but the board cannot re-rank projects. This process is set up to meet the requirements of the state statute creating the SRFB and the Lead Entity Program, and is designed to ensure that projects proposed for SRFB funding are technically solid, address priority issues, and are broadly supported by diverse community interests.

For the regional and local technical review, we used two sets of criteria to rank projects. The Citizen Committee used its own established set of criteria. The Technical Advisory Group met to review and rank projects on July 10. The group's proposed ranking and the notes of their meeting were then provided to the Citizen Committee, which met July 29 to rate the projects based on the Citizen Committee's criteria.

The Citizen Committee's final ranked list was presented to and approved by the board on August 7.

Technical Advisory Group Biological Matrix

The Technical Advisory Group used this tool to award projects a score based on its possible and intended biological benefit. The score is listed at the bottom of the form – projects can receive partial points. This score is adjusted based on four weighting factors; habitat quantity and quality, biological certainty of success, benefit to cost, and longevity of benefit.

Technical Advisory Group Evaluation Form

This worksheet lists several "certainty of success" categories, and Technical Advisory Group members use it as a guide to discuss factors not addressed in the matrix. The main intent of

these forms is to maintain consistency in the project evaluations, and to help Lead Entity staff document the discussion.

The Citizen Committee used its community evaluation and scoring criteria, which focuses on cultural, social, economic, efficient and effective resource use, educational value and community support.

A full description of the Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board Lead Entity process can be found in our Lead Entity Manual:

<http://www.ybfwrb.org/Assets/Documents/Lead%20Entity/FINAL%202014%20LEAD%20ENTITY%20MANUAL.pdf>

Please see question 5B and attached ranking forms for project specific details.

Klickitat County Lead Entity

In the Klickitat County Lead Entity's portions of the Lower and Middle Columbia Salmon Recovery Regions, the Klickitat County Lead Entity process was followed, including reviews by the lead entity's Technical Committee. A regional recovery plan has not been developed under Revised Codes of Washington 77.85.090 and 77.85.150 for any portion of the Klickitat County Lead Entity's area. Projects were evaluated for fit to the *Klickitat Lead Entity Region Salmon Recovery Strategy* (August, 2013), which is the adaptive management strategy developed pursuant to Revised Code of Washington 77.85.060(2)(e). The *Klickitat Lead Entity Region Salmon Recovery Strategy* references currently known stock assessment information and assessment work performed within the region, including the *Middle Columbia River Steelhead Distinct Population Segment ESA Recovery Plan* that was developed by NOAA-Fisheries. This recovery plan specifically addressed WRIA 30 in *Appendix B: Recovery Plan for the Klickitat River Population of the Middle Columbia River Steelhead Distinct Population Segment*, and addresses WRIA 31 in *Appendix C: Recovery Plan for the Rock Creek Population of the Middle Columbia River Steelhead Distinct Population Segment*. *Klickitat Lead Entity Region Salmon Recovery Strategy* also cites stock assessment information in the salmon and steelhead recovery plan developed by NOAA-Fisheries for the White Salmon River (WRIA 29b) populations of Endangered Species Act-listed steelhead and salmon. These recovery plans include stock assessments by the NOAA-Fisheries' lower and middle Columbia regional technical teams.

The technical review consisted of the following:

- A preliminary project review in which project sponsors met with the technical committee to discuss and refine project concepts and designs.

- A project site tour during which project sponsors presented their projects to the SRFB Review Panel representatives and to members of the Klickitat County Lead Entity's Technical Committee and Citizen's Review Committee.
- Project sponsors responded to comments received from the SRFB Review Panel throughout the grant round.
- A final technical committee evaluation in which project sponsors presented their updated proposals and the Technical Committee ranked projects and provided input and feedback to both project sponsors and the Citizen's Review Committee.
- The Citizen's Review Committee meeting in which project sponsors presented their projects to the committee and the committee evaluated and ranked projects for the project list with technical input from the technical committee.

The Klickitat Technical and Citizen's Review Committees evaluated ranking based on the following criteria:

- Habitat features and process
- Areas and actions
- Scientific
- Species
- Life history
- Costs
- Scope and approach
- Sequence
- Stewardship
- Landowner willingness
- Meets SRFB eligibility criteria
- Implementation readiness
- Community Issues and Support (Citizens Committee only)

Community Support

The project priority rankings for the Mid-Columbia allocation were fairly consistent between the two local committees. Comments from the local Technical Committee were provided to the Citizen's Review Committee. Some uncertainty about the level of future protection and improvement to fish habitat that would be achieved after the Rock Creek Riparian Easement (Acquisition) is secured received significant discussion by both committees.

During the grant round review process, both the lead entity Technical and Citizen's Review Committee's evaluated cost effectiveness when evaluating and ranking potential habitat project applications. This item also was addressed by the SRFB Review Panel during the project tours.

In addition to discussing proposed project budgets, there is a specific line item on each project evaluation that relates to cost benefit and effectiveness. Specifically, the question asks the reviewer to score the project between -10 (or 0 for Technical ranking) and 10 regarding costs, considering if the project:

- Has low cost relative to the predicted benefits for the project type and location.
- Has a reasonable cost relative to the predicted benefits for the project type and location.
- Has high cost relative to the predicted benefits for the project type and location.

During the review process, this specific topic is one of the most highly discussed issues when evaluating project proposals due to the limited funding allocation available and given the sentiment and responsibility that public funding should be spent in most beneficial and responsible fashion possible.

B. Identify your local technical review team

Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board

Name	Affiliation	Expertise
Dale Bambrick	NOAA-Fisheries	Supervisory fish biologist
David Child	Yakima Basin Joint Board	Fish biologist
John Easterbrooks	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Regional fish program manager
Joel Freudenthal	Yakima County	Fish and wildlife biologist
Sean Gross	NOAA-Fisheries	Fisheries biologist
Anna Lael	Kittitas County Conservation District	District manager
Paul LaRiviere	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	In-stream flow biologist
John Marvin	Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation	Habitat biologist
Tom Ring	Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation	Hydrogeologist
Heather Simmons	Department of Ecology	Activities Grants & Loans Specialist
Arden Thomas	Bureau of Reclamation	Fish biologist
Jeff Thomas	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Fisheries biologist
Richard Visser	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Restoration biologist
Rebecca Wassell	Mid Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	Project manager

Klickitat County Lead Entity

Brady Allen

Fisheries Biologist, US Geological Survey

Diane Driscoll	Fishery Resource Specialist, NOAA Fisheries
Jill Hardiman	Fisheries Biologist, US Geological Survey
Loren Meagher	Engineer, Central and Eastern Klickitat Conservation Districts
Jim Hill (Alt.)	District Manager, Central and Eastern Klickitat Conservation Districts
Mark Kreiter	Hydrologist, USDA Forest Service
David Lindley	Habitat Restoration Specialist, Yakama Nation Fisheries Program
Will Conley (Alt.)	Hydrologist, Yakama Nation Fisheries Program
Margaret Neuman	Executive Director, Mid-Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement
Tova Tillinghast	District Manager, Underwood Conservation District
Dan Richardson (Alt.)	Field Technician, Underwood Conservation District
Eric Bartrand	Fisheries Biologist, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Joe Zendt, Chairman	Fisheries Biologist, Yakama Nation Fisheries Program

All voting members are independent of a regional organization as they work with the lead entity as representatives of their field of expertise.

C. Explain how and when the SRFB Review Panel participated in your regional/lead entity process, if applicable.

Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board

SRFB Review Panel members Marnie Tyler and Tom Slocum toured nine project sites and had one project presentation spanning May 14-15, 2014. The tour visited all project sites except for the sites associated with the Reducing Road Density in the Naches Watershed project because we agreed before the visit that sponsor would prepare an office presentation for this project. Review panel members provided feedback to staff and applicants on site, and followed up with their written comments. They also provided lead entity staff with feedback on some of the technicalities of applications such as eligibility, budget formatting, and wording.

Board staff invited all review committee members to attend the site visits. Representatives of the Technical Advisory Group (included Heather Simmons, David Child, John Easterbrooks, John Marvin, Sean Gross, Tom Ring, Rebecca Wassell, and Richard Visser) and of the Citizen Committee (included Onni Perala, Jerry Rhodes, Tuck Russell, McClure Tosh, and Laurene Contreras). 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. The board received review panel comments on May 29. These comments were shared with applicants and Technical Advisory Group and Citizen Committee members, and applicants were asked to address these issues to strengthen their proposals as they entered them into PRISM.

Between May 29 and June 20, applicants had the opportunity to submit any changes or adjustments to their applications so a packet containing amended applications could be prepared two weeks before the Technical Advisory Group review. The board is pleased with how well review panel involvement enhances their review process.

Klickitat County Lead Entity

The SRFB Review Panel members Kelley Jorgensen and Pat Powers attended the Klickitat Lead Entity project tour on June 19, 2014. They received the pre-application packet for each proposed project three weeks prior to the site visits. The SRFB Review Panel provided feedback and questions to each of the project sponsors, at which point project sponsors submitted responses to their questions and concerns. After the sponsors addressed questions and comments provided by the SRFB Review Panel and those from local committee members the committees convened to evaluate and rank the projects. The Klickitat Lead Entity Coordinator routinely communicated with the RCO Grant Manager regarding general process questions, and questions specific to each of the projects.

5. Local evaluation process and project lists.

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

Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board

The August 2009 Yakima steelhead recovery outlines a list of recommended recovery actions that will contribute to restoring steelhead to viable levels in the Yakima basin. Project applicants were asked to identify the actions that pertained to their projects in their applications, and during the Technical Advisory Group evaluation process, we determined if a project had a high, medium, or low fit to the recovery plan.

The YBFWRB Focus Project List is a recent addition to our lead entity process (2013). In response to committee members request to improve the fit between SRFB proposals and the biological priorities that Technical Advisory Group participants feel need to be addressed, a Technical Advisory Group working group convened to develop a process to identify and describe focus actions. The result of this process was the YBFWRB Focus Project List. It helps identify the most timely/urgent of the high priority Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) projects and apply those funding resources to projects that represent the most immediate needs of priority species.

This effort resulted in the Technical Advisory Group Focus Project List:

<http://www.ybfwrp.org/Assets/Documents/Lead%20Entity/Final%202014%20TAG%20Focused%20Projects.pdf>

The list is used to:

- Give the Technical Advisory Group a way to proactively guide Yakima Basin SRFB funding towards high priority actions.
- Provide guidance to sponsors deciding what types of projects to pursue and propose.
- Strengthen the link between the SRFB project review criteria and recovery plan priorities.

Klickitat County Lead Entity

The *Klickitat Lead Entity Region Salmon Recovery Strategy* is the basis for project prioritization and work schedule development; project evaluation criteria incorporate strategy priorities. This strategy has a priority matrix containing priority sub-basins and reaches with associated rational, impacted species, life history significance, limiting habitat features, action priority ranking, specific habitat actions and rational, habitat forming processes, community interests, and the source of the information if applicable. This strategy and matrix are updated annually, or as needed if not annually, to reflect project completion and new information and data. All projects submitted for the 2014 SRFB grant round are specifically identified or address habitat issues identified in the *Klickitat Lead Entity Region Salmon Recovery Strategy*.

B. Explain how comments of technical, citizen, and policy reviews were addressed in finalizing the project list. Were there any issues about projects on the list and how were those resolved?

Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board

We provided each sponsor with a summary of comments and suggestions after project review milestones (site visits, sponsor presentations, etc.). As we moved through each evaluation feedback loop, sponsors considered the feedback received and modified their proposals as appropriate. All issues identified were to be addressed two weeks before the Technical Advisory Group review.

Upon completion of the Technical Advisory Group's review and scoring, the lead entity's Citizen Committee reviews and ranks the projects. Citizen 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 Committee

is critical to ensure that biological priorities and projects identified by the Technical Advisory Group 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 they can assess how to increase community support over time through the implementation of habitat projects. The Citizen Committee reviews the Technical Advisory Group's proposed project ranking and adjusts it based on the results of their evaluation of community values. Community values considered include: cultural, social, economic, efficient and effective resource use, community support, and partner support. The Citizen Committee develops the final recommended ranked project list. The committee takes the recommendations of the Technical Advisory Group into consideration, but they are not obligated to maintain the same ranking given to projects by the Technical Advisory Group if they feel a project's ranking needs to be adjusted based the Citizen Committee's evaluation.

The Citizen Committee chose to maintain the Technical Advisory Group's ranking for the first five projects, based on the fact that in general the Technical Advisory Group's highest ranked projects also received the highest scores based on the Citizen Committee's criteria. One exception was in the case of the Manastash Creek Acquisition and Restoration project. This project was the top ranked project for the Technical Advisory Group, but moved to number three by the Citizen Committee due to the lack of landowner acknowledgement forms and limited landowner communication. Other Citizen Committee conditions and changes to the Technical Advisory Group rank occurred for several projects:

1. Ahtanum Creek Restoration Survey and Design was moved from #7 on the Technical Advisory Group's list to #6 on the Citizen Committee's list because the project addresses priority species in a very visible project location. The Citizen Committee hopes this project will lead to additional projects with other agricultural landowners in this area.
2. Naches River Side Channel Assessment was moved from #10 on the Technical Advisory Group's list to #8 on the Citizen Committee's list because of good landowner involvement and because it is designed to address questions related to a potential future project with a relatively low financial investment. Te Citizen Committee also added the caveat to only allocate full funding if the initial hydraulic assessment supports the spring-fed channel approach.
3. Reducing Road Density in the Naches Watershed was moved from #8 on the Technical Advisory Group's list to #9 on the Citizen Committee's list because the benefits to salmonids was questionable for some of the proposed work sites. Sponsor asked to rescope and budget project to directly align with salmon, steelhead and/or bull trout recovery (focus on Nile Creek sites, remove Dry Creek sites).

On August 7, the board met and reviewed the ranked lead entity list submitted by the Citizen Committee, and approved the list unanimously.

Klickitat County Lead Entity

The Klickitat Lead Entity receives SRFB funding out of both the Lower Columbia Region allocation and the Middle Columbia Region allocation, 5% and 30% respectively. Therefore, the Lead Entity essentially comes up with two prioritization lists, one to utilize the funds available from the Middle Columbia and one from the Lower Columbia.

Proposed for funding in the Middle Columbia, the *Klickitat Floodplain Restoration Phase 6* project had few comments and questions. The fact that the project focuses on a high use area for fish and an important section on the river, in addition to the good track record of the project sponsors and successful implementation of past work, led to it being ranked 1st numerically by the Lead Entity. However, it was recognized by some of the members of the local committees that due to the historical success and the significant momentum of the project that it would very likely be funded during the 2015 SRFB application cycle if postponed until that time. With this in mind committee members felt consideration should be given to funding the *Rock Creek Riparian Easement (Acquisition)* project due to the timely nature of that project, see below.

Also proposed for funding in the Middle Columbia, the *Rock Creek Riparian Easement (Acquisition)* project was met with a positive review, although some mixed feelings were expressed during the Technical Committee and Citizens Review Committee evaluations. Questions surrounding potential unknowns included salmonid benefit, complex landowner/agency relationships, and funding for future implementation phases received extensive consideration. At the end of the ranking process the unique opportunity to acquire the easement under single land ownership, the intent to protect and improve several miles of critical fish habitat, and the potentially small window of opportunity to contractually secure the easement led the Citizens Review Committee to rank the project as the top priority for receiving funding in 2014. The Citizens Review Committee strongly indicated that if Eastern Klickitat Conservation District was unable to secure the contract with the landowner in the time allowed under the RCO grant agreement, then the funding should then go immediately to the *Klickitat Floodplain Restoration Phase 6* project as the alternate.

Project List Summary Table

Following is a project list summary table, reflecting the region's project list as submitted on November 12, 2013. For the Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region, there are 14 projects (including alternates) totaling \$2,686,327 submitted by the Yakima Basin Fish and

Wildlife Recovery Board. Of the 14 projects submitted, three are conditioned and eight are alternates. The Klickitat County Lead Entity submitted two project totaling \$513,150 and \$91,265 in matching funds through the Middle Columbia region. The Klickitat County Lead Entity also has submitted two projects through the Lower Columbia region.

Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board Proposed Projects

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	Primary Fish Stock Benefited	Priority in Recovery Plan or Strategy
1	14-1215	Coleman-Naneum Fish Passage Projects	Kittitas County Conservation District		
2	14-1203	Yakima Basin Stewardship Project	Mid-Columbia FEG		
3	14-1196	Manastash Creek Acquisition & Restoration 2	Kittitas County Public Works		
4	14-1214	Upper Yakima River Restoration	Kittitas Conservation Trust		
5	14-1238	South Fork Oak Creek Habitat Enhancement	Mid-Columbia FEG		
6	14-1222	Ahtanum Creek Restoration Survey and DESIGN 2014	North Yakima Conservation District		
7	14-1388	Cowiche Creek Siphon: Passage Design	North Yakima Conservation District		
8	14-1217	Naches River Side Channel Assessment	North Yakima Conservation District		
9	14-1204	Reducing road density in the Naches watershed	Mid-Columbia FEG		
10	14-1348	Badger Mtn ID Riverstation Screens	Badger Mountain Irrigation District		
Klickitat County Lead Entity Projects in the Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region					

Appendix N – Regional Summaries

Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	Primary Fish Stock Benefited	Priority in Recovery Plan or Strategy
1	13-1401	Klickitat Floodplain Restoration Phase 5	Columbia Land Trust	Klickitat winter and summer steelhead	Tier A, Priority A, pgs. 3, 41, 63-66
2	13-1397	Rock Creek Conservation Easement Assessment	Eastern Klickitat Conservation District	Rock Creek steelhead	Tier A, Priority A, pgs. 3, 43, 92-94