

# Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region



Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board  
1200 Chesterly Drive  
Yakima, WA 98902  
[www.ybfwrb.org](http://www.ybfwrb.org)

Executive Director  
Alex Conley  
(509) 453-4104  
[aconley@ybfwrb.org](mailto: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.  The Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board released

Recovery Plan	
	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 <a href="#">Web site</a> Klickitat Lead Entity <a href="#">Web page</a> <a href="#">Habitat Work Schedule</a>

## 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 2015 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**

<b>Funding and Requests</b>	<b>Totals</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Total Allocation	\$1,776,600	100%
Yakima Basin Lead Entity List (without alternates)	\$1,243,620	70%
Klickitat Lead Entity List (without alternates)	\$532,980	30%
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 Considerations:
  - 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?
  - How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to ESA liabilities for community members?
  - How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to recreational opportunities?
  - Does the project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component?
  - Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large?
- Economic Considerations:
  - At the current stage of the proposed project, what is the potential short-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy?
  - At the current stage of the proposed project, what is the potential long-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy?

- Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation)?
- At the current stage of the proposed project, how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?
- Project Context and Organization Considerations:
  - 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 Considerations:
  - Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project?
  - Are the right partners involved to make the project successful?
  - Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal?
  - At the current stage of the proposed project, 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 2015 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**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Expertise</b>
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
John Marvin	Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation	Habitat biologist
Scott Nicolai	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 SSHIAP<sup>1</sup>, what stock assessment work has been done to date to further characterize the status of salmonid species in the region?**

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 considers a benefit-to-cost weighting factor. This weighting factor asks TAG 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> SaSI = Salmon and Steelhead Stock Inventory; SSHIAP=Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Inventory and Assessment Program

The Citizen Committee also scores a project based on its assessment of whether a budget is reasonable relative to other similar projects and the proposals 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.**

All projects on our 2015 list provide primary benefit to listed fish species. Please see the [project list](#) on page 23 of this report for full details.

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

- E.** The only protection project on our 2015 list is the Teanaway Riparian and Floodplain Protection. The TAG ranked this project as #7. They consider the habitat quality to be high; however, many parts of property have low direct impact on habitat quality for anadromous fish. The Citizen Committee moved the project down from #7 to #12 because reviewers felt the proposal had limited benefit to salmon relative to the cost, and questioned the degree of risk to the riparian habitat if the property if it is not in conservation. Specifically, they wondered if the landowner could apply deed restrictions to the riparian area before selling. CC members questioned if SRFB was the best funding source for this project and were unable to justify allocating a large percent of funding to a project that they perceived to provide limited benefit for the dollars invested. This project is currently listed as an alternate.

**F. 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.**

The Technical Advisory Group identified six of our projects as "High Priority Fund" or "Priority Fund." The other four (projects 6, 8, 9, and 10) were identified as "Fund." In addition to the TAG Fund Category, three of the projects aligned with the [TAG Focus](#)

[Project List](#) (as described in response to [question 2B](#)). Please see the following summary table of funded projects for additional detail:

Rank	Project	TAG Fund Category	TAG Focus Project Designation
1	SF Cowiche Floodplain Restoration	High Priority Fund	
2	Gold Creek Instream Habitat Design	High Priority Fund	BTAP Gold Action #2: Gold Creek Floodplain Restoration
3	Naneum, Wilson, and Cherry Creek Assessment (Cost Increase)	High Priority Fund	Upper Yakima Action # 7: Provide fish passage into Upper Naneum Creek Upper Yakima Action #11: Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries (page 195)
4	Yakima RM153 Side Channel Connection Enhancement	High Priority Fund	Upper Yakima Action #13: Protect and restore floodplain, riparian, and in-channel habitats in the Upper Yakima, Kittitas, and Easton/Cle Elum Reaches (page 197)
5	Naneum-Coleman Fish Passage Projects (Cost Increase)	Priority Fund	Upper Yakima Action # 7: Provide fish passage into Upper Naneum Creek Upper Yakima Action #11: Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries (page 195)
6	Yakima River Floodplain Assessment & Final Design	Priority Fund	Upper Yakima Action #13: Protect and restore floodplain, riparian, and in-channel habitats in the Upper Yakima, Kittitas, and Easton/Cle Elum Reaches (page 197)
7	Williams Creek Aquatic Habitat Restoration	Priority Fund	Upper Yakima Action #14: Restore instream and floodplain habitat complexity in Swauk and Taneum creeks and Teanaway and lower Cle Elum rivers
8	Ahtanum Creek Riparian Enhancement 2015	Priority Fund	Naches Action #27: Ahtanum Creek floodplain side channel restoration
9	Parke Creek - Caribou Creek Fish Passage	Fund	Upper Yakima Action #11: Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries (page 195)

**G. Provides for match above the minimum requirement percentage. Identify the project’s match percentage and the regional match total.**

The majority of projects submitted for funding (11 out of 14) indicate the required match at or just above 15%. Due the administrative tasks that are involved with reporting on additional match, most of our sponsors prefer to keep their official SRFB match at 15%, but demonstrate additional project support, separate from the SRFB total, on the project budget forms attached in PRISM. The three exceptions on this year’s list include the #1 ranked SF Cowiche Creek Floodplain Restoration proposal, which includes a 24% match, the Teanaway Riparian and Floodplain Protection proposal (alternate), which includes a 84% match, and the Ensign Ranch – Big Creek Flow Enhancement proposal (alternate), which includes a 68% match

The total match from the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board for 2015 funded projects is \$181,178. The total match on our 2015 alternate project list is \$2,275,442.

**H. 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.**

Rank	Project	Sponsor	Number of projects previously funded	Number of projects previously completed	Number of active projects
1	SF Cowiche Floodplain Restoration	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	14	7	7
2	Gold Creek Instream Habitat Design	Kittitas Conservation Trust	13	7	2
3	Naneum, Wilson, and Cherry Creek Assessment (Cost Increase)	Kittitas County Public Works	3	0	3
4	Yakima RM153 Side Channel Connection Enhancement	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	14	7	7
5	Naneum-Coleman Fish Passage Projects (Cost Increase)	Kittitas County Conservation District	15	13	2

6	Yakima River Floodplain Assessment & Final Design	Trout Unlimited	0	0	0
7	Williams Creek Aquatic Habitat Restoration	Kittitas Conservation Trust	13	7	2
8	Ahtanum Creek Riparian Enhancement 2015	North Yakima Conservation District	14	11	3
9	Parke Creek - Caribou Creek Fish Passage	Kittitas County Conservation District	15	13	2

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

To our knowledge, none of our recommended projects involve members of the veteran’s conservation corps.

**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 7 & 8. The group’s proposed ranking and the notes of their meeting were then provided to the Citizen Committee, which met July 23 to rank 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 6.

The Citizen Committee moved the Teanaway Floodplain and Side Channel Protection project down our list from #7 to #12 because reviewers felt the proposal had limited benefit to salmon relative to the cost, and questioned the degree of risk to the riparian habitat if the property if it is not in conservation. Specifically, they wondered if the landowner could apply deed restrictions to the riparian area before selling. CC members questioned if SRFB was the best funding source for this project and were unable to justify allocating a large percent of funding to a project that they perceived to provide limited benefit for the dollars invested.

#### ***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.ybfwrp.org/Assets/Documents/Lead%20Entity/2015%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

Technical Committee commented on and ranked each project and forwarded consensus comments to 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 consistent between the two local committees. Comments from the local Technical Committee were provided to the Citizen’s Review Committee. The Rock Creek Riparian Easement (Acquisition) from last year was funded through direct appropriation from the Legislature which led to Klickitat River Floodplain Restoration being funded in 2014. A finalized agreement was in place to allow Middle Columbia River Regional dollars to be used for the Steelhead recovery in the White Salmon Basin for this 2015 grant round.

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 0 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**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Expertise</b>
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
John Marvin	Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation	Habitat biologist
Scott Nicolai	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
Bengt Coffin	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
Amber Johnson	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 Pat Powers and Jennifer O'Neal toured sixteen proposed project sites spanning May 11-13, 2015. Review panel members provided feedback to staff and applicants on site, and followed up with their written comments.

Board staff invited all review committee members to attend the site visits. Representatives of the Technical Advisory Group (including Anna Lael, Arden Thomas, Heather Simmons, David Child, John Easterbrooks, Joel Freudenthal, John Marvin, Scott Nicolai, Sean Gross, Rebecca Wassell, and Richard Visser) and of the Citizen Committee (including Jerry Rhodes, Doug Mayo, and Don Chaplin). 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 June 1. 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 June 1 and June 19, 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 Tom Slocum attended the Klickitat Lead Entity project tour on June 18, 2015. 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.ybfwrb.org/Assets/Documents/Lead%20Entity/4%20TAG%20Matrix%20Guide.docx>

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 2015 SRFB grant round are specifically identified or address habitat issues identified in the *Klickitat Lead Entity Region Salmon Recovery Strategy*. The Strategy was updated in 2015 to include monitoring projects.

**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 majority of the 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. The two primary changes that the Citizen Committee made to the to the Technical Advisory Group rank were as follows:

1. The Teanaway Floodplain and Side Channel Protection project was moved down from #7 to #12 because reviewers felt the proposal had limited benefit to salmon relative to the cost, and questioned the degree of risk to the riparian habitat if the property if it is not in conservation. Specifically, they wondered if the landowner could apply deed restrictions to the riparian area before selling. CC members questioned if SRFB was the best funding source for this project and were unable to justify allocating a large percent of funding to a project that they perceived to provide limited benefit for the dollars invested.
2. The SF Cowiche/NF Manastash Floodplain Restoration proposal was split into two distinct projects (#1 and #11, respectively) because the Cowiche worksite is a higher priority and has a better cost-benefit ratio. Committee members felt that the NF Manastash proposal could be delayed until the removal of the downstream passage barrier (Reed Diversion) is removed.

On August 6, 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. 2015 was the first year in which Middle Columbia Region allocation dollars could be used in the White Salmon Basin. Since all projects for 2015 were for the White Salmon Basin the Lead Entity only came up with 1 prioritization list for the total funds.

There were no changes between the Technical Committee Ranking and the Citizens Review Committee Rankings this year. All projects were ranked for full funding this year.

### **Project List Summary Table**

Following is a project list summary table, reflecting the region’s project list. For the Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region, there are 9 projects totaling \$1,243,620 submitted by the Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board. The Middle Columbia Region also has one partially funded project, and five alternates. The remaining \$532,980 of the Mid-Columbia allocation will be used by the Klickitat Lead Entity for projects in the Lower Columbia region. If

any Klickitat project does not move forward due to POCs, landowner issues, or other reasons, we would like to transfer those funds back to the Yakima Basin Lead Entity to help fund our alternate projects.

**Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board Proposed Projects**

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Sponsor	Primary Fish Stock Benefited	Priority in Recovery Plan or Strategy
1	15-1144	<a href="#">SF Cowiche Floodplain Restoration</a>	Mid-Columbia FEG / Yakama Nation	Steelhead, Coho	Upper Yakima Action #15: Restore tributary riparian areas Naches #22: Improve riparian, floodplain, and temperature conditions in Cowiche Creek
2	15-1153	<a href="#">Gold Creek Instream Habitat Design</a>	Kittitas Conservation Trust	Bull Trout	Bull Trout Action Plan, Gold Action #2: Gold Creek Floodplain Restoration
3	13-1315	<a href="#">Naneum, Wilson, and Cherry Creek Assessment (Cost Increase)</a>	Kittitas County Public Works	Steelhead, Spring Chinook, Coho	Upper Yakima Action # 7, Provide fish passage into Upper Naneum (Page 193) Upper Yakima Action #11 Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries (page 195) Upper Yakima Action #15, Restore tributary riparian areas (page 199)
4	15-1350	<a href="#">Yakima RM153 Side Channel Connection Enhancement</a>	Mid-Columbia FEG	Steelhead, Spring Chinook, Coho, Bull Trout	Upper Yakima Action #13: Protect and restore floodplain, riparian, and in-channel habitats in the Upper Yakima, Kittitas, and Easton/Cle Elum Reaches (page 197)
5	14-1215	<a href="#">Naneum-Coleman Fish Passage Projects (Cost Increase)</a>	Kittitas County Conservation District	Steelhead, Spring Chinook, Coho	Upper Yakima Action #11 - Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries (page 195) Upper Yakima #7 – Provide fish passage into upper Naneum Creek (pg 193).

**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
6	15-1147	<a href="#">Yakima River Floodplain Assessment &amp; Final Design</a>	Trout Unlimited	Steelhead, Spring Chinook, Coho, Bull Trout	Upper Yakima Action #13: Protect and restore floodplain, riparian, and in-channel habitats in the Upper Yakima, Kittitas, and Easton/Cle Elum Reaches (page 197).
7	15-1247	<a href="#">Williams Creek Aquatic Habitat Restoration</a>	Kittitas Conservation Trust	Steelhead	Upper Yakima Action #14: Restore instream and floodplain habitat complexity in Swauk and Taneum creeks and Teanaway and lower Cle Elum rivers Upper Yakima Action #15: Restore tributary riparian areas
8	15-1141	<a href="#">Ahtanum Creek Riparian Enhancement 2015</a>	North Yakima Conservation District	Steelhead, Spring Chinook, Coho, Bull Trout	Naches Action #27: Ahtanum Creek floodplain side channel restoration Naches Action #29: Reduce livestock impacts on Ahtanum Creek riparian areas
9	15-1151	<a href="#">Parke Creek - Caribou Creek Fish Passage</a>	Kittitas County Conservation District	Steelhead, Spring Chinook, Coho	Upper Yakima Action #11: Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries (page 195)
9 ALT	15-1151	<a href="#">Parke Creek - Caribou Creek Fish Passage</a>	Kittitas County Conservation District	Steelhead, Spring Chinook, Coho	Upper Yakima Action #11: Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries (page 195)
10 ALT	15-1143	<a href="#">Swauk RM 17.3 to 18.8 Floodplain Reconnection</a>	Mid-Columbia FEG	Steelhead, Spring Chinook	Upper Yakima Action #14: Restore instream and floodplain habitat complexity in Swauk and Taneum creeks and Teanaway and lower Cle Elum rivers.

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	Primary Fish Stock Benefited	Priority in Recovery Plan or Strategy
11 ALT	15-1483	<a href="#">NF Manastash Floodplain Restoration</a>	Mid-Columbia FEG / Yakama Nation	Steelhead, Coho	Upper Yakima Action #15: Restore tributary riparian areas Naches #22: Improve riparian, floodplain, and temperature conditions in Cowiche Creek
12 ALT	15-1148	<a href="#">Teanaway Floodplain and Side Channel Protection</a>	WDFW/Trust for Public Land	Steelhead, Bull Trout, Spring Chinook	Upper Yakima Action #14: Restore instream and floodplain habitat complexity in Swauk and Taneum creeks and Teanaway and lower Cle Elum rivers.
13 ALT	15-1146	<a href="#">Ensign Ranch - Big Creek Flow Enhancement Project</a>	WA Water Trust	Steelhead, Spring Chinook, Coho, Bull Trout	Basinwide Action #5: Utilize Trust Water Rights Program to improve instream flows.
14 ALT	15-1149	<a href="#">Whiskey Creek Fish Passage at EWC</a>	Kittitas County Conservation District	Steelhead, Spring Chinook, Coho	Upper Yakima Action # 7: Provide fish passage into Upper Naneum Creek Upper Yakima Action #11: Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries (page 195)
<b>Klickitat County Lead Entity Projects in the Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region</b>					
1	15-1296	Assess Salmonid Recolonization- White Salmon River	Underwood Conservation District	Steelhead	Tier A, Priority A Pages: 2, 39-41,
2	15-1258	Mill Creek Fish Passage Construction	Underwood Conservation District	Steelhead, Spring Chinook, Fall Chinook, Coho	Tier B, Priority A Pages: 2, and 58,

**Appendix N – Regional Summaries**

Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Project Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Primary Fish Stock Benefited</b>	<b>Priority in Recovery Plan or Strategy</b>
3	15-1298	Rattlesnake Creek Riparian Vegetation Enhancement	Underwood Conservation District	Steelhead, Sping & Fall Chinook, Coho	Tier A, Priority A Pages 2, and 49
4	15-1297	Upper Rattlesnake Creek Hydrologic Project	Underwood Conservation District	Steelhead, Sping & Fall Chinook, Coho	Tier A, Priority A

**2015 Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recover Board’s Technical Advisory Group Evaluation Results**

TAG RANK	Project Name	S Score	H Score	T Score	WF1	WF2	WF3	WF4	Total	SRFB Request	Altered Cumulative
1	SF Cowiche Floodplain Restoration (YN/MCFEG)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47.5	115000	\$115,000
2	Gold Creek Instream Habitat Design (KCT)	4	11.5	15.5	1.6	0.8	1.1	1.3	28.4	\$185,705	\$300,705
3	Naneum, Wilson & Cherry Creek Assessment (Kittitas County)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34.0	\$100,000	\$400,705
4	Yakima RM153 Side Channel Conn. Enhancement (MCFEG)	7	14.5	21.5	1.8	1	1.3	0.9	45.3	\$116,000	\$516,705
5	Naneum-Coleman Fish Passage Projects (KCCD)	5	19	24	1.2	1	1	1.3	37.4	\$185,312	\$702,017
6	Yakima River Floodplain Assessment & Final Design (TU)	7.5	19	26.5	1.4	0.9	1	1	33.4	\$123,701	\$825,718
7	Teanaway Floodplain & Side Channel Protection (WDFW/TPL)	8	20.5	28.5	1.4	0.7	1	1.3	36.3	\$700,000	\$1,525,718
8	William's Creek Aquatic Habitat Restoration (KCT)	4	14.5	18.5	1.8	0.8	1	1.2	32.0	\$214,920	\$1,740,638
9	NF Manastash Floodplain Restoration (YN/MCFEG)	0	12	12	1.6	0.8	1.1	1.5	25.3	\$164,000	\$1,904,638
10	Ahtanum Creek Riparian Enhancement 2015 (NYCD)	7	16	23	1.2	1	1	0.9	24.8	\$200,668	\$2,105,306
11	Parke Creek - Caribou Creek Fish Passage (KCCD)	4	11	15	1.2	1	1	1.2	21.6	\$280,339	\$2,385,645
12	Swauk Floodplain Reconnection (MCFEG)	4	19.5	23.5	1.6	0.7	0.7	1	18.4	\$385,000	\$2,770,645
13	Ensign Ranch - Big Creek Flow Enhancement (WWT)	4	8	12	1.4	0.7	1	1.3	15.3	\$146,500	\$2,917,145
14	Whiskey Creek Fish Passage @ EWC (KCCD)	0	3	3	1	0.7	1	1.2	2.5	\$59,191	\$2,976,336
15	Yakima & Naches Side Channel Enhancement Design (MCFEG)	3.5	2	5.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	1.4	\$100,000	\$3,076,336

**Notes:**

#2 (Gold Creek) was moved up because the TAG recognized that the Gold Creek Action was removed from the TAG Focus list prematurely.

#3 (Assessment Increase) was moved up to assure full funding in the approved cost increase.

#7 (Teanaway) was moved down one spot to assure full funding for #6, while still providing funding to the Teanaway proposal.

#14 (Whiskey) was deferred until there is an assessment and strategy to getting fish to upper Naneum, and the downstream barriers are addressed.

#15 (Side Channel Enhancement Design) was designated as do not fund due to risks and constraints at each work site.

Green = High Priority Fund
Yellow = Priority Fund
Orange = Fund
Pink = Defer
Red = Do Not Fund

2015 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Swauk RM 17.3 to 18.8 Floodplain Reconnection</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group
<b>Date:</b>	July 7, 2015

<b>Limiting Factors</b>
What are the major limiting factors and/or threats in this reach, and does the project address these factors?
The limiting factors that may be addressed by this proposal include Riparian/Floodplain/LWD, Max Temperature and Confinement.

<b>Recovery Actions</b>
What Recovery Actions are addressed by this project?
Upper Yakima Action #14: Restore instream and floodplain habitat complexity in Swauk and Taneum creeks and Teanaway and lower Cle Elum rivers.

<b>Landowner Commitment</b>
Does it appear that the landowner(s) are supportive and committed to the project? Rating: LOW <b>MODERATE</b> HIGH
A support letter from the USFS and DOT would help convey landowner commitment. It is not clear if WSDOT is onboard with the lower portion of this project, which may affect their road prism.

<b>Organizational Capacity</b>
Does the project applicant demonstrate the ability to develop, design and implement this type of project? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
High confidence that the MCFEG will successfully complete this project. MCFEG has demonstrated their ability to manage and implement a wide variety of instream and riparian restoration projects, including design and permitting.

<b>Project Sequence</b>
Will the benefits of this project be realized immediately or do those benefits depend upon the completion of other projects (e.g. downstream)? Rating: LOW <b>MODERATE</b> HIGH
Benefits should accrue immediately after the next channel maintaining (i.e. high flow) event that will allow Swauk Creek to take advantage of the new DOT culverts, levee removal, etc. Project success partially depends on WSDOT removal of undersized culverts. BDAs and LWD should result in immediate hydrological benefits. Other project elements may take years to benefit project area. Also, proper livestock management will be critical to ensure planting success.

<b>Project Synergy</b>
Does the project complement previous habitat improvement projects in the area?
Yes, the project aligns well with the WSDOT culvert/passage work planned at US-97, especially for the major fish passage barrier upstream of the project. Some stream and floodplain restoration work was completed under an Ecology grant much further downstream (SM 6-7) by Yakama Nation.

<b>Budget</b>
Does the project budget appear reasonable? If not, why?
<p>The sponsor is encouraged to scale back project elements for significant cost savings. For example, the survey, design, and full removal of the berm will be very expensive, and nearly as much benefit could be achieved much more cheaply by simply breaching the berm in a few spots and leaving the native soils on site. The cost of placing LWD seems very high, particularly because there are likely opportunities to source the wood directly from the project vicinity or partner with USFS work in the area to acquire the wood. The LWM trap is expensive and may not be necessary. The planting budget seems excessive. TAG encourages a very low-tech “design” for LWD in the upper half of the project because there is little risk of the creek transporting LWD down to the culvert if full length logs are used.</p> <p>The budget for the interpretive sign seems high and uncertain what “construction observation” entails. Unclear why 120 hours of bookkeeping time (on top of contracting, grant reporting, and coordination) are budgeted for a project that appears to be mainly reimbursement of WSDOT contracting. Unclear why WSDOT’s mitigation requirement to replant disturbed areas of their construction project are being proposed as match for this project.</p>

<b>Design</b>
If the project includes a design, does it appear to be adequate?
Project design is currently conceptual. A 100% design is part of the budget. Sponsor is encouraged to look for opportunities to take a lighter touch on the design.

<b>Future Stewardship</b>
Does the proposal include a plan for site maintenance to assure project longevity?
Project applicant does not adequately discuss long term vegetation and BDA maintenance after the grant period, or how it will be funded. BDAs need regular maintenance or they will blow out like an abandoned beaver dam. Does the applicant expect beaver to move in, or will they relocate beaver here, to replace the BDAs? The proposal mentions that sheep should not be lingering in the project area but does not state explicitly that they will be excluded and says plant damage from grazing will be monitored. Will applicant find alternative funds to maintain plants and control weeds after 3 years?

<b>Uncertainties and Constraints</b>
Has the applicant adequately identified and addressed any constraints and uncertainties associated with this project?
Rating: LOW <b>MODERATE</b> HIGH
Applicant is probably underestimating the constraints associated with working along a highway prism. Adding LWD adjacent to SR97 at the downstream end of project could very easily cause real problems with WSDOT engineers/managers and this issue has not yet been adequately vetted. It may not be worth the effort and expense to design and construct. Also, if WSDOT will be the contract implementer (as proposed) there is significant uncertainty with their proper oversight of construction. This type of project is not WSDOT's expertise, so potential benefits of the project could be lost through imprecise implementation. No commitment from the USFS that their sheep grazing plan will be modified and enforced to prevent damage to \$69,000 worth of plantings. Overgrazing in the project area would nullify the floodplain reconnection benefits of the project.

<b>Habitat Restoration Only</b>
---------------------------------

Is the project likely to result in measureable and persistent improvements in habitat quality and/or quantity in the project area?
Yes, if grazing damage is prevented, then short term and long term benefits should occur.

<b>Assessment Only</b>
Will the assessment produce projects that address recovery actions?
N/A

<b>Design Only</b>
Will the design result in a feasible/fundable project that has habitat benefits?
N/A

<b>Appraisal (Acquisitions)</b>
Has there been an appraisal? If there is no appraisal, is the TAG comfortable with how the cost estimate for the acquisition was calculated? Has the project sponsor indicated that the landowner is willing to consider the appraised value?
N/A

<b>Habitat Quality (Acquisition)</b>
Does the proposed acquisition involve a piece of property that already has high quality habitat? If not, what action(s) will be required post-acquisition to make it high quality?
N/A

<b>Urgency (Acquisitions)</b>
Why is it important that this property be acquired as soon as possible?
N/A

<b>What are the strengths of this proposal?</b>
Swauk Creek is a priority stream for steelhead. Conceptual design project is completed. There is strong partnership involvement and coordination, along with contributed funds for design.

<b>What are the weaknesses of this proposal?</b>
High cost for elements of the project without high benefits and unknowns such as source of wood, engineering and project impacts to road. The grazing concern was not addressed.

<b>TAG recommended actions for improvement of proposal before official submission to SRFB</b>
Consider reducing the overall costs and increase the percentage of SRFB funding that goes to on-the-ground construction (berm removal, LWD placement). Consider scaling back the work in the downstream area of the project. More thoroughly vet the project with WSDOT decision makers. Reconsider need to engineer the LWD in the upper half of the project. Work with land managers to get local wood cheaply. Consider how well WSDOT will be able to implement the project.

2015 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>NF Manastash/SF Cowiche Floodplain Restoration</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group
<b>Date:</b>	July 7, 2015

<b>Limiting Factors</b>
What are the major limiting factors and/or threats in this reach, and does the project address these factors?
The limiting factors that may be addressed by this proposal include confinement, floodplain connectivity, and LWD deficiency.

<b>Recovery Actions</b>
What Recovery Actions are addressed by this project?
Upper Yakima Action #15: Restore tributary riparian areas Naches #22: Improve riparian, floodplain, and temperature conditions in Cowiche Creek.

<b>Landowner Commitment</b>
Does it appear that the landowner(s) are supportive and committed to the project? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
Projects are on WDFW wildlife areas (Oak Creek and L.T. Murray). WDFW is fully supportive of these two projects and is providing wood to put into the two creeks.

<b>Organizational Capacity</b>
Does the project applicant demonstrate the ability to develop, design and implement this type of project? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
YN Habitat Program has completed similar projects (Taneum Cr.) and is currently working on several more (lower Oak Cr., Indian Cr., etc.). MCFEG has demonstrated staff knowledge and experience and organization capacity on numerous projects.

<b>Project Sequence</b>
Will the benefits of this project be realized immediately or do those benefits depend upon the completion of other projects (e.g. downstream)? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
NF Manastash: Moderate because fish do not have access until the Reed Diversion is removed, though high likelihood that barrier will be removed in the next few years. SF Cowiche: High because the project proposal reflects a good next step for creek restoration in an area currently used by adult and juvenile steelhead.

<b>Project Synergy</b>
Does the project complement previous habitat improvement projects in the area?
NF Manastash: Downstream efforts to address downstream barriers will potentially increase use of the areas by fish. But that project has not been completed. SF Cowiche: Yes, the project complements previous habitat improvement projects in the area.

<b>Budget</b>
---------------

Does the project budget appear reasonable? If not, why?
Yes – The project budget for logging operations and amount of LWD seems reasonable.

<b>Design</b>
If the project includes a design, does it appear to be adequate?
N/A

<b>Future Stewardship</b>
Does the proposal include a plan for site maintenance to assure project longevity?
The project(s) are for wood replenishment. The sponsor and the TAG believe that long-term maintenance is not required

<b>Uncertainties and Constraints</b>
Has the applicant adequately identified and addressed any constraints and uncertainties associated with this project?
Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
Risk analysis completed to assure no impacts on downstream landowners by placing wood in the creeks upstream (placed above channel constrictions).

<b>Habitat Restoration Only</b>
Is the project likely to result in measureable and persistent improvements in habitat quality and/or quantity in the project area?
Yes, improvements to habitat quality are expected to to be similar to what has occurred on Taneum Creek.

<b>Assessment Only</b>
Will the assessment produce projects that address recovery actions?
N/A

<b>Design Only</b>
Will the design result in a feasible/fundable project that has habitat benefits?
N/A

<b>Appraisal (Acquisitions)</b>
Has there been an appraisal? If there is no appraisal, is the TAG comfortable with how the cost estimate for the acquisition was calculated? Has the project sponsor indicated that the landowner is willing to consider the appraised value?
N/A

<b>Habitat Quality (Acquisition)</b>
Does the proposed acquisition involve a piece of property that already has high quality habitat? If not, what action(s) will be required post-acquisition to make it high quality?
N/A

<b>Urgency (Acquisitions)</b>
Why is it important that this property be acquired as soon as possible?

N/A

**What are the strengths of this proposal?**

Implements a proven and low cost in-stream habitat and floodplain restoration technique on public lands owned by WDFW. Opportunity to replicate the successful pilot project on Taneum Creek (L.T. Murray WLA) on another L.T. Murray stream (NF Manastash) and SF Cowiche (Oak Creek WLA)

**What are the weaknesses of this proposal?**

NF Manastash: Fish do not have access until the Reed Diversion is removed, although it is likely that the diversion will be removed in the future.

SF Cowiche: Benefits of project will be high immediately, but to get VERY high benefits, flood flows will be needed to re-work some floodplain areas. We may need to wait for some years to get those additional benefits, depending on when the next big floods hit these creeks.

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

Consider splitting this into two separate projects. They are both good projects, but the Cowiche Creek worksite is a higher priority because anadromous fish can already access it. The Cowiche project has an even better cost-benefit ratio than the Manastash because it will not require helicopter construction.

2015 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Yakima &amp; Naches Side Channel Enhancement Design</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group
<b>Date:</b>	July 7, 2015

<b>Limiting Factors</b>
What are the major limiting factors and/or threats in this reach, and does the project address these factors?
The limiting factors that may be addressed by this proposal include max temperature, fine sediment, and confinement.

<b>Recovery Actions</b>
What Recovery Actions are addressed by this project?
Lower Mainstem Action #7: Protect and restore mainstem and floodplain habitats below Sunnyside Dam Naches Action #31: Restore side channels and floodplain of Upper Naches River.

<b>Landowner Commitment</b>
Does it appear that the landowner(s) are supportive and committed to the project? Rating: LOW <b>MODERATE</b> HIGH
Unclear. There are multiple landowners and it does not appear that all of them are on board yet (depending on the proposed work site).

<b>Organizational Capacity</b>
Does the project applicant demonstrate the ability to develop, design and implement this type of project Rating: LOW <b>MODERATE</b> HIGH
High confidence that the MCFEG will successfully complete this project. MCFEG has demonstrated their ability to manage and implement a wide variety of instream and riparian restoration projects, including design and permitting. Despite this history, this project does not appear to be developed to the point that funding is warranted in this grant round.

<b>Project Sequence</b>
Will the benefits of this project be realized immediately or do those benefits depend upon the completion of other projects (e.g. downstream)? Pines: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b> Naches: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b> Songbird: <b>LOW</b> MODERATE HIGH Mast: LOW <b>MODERATE</b> HIGH
Feasibility level designs on the Yakima River sites seemed well sequenced. Concern about moving forward on final designs at the Naches site due to concerns about flood risks to landowners.

<b>Project Synergy</b>
Does the project complement previous habitat improvement projects in the area?
Expands the scope of the Ecology funding for Mast Farms.

<b>Budget</b>
---------------

Does the project budget appear reasonable? If not, why?
While the cost proposed are low for the work described, there are concerns that the sponsor is underestimating many constraints at some of the sites, and therefore has not adequately budgeted for them. The groundwater investigation at the MP 10 site is unnecessary.

<b>Design</b>
If the project includes a design, does it appear to be adequate?
Design goals are not clear enough to have confidence that a design will yield a project with high benefits to fish.

<b>Future Stewardship</b>
Does the proposal include a plan for site maintenance to assure project longevity?
N/A

<b>Uncertainties and Constraints</b>
Has the applicant adequately identified and addressed any constraints and uncertainties associated with this project? Rating: <b>LOW</b> MODERATE HIGH
There are major constraints at these worksites. At site #1, the existing parking area and driveway cause a constraint that will take money and/or stakeholder (public site users) to overcome, even if there is an otherwise viable project here. At site #2, there are unrealistic expectations that a high flow channel can be opened and that it will not increase flood risk. The physical challenges and the challenge of getting multiple private landowners to agree to this project do not appear to be well understood. If all landowners can agree, it will probably only be after project goals have been significantly compromised to protect the landowners, and at that point the benefits of such a project may not justify the cost. At site #3, having to get landowner support is a constraint, especially because landowners have not been contacted. Implementing a project in a river of this size may also be beyond the experience of applicant. It is unclear what the objectives of a project at this site would be, which adds additional uncertainty

<b>Habitat Restoration Only</b>
Is the project likely to result in measureable and persistent improvements in habitat quality and/or quantity in the project area?
N/A

<b>Assessment Only</b>
Will the assessment produce projects that address recovery actions?
Unknown. At site #2, there is probably not a feasible project with meaningful benefits at a reasonable cost. At site #3, perhaps there is potential, but the proposal does not articulate specific goals, so it is really unclear what the SRFB investment would result in.

<b>Design Only</b>
Will the design result in a feasible/fundable project that has habitat benefits?
(Sites 1 & 4) The design goals are not sufficient to result in feasible & fundable project

<b>Appraisal (Acquisitions)</b>
Has there been an appraisal? If there is no appraisal, is the TAG comfortable with how the cost estimate

for the acquisition was calculated? Has the project sponsor indicated that the landowner is willing to consider the appraised value?
N/A

<b>Habitat Quality (Acquisition)</b>
Does the proposed acquisition involve a piece of property that already has high quality habitat? If not, what action(s) will be required post-acquisition to make it high quality?
N/A

<b>Urgency (Acquisitions)</b>
Why is it important that this property be acquired as soon as possible?
N/A

<b>What are the strengths of this proposal?</b>
The proposal begins the process of outreach to landowners that could help addresses lack of side channel habitat in the main stem Yakima and Naches.

<b>What are the weaknesses of this proposal?</b>
Reviewers found it very difficult to score multiple projects bundled together. Most of these sites have real constraints that the proposal does not mention and the objectives for each site are not well articulated. Need to focus on restoring historical and naturally occurring side channels rather than creating new ones (e.g. MP 10 project). Concern that placement of wood in the lower mainstem Yakima River may create smallmouth bass habitat.

<b>TAG recommended actions for improvement of proposal before official submission to SRFB</b>
<p>Yakima river pond - If elevations are appropriate, consider connecting the pond via excavating an outlet to the river without spending lots of money on design/study. Or walk away from project.</p> <p>Naches N Loop - Abandon the concept of opening the inlet to side channel, if landowner support is needed. Consider changing project focus to making the lower end of the channel a more functional off-channel habitat for fish moving up from the bottom. Consider if the driveway culverts are a fish barrier, if riparian work is needed, and look at fish access from bottom end.</p> <p>Mast - Focus a little more on what is going on with the springwater and what realistic ecosystem-process goals would be. Work with technical staff in basin to consider if there is a solution worth pursuing.</p> <p>Songbird - Figure out what is limiting salmonids at site and goals for addressing the problems.</p>

2015 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Yakima RM153 Side Channel Connection Enhancement</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group
<b>Date:</b>	July 7, 2015

<b>Limiting Factors</b>
What are the major limiting factors and/or threats in this reach, and does the project address these factors?
The limiting factors that may be addressed by this proposal include riparian/floodplain/LWD, confinement and dewatering.

<b>Recovery Actions</b>
What Recovery Actions are addressed by this project?
Upper Yakima Action #13: Protect and restore floodplain, riparian, and in-channel habitats in the Upper Yakima, Kittitas, and Easton/Cle Elum Reaches (page 197)

<b>Landowner Commitment</b>
Does it appear that the landowner(s) are supportive and committed to the project? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
Jeff Brunson of the Bull Ditch Canal Company attended the site tour and is supportive of fixing the rock weir structure.

<b>Organizational Capacity</b>
Does the project applicant demonstrate the ability to develop, design and implement this type of project? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
MCFEG and Al Potter will be able to successfully complete this project.

<b>Project Sequence</b>
Will the benefits of this project be realized immediately or do those benefits depend upon the completion of other projects (e.g. downstream)? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
This is an urgent issue to address. Completion will immediately prevent dewatering of the Bull Ditch side channel and allow the irrigators to access Yakima R. water, thus increasing the flow in lower Wilson Creek for salmonid rearing.

<b>Project Synergy</b>
Does the project complement previous habitat improvement projects in the area?
Yes, the project will repairs and restore the side channel rearing enhancement project completed by WDFW in 1998-99.

<b>Budget</b>
Does the project budget appear reasonable? If not, why?
Yes

<b>Design</b>
---------------

If the project includes a design, does it appear to be adequate?
Yes, Al Potter preliminary design drawings are complete and look good.

<b>Future Stewardship</b>
Does the proposal include a plan for site maintenance to assure project longevity?
No specific plan in place but a stated commitment to work with project partners to monitor the structures performance. This structure has persisted for 17 years and only requires significant work to repair/relocate the boat notch. It may need periodic maintenance every 15 - 25 years, although it could be much more or much less based on the size and frequency of future flood events.

<b>Uncertainties and Constraints</b>
Has the applicant adequately identified and addressed any constraints and uncertainties associated with this project?
Rating: LOW <b>MODERATE</b> HIGH
There was only one uncertainty mentioned in the application- that rivers change. Applicant addressed that by saying the structure will be built to be adaptable. Rivers do change and sometimes radically with one flood event. Risk that the structure could be compromised at some point in the future. However, this is a truism for all instream projects and this particular project and site does not appear to have any more risk than a typical project.

<b>Habitat Restoration Only</b>
Is the project likely to result in measureable and persistent improvements in habitat quality and/or quantity in the project area?
Yes, Will restore perennial flow to the Bull Ditch Side Channel and in lower Wilson Creek.

<b>Assessment Only</b>
Will the assessment produce projects that address recovery actions?
N/A

<b>Design Only</b>
Will the design result in a feasible/fundable project that has habitat benefits?
N/A

<b>Appraisal (Acquisitions)</b>
Has there been an appraisal? If there is no appraisal, is the TAG comfortable with how the cost estimate for the acquisition was calculated? Has the project sponsor indicated that the landowner is willing to consider the appraised value?
N/A

<b>Habitat Quality (Acquisition)</b>
Does the proposed acquisition involve a piece of property that already has high quality habitat? If not, what action(s) will be required post-acquisition to make it high quality?
N/A

<b>Urgency (Acquisitions)</b>
Why is it important that this property be acquired as soon as possible?

N/A

**What are the strengths of this proposal?**  
Low cost action with significant improvements to side-channel of Yakima River and several miles of Wilson Creek due to flow benefits. This proposal addresses an urgent problem that kills juvenile fish every year, and in 2015 has killed fish more than once.

**What are the weaknesses of this proposal?**  
As with all projects reliant on an instream structure, may need recurring investment to keep the mainstem structure functioning. Unclear if the pilot channel in middle of the river will be needed or is worth the environmental impacts. It is possible there is a more efficient approach relating to regrading side channel and/or adjusting head gates, though it appears applicant will consider this before implementing the proposed approach.

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

2015 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Whiskey Creek Fish Passage at EWC</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	Kittitas County Conservation District
<b>Date:</b>	July 7, 2015

<b>Limiting Factors</b>
What are the major limiting factors and/or threats in this reach, and does the project address these factors?
The limiting factors that may be addressed by this proposal are screening & passage.

<b>Recovery Actions</b>
What Recovery Actions are addressed by this project?
Upper Yakima Action # 7: Provide fish passage into Upper Naneum Creek. Upper Yakima Action #11: Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries (page 195).

<b>Landowner Commitment</b>
Does it appear that the landowner(s) are supportive and committed to the project? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
The landowner commitment of the actual property owner and the Ellensburg Water Company are high.

<b>Organizational Capacity</b>
Does the project applicant demonstrate the ability to develop, design and implement this type of project? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
KCCD has a proven track record on projects like this.

<b>Project Sequence</b>
Will the benefits of this project be realized immediately or do those benefits depend upon the completion of other projects (e.g. downstream)? Rating: <b>LOW</b> MODERATE HIGH
Out of sequence with the Naneum-Wilson-Cherry Assessment and the four (partial & complete) passage barriers downstream yet to be fixed.

<b>Project Synergy</b>
Does the project complement previous habitat improvement projects in the area?
No. There are multiple upstream and downstream barriers.

<b>Budget</b>
Does the project budget appear reasonable? If not, why?
Yes, the budget is reasonable for the work proposed.

<b>Design</b>
If the project includes a design, does it appear to be adequate?
N/A

<b>Future Stewardship</b>
Does the proposal include a plan for site maintenance to assure project longevity?
N/A

<b>Uncertainties and Constraints</b>
Has the applicant adequately identified and addressed any constraints and uncertainties associated with this project? Rating: <b>LOW</b> MODERATE HIGH
Major uncertainty is if Whiskey will be used as the main route for adult salmon/steelhead migration into the upper watershed. If not, this project will not be a high enough priority to justify the cost. A secondary uncertainty is if downstream barriers (such as that at the BNSF crossing) will be remedied. If not, this project will have no value.

<b>Habitat Restoration Only</b>
Is the project likely to result in measureable and persistent improvements in habitat quality and/or quantity in the project area?
N/A

<b>Assessment Only</b>
Will the assessment produce projects that address recovery actions?
N/A

<b>Design Only</b>
Will the design result in a feasible/fundable project that has habitat benefits?
Uncertain. Depends on how the downstream issues are resolved.

<b>Habitat Quality (Acquisition)</b>
Does the proposed acquisition involve a piece of property that already has high quality habitat? If not, what action(s) will be required post-acquisition to make it high quality?
N/A

<b>Urgency (Acquisitions)</b>
Why is it important that this property be acquired as soon as possible?
N/A

<b>What are the strengths of this proposal?</b>
Straight-forward, relatively uncomplicated passage project. KCCD has experience planning and implementing projects just like this.

<b>What are the weaknesses of this proposal?</b>
Difficult to judge benefit of project without more certainty on long term plan for Whiskey Creek. Out of sequence with larger study (Assessment) and there are several barriers downstream. Without those barriers being corrected, this project will have no value.

<b>TAG recommended actions for improvement of proposal before official submission to SRFB</b>
Wait until the assessment on Naneum, Wilson and Cherry Creeks is completed and there is a plan for

repairing downstream barriers before re-submitting the proposal.

2015 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Parke Creek - Caribou Creek Fish Passage</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	Kittitas County Conservation District
<b>Date:</b>	July 7, 2015

<b>Limiting Factors</b>
What are the major limiting factors and/or threats in this reach, and does the project address these factors?
The limiting factors that may be addressed by this proposal include fine sediment, screening and passage.

<b>Recovery Actions</b>
What Recovery Actions are addressed by this project?
Upper Yakima Action #11: Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries (page 195).

<b>Landowner Commitment</b>
Does it appear that the landowner(s) are supportive and committed to the project? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
The KCCD works well with private landowners.

<b>Organizational Capacity</b>
Does the project applicant demonstrate the ability to develop, design and implement this type of project Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
KCCD experienced with fish passage and irrigation reconfiguration projects.

<b>Project Sequence</b>
Will the benefits of this project be realized immediately or do those benefits depend upon the completion of other projects (e.g. downstream)? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
These are the lowest barriers/diversions on Parke and Caribou Creeks, which may serve as rearing habitat, but probably will not support spawning of anadromous fish other than coho.

<b>Project Synergy</b>
Does the project complement previous habitat improvement projects in the area?
Yes, this project is part of a larger effort to reestablish fish passage in the Cherry Creek tributaries. Several screening and passage projects have been completed in Cherry/Parke/Caribou.

<b>Budget</b>
Does the project budget appear reasonable? If not, why?
Yes, the budget seems reasonable for the work proposed.

<b>Design</b>
If the project includes a design, does it appear to be adequate?
N/A

<b>Future Stewardship</b>
Does the proposal include a plan for site maintenance to assure project longevity?
Yes, landowners will be responsible for their pump stations and fish screens and will maintain them.

<b>Uncertainties and Constraints</b>
Has the applicant adequately identified and addressed any constraints and uncertainties associated with this project?
Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
Some uncertainty about the timing of the conversion to pump diversion/sprinklers.

<b>Habitat Restoration Only</b>
Is the project likely to result in measureable and persistent improvements in habitat quality and/or quantity in the project area?
Yes, this project should provide benefits to fish that will last.

<b>Assessment Only</b>
Will the assessment produce projects that address recovery actions?
N/A

<b>Design Only</b>
Will the design result in a feasible/fundable project that has habitat benefits?
N/A

<b>Appraisal (Acquisitions)</b>
Has there been an appraisal? If there is no appraisal, is the TAG comfortable with how the cost estimate for the acquisition was calculated? Has the project sponsor indicated that the landowner is willing to consider the appraised value?
N/A

<b>Habitat Quality (Acquisition)</b>
Does the proposed acquisition involve a piece of property that already has high quality habitat? If not, what action(s) will be required post-acquisition to make it high quality?
N/A

<b>Urgency (Acquisitions)</b>
Why is it important that this property be acquired as soon as possible?
N/A

<b>What are the strengths of this proposal?</b>
The project works to address the fish passage and fish screening needs within the East Ellensburg tributaries. The proposal is well laid out and clear. They have addressed all the questions well.

<b>What are the weaknesses of this proposal?</b>
The streams aren't the highest priority for Upper Yakima Action #11, and there does not appear to be landowner interest to reestablish native riparian vegetation to improve value for rearing salmonids.

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

**2015 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form**

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Ahtanum Creek Riparian Enhancement 2015</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	North Yakima Conservation District
<b>Date:</b>	July 8, 2015

**Limiting Factors**  
 What are the major limiting factors and/or threats in this reach, and does the project address these factors?  
 The limiting factors that may be addressed by this proposal include max temperature, riparian/floodplain/LWD, and confinement.

**Recovery Actions**  
 What Recovery Actions are addressed by this project?  
 Naches Action #27: Ahtanum Creek floodplain side channel restoration.  
 Naches Action #29: Reduce livestock impacts on Ahtanum Creek riparian areas.

**Landowner Commitment**  
 Does it appear that the landowner(s) are supportive and committed to the project?  
 Rating: LOW **MODERATE** HIGH  
 Three out of four landowner acknowledgement forms have been submitted. The Yakama Nation landowner form is not included.

**Organizational Capacity**  
 Does the project applicant demonstrate the ability to develop, design and implement this type of project?  
 Rating: LOW MODERATE **HIGH**  
 NYCD has successfully completed similar riparian restoration projects on several local creeks, including on lower Ahtanum near LaSalle H.S.

**Project Sequence**  
 Will the benefits of this project be realized immediately or do those benefits depend upon the completion of other projects (e.g. downstream)?  
 Rating: LOW MODERATE **HIGH**  
 This proposal is in coordination with an in-stream restoration project. Some benefits, such as reduced bank erosion, should be immediate in places. Riparian restoration benefits will be longer term. Project benefits do not directly depend on other projects downstream.

**Project Synergy**  
 Does the project complement previous habitat improvement projects in the area?  
 Yes, the proposal corresponds well with the 2014 assessment project.

<b>Budget</b>
Does the project budget appear reasonable? If not, why?
Yes, the budget seems reasonable for the work proposed.

<b>Design</b>
If the project includes a design, does it appear to be adequate?
N/A

<b>Future Stewardship</b>
Does the proposal include a plan for site maintenance to assure project longevity?
Yes, three year plant maintenance by NYCD until plants are established, and ten years of maintenance on fencing and off channel livestock watering by landowners/operators.

<b>Uncertainties and Constraints</b>
Has the applicant adequately identified and addressed any constraints and uncertainties associated with this project?
Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
The applicant did not thoughtfully discuss any possible challenges that may come up, and therefore did not discuss how they could be addressed. Challenges might be continued landowner willingness, weed management after the grant period, fencing maintenance, channel migration, etc. However, the applicant has successfully completed similar projects.

<b>Habitat Restoration Only</b>
Is the project likely to result in measureable and persistent improvements in habitat quality and/or quantity in the project area?
Yes, measurable improvements in vegetation should be achieved at the project site.

<b>Assessment Only</b>
Will the assessment produce projects that address recovery actions?
N/A

<b>Design Only</b>
Will the design result in a feasible/fundable project that has habitat benefits?
N/A

<b>Urgency (Acquisitions)</b>
Why is it important that this property be acquired as soon as possible?
N/A

<b>What are the strengths of this proposal?</b>
Addresses limiting factors. Scale of project sufficient to result in meaningful change. Doing the vegetation while implementing construction of physical habitat restoration will increase success and probably reduce costs. Experience level of the NYCD and project lead, Brian Schmidt, in designing and implementing this type of project.

<b>What are the weaknesses of this proposal?</b>
--

Long-term landowner/operator commitment to riparian habitat restoration when there is little [perceived] direct benefit to them. Longer-term assurance of maintenance would strengthen proposal.

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

Longer-term assurance of maintenance and protection of riparian vegetation from future management actions by landowners would strengthen proposal.

2015 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Naneum-Coleman Fish Passage (Cost Increase)</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	Kittitas County Conservation District
<b>Date:</b>	July 8, 2015

<b>Limiting Factors</b>
What are the major limiting factors and/or threats in this reach, and does the project address these factors?
The limiting factors that may be addressed by this proposal include fine sediment, screening and passage.

<b>Recovery Actions</b>
What Recovery Actions are addressed by this project?
Upper Yakima Action # 7: Provide fish passage into Upper Naneum Creek. Upper Yakima Action #11: Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries (page 195).

<b>Landowner Commitment</b>
Does it appear that the landowner(s) are supportive and committed to the project? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
Landowner is committed to the changing the sprinkler system provided the SRFB grant is approved to fund the more expensive gravity fish screens required at these two sites.

<b>Organizational Capacity</b>
Does the project applicant demonstrate the ability to develop, design and implement this type of project Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
KCCD has demonstrated ability to implement these types of projects.

<b>Project Sequence</b>
Will the benefits of this project be realized immediately or do those benefits depend upon the completion of other projects (e.g. downstream)? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
These are the next fish passage and screening projects in the Naneum and Coleman Cr. systems and provide immediate benefits for fish.

<b>Project Synergy</b>
Does the project complement previous habitat improvement projects in the area? Yes, the proposed projects complement many upstream restoration efforts.

<b>Budget</b>
Does the project budget appear reasonable? If not, why? Yes, the budget is reasonable for the work proposed.

<b>Design</b>
If the project includes a design, does it appear to be adequate?

N/A

**Future Stewardship**

Does the proposal include a plan for site maintenance to assure project longevity?

Yes, landowners will be responsible for their fish screens and will maintain them.

**Uncertainties and Constraints**

Has the applicant adequately identified and addressed any constraints and uncertainties associated with this project?

Rating: LOW MODERATE **HIGH**

Some uncertainty on how effective the fish screen cleaning system will be. Unclear if the "automatic spray bar" cleaning system is a proven design currently being used successfully elsewhere on Ellensburg area creek diversions.

**Habitat Restoration Only**

Is the project likely to result in measureable and persistent improvements in habitat quality and/or quantity in the project area?

Yes, this project should provide benefits to fish that will last.

**Assessment Only**

Will the assessment produce projects that address recovery actions?

N/A

**Design Only**

Will the design result in a feasible/fundable project that has habitat benefits?

N/A

**Habitat Quality (Acquisition)**

Does the proposed acquisition involve a piece of property that already has high quality habitat? If not, what action(s) will be required post-acquisition to make it high quality?

N/A

**Urgency (Acquisitions)**

Why is it important that this property be acquired as soon as possible?

N/A

**What are the strengths of this proposal?**

Priority actions on priority streams to allow access to the Wilson Naneum systems. Ranked #2 in matrix scoring in 2014 (49.1 points). Nothing from a fish perspective has changed. The cost has gone up because the screen type has changed. Water quality will be improved by converting from gated pipe to sprinkler irrigation.

**What are the weaknesses of this proposal?**

Cost and incremental nature of this type of activity. Unclear if this will contribute to long term passage into upper Naneum or not, and if not, benefits are less.

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

Work with EWC to reduce EWC deliveries in the creek due to reduced need by the landowner because of the sprinkler conversion. Lower flow will create better rearing habitat during the irrigation season.

**2015 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form**

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Naneum, Wilson &amp; Cherry Creek Assessment (Cost Increase)</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	Kittitas County Public Works/Flood Control Zone District
<b>Date:</b>	July 8, 2015

**Note: These are the comments collected in 2013**

**Limiting Factors**

What are the major limiting factors and/or threats in this reach, and does the project address these factors?

The limiting factors that may be addressed by this proposal include max temperature, confinement, riparian/floodplain/LWD, screening and passage.

**Recovery Actions**

What Recovery Actions are addressed by this project?

Upper Yakima Action # 7, Provide fish passage into Upper Naneum (Page 193).

Upper Yakima Action #11 Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries (page 195).

Upper Yakima Action #15, Restore tributary riparian areas (page 199).

**Landowner Commitment**

Does it appear that the landowner(s) are supportive and committed to the project?

Rating: LOW MODERATE HIGH **UNKNOWN**

With so many land owners in this area, and project at the assessment stage, it is difficult to rate this. Presumed to be low based on landowner resistance to passage assessment completed years earlier, although with reduced apprehension regarding ESA, landowner resistance may be lower. Given recent flood damage in the area, the project’s inclusion of understanding and reducing flood risk as a goal, and leadership by the Flood Control Zone District, there is hope that there will be high interest and engagement from landowners (as happened with the recent Manastash assessment).

**Organizational Capacity**

Does the project applicant demonstrate the ability to develop, design and implement this type of project

Rating: LOW MODERATE **HIGH**

This assessment would be completed by a coalition of entities with high organizational capacity and a new SRFB project proponent (Kittitas County FCZD). This is a large, multi-year project but will have support from many entities.

**Project Sequence**

Will the benefits of this project be realized immediately or do those benefits depend upon the completion of other projects (e.g. downstream)?

Rating: LOW MODERATE **HIGH**

HIGH; This project is timely in that it will synthesize all previous work that has been completed, and will also provide new data that is critical to moving forward with any restoration in this area. One goal of the project is to help prioritize money that is spent in the watershed.

**Budget**

Does the project budget appear reasonable? If not, why?

Yes, budget seems reasonable for an assessment of this scope and scale.

**Design**

If the project includes a design, does it appear to be adequate?

N/A

**Future Stewardship**

Does the proposal include a plan for site maintenance to assure project longevity?

N/A

**Uncertainties and Constraints**

Has the applicant adequately identified and addressed any constraints and uncertainties associated with this project?

Rating: LOW MODERATE **HIGH**

This is a very complex and potentially politically sensitive project, with many land owners and stake holders to work with. Land owners could increase uncertainty of success with completing the assessment if surveyors are not allowed access to large portions of private land.

**Habitat Restoration Only**

Is the project likely to result in measureable and persistent improvements in habitat quality and/or quantity in the project area?

N/A

**Assessment Only**

Will the assessment produce projects that address recovery actions?

Yes, addresses Upper Yakima Action # 7, Provide fish passage into Upper Naneum (Page 193), and Upper Yakima Action #11 Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries (page 195).

**Design Only**

Will the design result in a feasible/fundable project that has habitat benefits?

N/A

**Appraisal (Acquisitions)**

Has there been an appraisal? If there is no appraisal, is the TAG comfortable with how the cost estimate for the acquisition was calculated? Has the project sponsor indicated that the landowner is willing to consider the appraised value?

N/A

**Habitat Quality (Acquisition)**

Does the proposed acquisition involve a piece of property that already has high quality habitat? If not, what action(s) will be required post-acquisition to make it high quality?
N/A

<b>Urgency (Acquisitions)</b>
Why is it important that this property be acquired as soon as possible?
N/A

<b>What are the strengths of this proposal?</b>
The principal partners, KCCD and KCPW/FCZD, have credibility and are respected in the lower Kittitas Valley. Together, with the help of other partners, they have the best chance of being successful. The approach laid out is comprehensive. Also, applicants understand the challenges involved and are prepared to face these challenges. A comprehensive assessment and restoration strategy in this important watershed has been needed for years.

<b>What are the weaknesses of this proposal?</b>
Difficulty of working in this area with a large number of landowners and complex hydrology creates uncertainty.

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

<b>TAG response to the 2015 cost increase request</b>
The TAG reviewed and discussed the request in detail. The items leading to increased costs were recommended and supported by the technical advisory group working on the assessment project. They decided to support the cost increase & to use the ranking scores from 2013 to determine the project's placement on the 2015 TAG ranked list.

2015 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Williams Creek Aquatic Habitat Restoration</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	Kittitas Conservation Trust
<b>Date:</b>	July 8, 2015

<b>Limiting Factors</b>
What are the major limiting factors and/or threats in this reach, and does the project address these factors?
The limiting factors that may be addressed by this proposal include fine sediment, riparian/LWD, and Passage.

<b>Recovery Actions</b>
What Recovery Actions are addressed by this project?
Upper Yakima Action #14: Restore instream and floodplain habitat complexity in Swauk and Taneum creeks and Teanaway and lower Cle Elum rivers
Upper Yakima Action #15: Restore tributary riparian areas

<b>Landowner Commitment</b>
Does it appear that the landowner(s) are supportive and committed to the project?
Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
USFS is a project partner and is very interested in the outcome.

<b>Organizational Capacity</b>
Does the project applicant demonstrate the ability to develop, design and implement this type of project?
Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
KCT has been successful with large complicated projects in the past and they have the capacity to be successful in cooperation with the Cle Elum Ranger District.

<b>Project Sequence</b>
Will the benefits of this project be realized immediately or do those benefits depend upon the completion of other projects (e.g. downstream)?
Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
Project has been reworked to address watershed health, fish access and habitat in Williams Cr. and lower Cougar and Lion Gulch. Road closures and culvert replacements will have immediate benefits, along with LWD placement.

<b>Project Synergy</b>
Does the project complement previous habitat improvement projects in the area?
This is the first SRBD project in the Williams Creek watershed, but is coordinated with the USFS Swauk Pines Watershed Restoration Project.

<b>Budget</b>
Does the project budget appear reasonable? If not, why?
Yes, the SRFB request seems reasonable with most funding going to construction rather than AA&E. Linkage to Swauk Pines project is providing LWD at no cost for the trees because of the thinning project.

<b>Design</b>
If the project includes a design, does it appear to be adequate?
Standard specs are adequate for road decommissioning & design of fish passage is part of project scope.

<b>Future Stewardship</b>
Does the proposal include a plan for site maintenance to assure project longevity?
USFS will need to continuously evaluate the effectiveness of road closures and management of off road use. Other project elements will not need significant maintenance.

<b>Uncertainties and Constraints</b>
Has the applicant adequately identified and addressed any constraints and uncertainties associated with this project?
Rating: LOW <b>MODERATE</b> HIGH
Uncertain if the NEPA will be complete in 2016. KCT and USFS have not explained how they are going to control ORV use to prevent watershed and creek damage after road decommissioning. This area suffers from pervasive environmental impacts by recreational users. It is unclear how that behavior is going to be changed. However, the benefits of culvert upgrades and in-stream wood placement are unlikely to be affected by any future non-compliance of recreational users.

<b>Habitat Restoration Only</b>
Is the project likely to result in measureable and persistent improvements in habitat quality and/or quantity in the project area?
Yes, fish use and reductions in off road vehicle use can be measured immediately.

<b>Assessment Only</b>
Will the assessment produce projects that address recovery actions?
N/A

<b>Design Only</b>
Will the design result in a feasible/fundable project that has habitat benefits?
N/A

<b>Appraisal (Acquisitions)</b>
Has there been an appraisal? If there is no appraisal, is the TAG comfortable with how the cost estimate for the acquisition was calculated? Has the project sponsor indicated that the landowner is willing to consider the appraised value?
N/A

<b>Habitat Quality (Acquisition)</b>
Does the proposed acquisition involve a piece of property that already has high quality habitat? If not, what action(s) will be required post-acquisition to make it high quality?
N/A

<b>Urgency (Acquisitions)</b>
Why is it important that this property be acquired as soon as possible?

N/A

**What are the strengths of this proposal?**

This project is part of a larger effort to address the Williams drainage and addresses several limiting factors and impacts. Addresses ecosystem processes that are the main limiting factors. Fixes barriers. Landowner support. Swauk system is important for steelhead. KCT's experience managing projects combined with a good partner (USFS - Cle Elum RD) that is highly motivated to cooperate because of the linkage to their Swauk Pines Watershed Restoration project.

**What are the weaknesses of this proposal?**

It will be challenging to get public acceptance of road decommissioning and restoration that will limit traditional recreational use in some ways; particularly ORV use. It is not clear how illegal activities will be managed in the future. Not clear if proposed LWD loading will be sufficient, though it will be an improvement

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

2015 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Gold Creek Instream Habitat Design</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	Kittitas Conservation Trust
<b>Date:</b>	July 8, 2015

<b>Limiting Factors</b>
What are the major limiting factors and/or threats in this reach, and does the project address these factors?
The limiting factors that may be addressed by this proposal include LWD deficiency, minimum width, and seasonal dewatering.

<b>Recovery Actions</b>
What Recovery Actions are addressed by this project?
BTAP Gold Action #2: Gold Creek Floodplain Restoration.

<b>Landowner Commitment</b>
Does it appear that the landowner(s) are supportive and committed to the project? Rating: LOW <b>MODERATE</b> HIGH
SOW contains budget for continued landowner engagement

<b>Organizational Capacity</b>
Does the project applicant demonstrate the ability to develop, design and implement this type of project Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
KCT has worked on large complex projects successfully and has demonstrated the ability to complete this in-stream habitat preliminary design project.

<b>Project Sequence</b>
Will the benefits of this project be realized immediately or do those benefits depend upon the completion of other projects (e.g. downstream)? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
One of two major projects that could address the major and urgent limiting factor of dewatering.

<b>Project Synergy</b>
Does the project complement previous habitat improvement projects in the area?
Yes, this project compliments the previous I-90 bridge construction project, land purchases, and the Gold Creek Assessment.

<b>Budget</b>
Does the project budget appear reasonable? If not, why?
The budget appears somewhat high to produce final designs on improvements that have already been conceptualized, but doesn't seem unreasonable for a project this large and complex.

<b>Design</b>
If the project includes a design, does it appear to be adequate?
N/A

<b>Future Stewardship</b>
Does the proposal include a plan for site maintenance to assure project longevity?
N/A

<b>Uncertainties and Constraints</b>
Has the applicant adequately identified and addressed any constraints and uncertainties associated with this project? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
Uncertainty about the level of landowner commitment (both private & USFS) for the proposed project, which is probably to be expected at this point in project development.

<b>Habitat Restoration Only</b>
Is the project likely to result in measureable and persistent improvements in habitat quality and/or quantity in the project area?
N/A

<b>Design Only</b>
Will the design result in a feasible/fundable project that has habitat benefits?
Yes, this is for a preliminary design. Final design will still be needed.

<b>Appraisal (Acquisitions)</b>
Has there been an appraisal? If there is no appraisal, is the TAG comfortable with how the cost estimate for the acquisition was calculated? Has the project sponsor indicated that the landowner is willing to consider the appraised value?
N/A

<b>Habitat Quality (Acquisition)</b>
Does the proposed acquisition involve a piece of property that already has high quality habitat? If not, what action(s) will be required post-acquisition to make it high quality?
N/A

<b>Urgency (Acquisitions)</b>
Why is it important that this property be acquired as soon as possible?
N/A

<b>What are the strengths of this proposal?</b>
Addresses one of the highest priority issues for Yakima basin bull trout. Builds upon previously funded assessment. Can be implemented sooner than the Gold Greek Pond element, but continues stakeholder outreach for that project. The proposal is based on two years of research by a very qualified organization.

<b>What are the weaknesses of this proposal?</b>
Landowner concerns need to be addressed. Part of addressing such concerns will be educating landowners about current flood risk that they face and how the project will or will not affect that risk. It appears that applicant will do this as part of the proposed project.

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

**2015 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form**

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Teanaway Floodplain and Side Channel Protection</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife & Trust for Public Land
<b>Date:</b>	July 8, 2015

**Limiting Factors**

What are the major limiting factors and/or threats in this reach, and does the project address these factors?

The limiting factors that may be addressed by this proposal include Riparian/Floodplain/LWD.

**Recovery Actions**

What Recovery Actions are addressed by this project?

Upper Yakima Action #14: Restore instream and floodplain habitat complexity in Swauk and Taneum creeks and Teanaway and lower Cle Elum rivers.

**Landowner Commitment**

Does it appear that the landowner(s) are supportive and committed to the project?

Rating: LOW MODERATE **HIGH**

The landowners are motivated sellers; and would prefer to sell to TPL and WDFW to assure public ownership.

**Organizational Capacity**

Does the project applicant demonstrate the ability to develop, design and implement this type of project?

Rating: LOW MODERATE **HIGH**

Acquisition of lands for public uses is what TPL does and the collaboration with WDFW seems positive.

**Project Sequence**

Will the benefits of this project be realized immediately or do those benefits depend upon the completion of other projects (e.g. downstream)?

Rating: LOW MODERATE **HIGH**

This proposal is well sequenced with the Teanaway Community Forest purchase.

**Project Synergy**

Does the project complement previous habitat improvement projects in the area?

Synergy with the Teanaway Community Forest and the proposal connects with the Community Forest on both sides of the river.

**Budget**

Does the project budget appear reasonable? If not, why?

Yes, the budget is reasonable, but prefer to focus on the 25% that has a direct nexus with salmon.

<b>Design</b>
If the project includes a design, does it appear to be adequate?
N/A

<b>Future Stewardship</b>
Does the proposal include a plan for site maintenance to assure project longevity?
Yes, WDFW will maintain the property.

<b>Uncertainties and Constraints</b>
Has the applicant adequately identified and addressed any constraints and uncertainties associated with this project? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
Not certain if the project sponsor will successfully obtain matching funds. Uncertainty about the water component that is associated, but not funded by this project. Assume that 35 new wells could be created. Not clear about the degree of risk to fish habitat associated with the property. If it was sold for development, most of the riparian features would likely remain intact.

<b>Habitat Restoration Only</b>
Is the project likely to result in measureable and persistent improvements in habitat quality and/or quantity in the project area?
N/A

<b>Assessment Only</b>
Will the assessment produce projects that address recovery actions?
N/A

<b>Design Only</b>
Will the design result in a feasible/fundable project that has habitat benefits?
N/A

<b>Appraisal (Acquisitions)</b>
Has there been an appraisal? If there is no appraisal, is the TAG comfortable with how the cost estimate for the acquisition was calculated? Has the project sponsor indicated that the landowner is willing to consider the appraised value?
Yes, the project descriptions states that an appraisal was completed in 2014.

<b>Habitat Quality (Acquisition)</b>
Does the proposed acquisition involve a piece of property that already has high quality habitat? If not, what action(s) will be required post-acquisition to make it high quality?
Yes, 25% of the property in riparian/floodplain habitat are high quality. Teanaway river habitat is also high quality in this reach.

<b>Urgency (Acquisitions)</b>
Why is it important that this property be acquired as soon as possible?
Property will be split up and sold for development if the TPL option is not exercised by Feb. 2016. This

land is prime for development if it is not acquired and preserved. Seems pretty likely that the site will be developed at some point if not acquired for conservation. However, the degree to which development on this property would significantly degrade fish habitat is far less certain. Therefore, it is not clear how much threat to existing habitat functions we will avert through purchase.

**What are the strengths of this proposal?**

The mature, wide riparian forest buffer that separates the agricultural land from the river. The 0.6 miles of mainstem Teanaway R. that would be protected from development. Complements other acquisition and protection efforts in the Teanaway. Having the full footprint of the riparian are in conservation would allow us to increase the footprint riparian habitat.

**What are the weaknesses of this proposal?**

It is expensive and many parts of property have low direct impact on habitat quality for anadromous fish. Unclear whether changes in Critical Area ordinances and other regulations would protect the majority of functions this lot provides despite potential subdivision.

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

Consider using SRFB funding on the Teanaway River adjacent parcels. Use the RCO contract to explicitly state that the SRFB funding should clearly fund the protection of floodplain values. Suggest TPL place an easement or deed restriction on the property so that it will not be used for grazing in the riparian areas after being conveyed to the state.

2015 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Yakima River Floodplain Assessment &amp; Final Design</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	Trout Unlimited
<b>Date:</b>	July 8, 2015

<b>Limiting Factors</b>
What are the major limiting factors and/or threats in this reach, and does the project address these factors?
The limiting factors that may be addressed by this proposal include riparian/floodplain/LWD, confinement, and high summer flow.

<b>Recovery Actions</b>
What Recovery Actions are addressed by this project?
Upper Yakima Action #13: Protect and restore floodplain, riparian, and in-channel habitats in the Upper Yakima, Kittitas, and Easton/Cle Elum Reaches (page 197).

<b>Landowner Commitment</b>
Does it appear that the landowner(s) are supportive and committed to the project? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
Excellent support letter from Mark Anderson, landowner, showing high commitment to improving his property for ecosystem health and fish.

<b>Organizational Capacity</b>
Does the project applicant demonstrate the ability to develop, design and implement this type of project? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
Trout Unlimited is a new sponsor in this area, but they have implemented phased projects across a large region. They have access to a lot of resources and experienced staff.

<b>Project Sequence</b>
Will the benefits of this project be realized immediately or do those benefits depend upon the completion of other projects (e.g. downstream)? Rating: LOW MODERATE <b>HIGH</b>
It is appropriate to first work through assessment and planning for designs.

<b>Project Synergy</b>
Does the project complement previous habitat improvement projects in the area?
Yes, this proposal complements the BOR's Shaake work and the SRFB Yakima River Hansen Pit to Ringer Loop Assessment, plus the Bull Canal work proposal just upstream.

<b>Budget</b>
Does the project budget appear reasonable? If not, why?
Yes, the budget appears reasonable for the work proposed.

<b>Design</b>
If the project includes a design, does it appear to be adequate?

N/A

**Future Stewardship**

Does the proposal include a plan for site maintenance to assure project longevity?

N/A

**Uncertainties and Constraints**

Has the applicant adequately identified and addressed any constraints and uncertainties associated with this project?

Rating: LOW MODERATE **HIGH**

Main uncertainties are the landowner cooperation with preferred alternative and funding for implementation. Both addressed and not unusual for this type of project.

**Habitat Restoration Only**

Is the project likely to result in measureable and persistent improvements in habitat quality and/or quantity in the project area?

N/A

**Assessment Only**

Will the assessment produce projects that address recovery actions?

Yes. There are clearly beneficial actions to be taken on the downstream half of property and high certainty these will get done. Less clear is how much benefit can be achieved further upstream with levee removal.

**Design Only**

Will the design result in a feasible/fundable project that has habitat benefits?

Yes.

**Habitat Quality (Acquisition)**

Does the proposed acquisition involve a piece of property that already has high quality habitat? If not, what action(s) will be required post-acquisition to make it high quality?

N/A

**Urgency (Acquisitions)**

Why is it important that this property be acquired as soon as possible?

N/A

**What are the strengths of this proposal?**

Landowner seems genuinely interested, and took initiative to contact TU. Large property with lots of potential for restoration. Fish access for high-functioning side channels can be achieved fairly simply. Applicant can take advantage of hydraulic modelling work already completed in reach by both Reclamation and Kittitas County.

**What are the weaknesses of this proposal?**

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

Ensure that work builds upon and utilizes existing modelling from complementary projects adjacent to this property.

**2015 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form**

<b>Project Title:</b>	<b>Ensign Ranch - Big Creek Flow Enhancement Project</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	Washington Water Trust
<b>Date:</b>	July 8, 2015

**Limiting Factors**

What are the major limiting factors and/or threats in this reach, and does the project address these factors?

The limiting factors that may be addressed by this proposal include max temperature, flow, and screening.

**Recovery Actions**

What Recovery Actions are addressed by this project?

Basinwide Action #5: Utilize Trust Water Rights Program to improve instream flows.

**Landowner Commitment**

Does it appear that the landowner(s) are supportive and committed to the project?

Rating: LOW MODERATE **HIGH**

Yes, the landowner participated in 2014 with the Yakama Nation's Big Creek Fish Passage Project and remains interested in completing this work.

**Organizational Capacity**

Does the project applicant demonstrate the ability to develop, design and implement this type of project?

Rating: LOW MODERATE **HIGH**

WWT staff specialize in water trust and conservation projects.

**Project Sequence**

Will the benefits of this project be realized immediately or do those benefits depend upon the completion of other projects (e.g. downstream)?

Rating: LOW **MODERATE** HIGH

It may be premature to fund this work before the PHABSIM study is completed.

**Project Synergy**

Does the project complement previous habitat improvement projects in the area?

Yes, after completion of the Big Creek fish passage project, this is the next step to address the fish screening needs.

**Budget**

Does the project budget appear reasonable? If not, why?

Yes, the budget is reasonable.

<b>Design</b>
If the project includes a design, does it appear to be adequate?
N/A

<b>Future Stewardship</b>
Does the proposal include a plan for site maintenance to assure project longevity?
Endowed fund to cover O&M costs. It is in the landowner's interests to carry out needed maintenance.

<b>Uncertainties and Constraints</b>
Has the applicant adequately identified and addressed any constraints and uncertainties associated with this project?
Rating: LOW <b>MODERATE</b> HIGH
The biological importance of this water savings is somewhat unclear. It seems premature to proceed with this project while a PHABSIM study is underway that will identify how important this water will be in lower Big Creek.

<b>Habitat Restoration Only</b>
Is the project likely to result in measureable and persistent improvements in habitat quality and/or quantity in the project area?
Uncertain – possible rearing benefits

<b>Appraisal (Acquisitions)</b>
Has there been an appraisal? If there is no appraisal, is the TAG comfortable with how the cost estimate for the acquisition was calculated? Has the project sponsor indicated that the landowner is willing to consider the appraised value?
N/A

<b>Habitat Quality (Acquisition)</b>
Does the proposed acquisition involve a piece of property that already has high quality habitat? If not, what action(s) will be required post-acquisition to make it high quality?
NA

<b>Urgency (Acquisitions)</b>
Why is it important that this property be acquired as soon as possible?
N/A

<b>What are the strengths of this proposal?</b>
Coincides with complementary efforts upstream to address flow issues. Tributary steelhead production is a high priority for the Upper Yakima population. It's sequencing with the completed (2014) fish passage project and the match funding are also strengths.

<b>What are the weaknesses of this proposal?</b>
Given flows and time of year, this will probably help rearing fish only. Project seems out of sequence with PHABSIM study. The new screen placed in the Yakima will be better designed to be safer, but it will encounter far more juvenile fish due to location, so unclear if the screening/entrainment risk is a net benefit of project. It is unclear what current diversion rates are, and thus how significant the benefits of

the downstream transfer would be.

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

Re-assess the need for the project once the PHABSIM data is available.

**2015 Yakima Basin Lead Entity Ranked Project List**  
*as presented to the Board for approval on August 6, 2015*

Rank	Project Name	Sponsor	PRISM #	SRFB Request	Cumulative Total	BLM Funding
1	<a href="#">SF Cowiche Floodplain Restoration</a>	Mid-Columbia FEG / Yakama Nation	15-1144	\$115,000	\$88,000	\$27,000
2	<a href="#">Gold Creek Instream Habitat Design</a>	Kittitas Conservation Trust	15-1153	\$185,705	\$273,705	
3	<a href="#">Naneum, Wilson, and Cherry Creek Assessment (Cost Increase)</a>	Kittitas County Public Works	13-1315	\$100,000	\$373,705	
4	<a href="#">Yakima RM153 Side Channel Connection Enhancement</a>	Mid-Columbia FEG	15-1350	\$116,000	\$489,705	
5	<a href="#">Naneum-Coleman Fish Passage Projects (Cost Increase)</a>	Kittitas County Conservation District	14-1215	\$185,312	\$675,017	
6	<a href="#">Yakima River Floodplain Assessment &amp; Final Design</a>	Trout Unlimited	15-1147	\$123,701	\$798,718	
7	<a href="#">Williams Creek Aquatic Habitat Restoration</a>	Kittitas Conservation Trust	15-1247	\$214,920	\$1,013,638	
8	<a href="#">Ahtanum Creek Riparian Enhancement 2015</a>	North Yakima Conservation District	15-1141	\$200,668	\$1,214,306	
9	<a href="#">Parke Creek - Caribou Creek Fish Passage</a>	Kittitas County Conservation District	15-1151	\$280,339	\$1,494,645	
10	<a href="#">Swauk RM 17.3 to 18.8 Floodplain Reconnection</a>	Mid-Columbia FEG	15-1143	\$385,000	\$1,879,645	
11	<a href="#">NF Manastash Floodplain Restoration</a>	Mid-Columbia FEG / Yakama Nation	15-1144	\$164,000	\$2,043,645	
12	<a href="#">Teaway Floodplain and Side Channel Protection</a>	WDFW/Nature Conservancy	15-1148	\$350,000	\$2,393,645	
13	<a href="#">Ensign Ranch - Big Creek Flow Enhancement Project</a>	WA Water Trust	15-1146	\$146,500	\$2,540,145	
14	<a href="#">Whiskey Creek Fish Passage at EWC</a>	Kittitas County Conservation District	15-1149	\$59,191	\$2,599,336	
15	<a href="#">Yakima &amp; Naches Side Channel Enhancement Design</a>	Mid-Columbia FEG	15-1142	\$100,000	\$2,699,336	

Full Funding	Partial Funding	Alternate Project	Do Not Fund
--------------	-----------------	-------------------	-------------

Notes:

- A. Committee members wish to split the SF Cowiche/NF Manastash proposal into two distinct projects (#1 and #11, respectively) because the Cowiche worksite is a higher priority and has a better cost-benefit ratio.
- B. The Teanaway Floodplain and Side Channel Protection project was moved down from #7 to #12 because reviewers felt the proposal had limited benefit to salmon relative to the cost, and questioned the degree of risk to the riparian habitat if the property is not in conservation. Specifically, they wondered if the landowner could apply deed restrictions to the riparian area before selling. CC members questioned if SRFB was the best funding source for this project and were unable to justify allocating a large percent of funding to a project that they perceived to provide limited benefit for the dollars invested.
- C. The Yakima & Naches Side Channel Enhancement Design proposal was designated as do not fund due to risks and constraints at each work site.

## NF Manastash/SF Cowiche Floodplain Restoration

### Cultural & Social Considerations

	Manastash	Cowiche
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members?	1	1
<b>Both projects received a positive point (+1) because they have the potential to protect or enhance cultural resources for the Yakama Nation and its members.</b>		
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community?	0	0
How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to ESA liabilities for community members?	0	0
How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to recreational opportunities?	0	0
Does project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component?	0	0
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large?	0	0

### Economic Considerations

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential short-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy?	1	1
<b>Both projects were awarded a positive score (+1) due to the potential to create jobs and other opportunities for local contractors and businesses during the construction phase.</b>		
At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential long-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy?	0	0
Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation)?	1	1
<b>Both projects were awarded a positive score (+1) because it is clear how the sponsor plans to spend SRFB grant funding and the budget is clear and reasonable for the work proposed.</b>		
At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?	0	0

### Project Context & Organization Considerations

If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature?	0	0
Is the project innovative, standard, or problematic?	0	0
How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions?	0	1
<b>The SF Cowiche Creek worksite received a positive score (+1) because it complements multiple previous and ongoing projects on Cowiche creek and should result in immediate benefits to fish.</b>		
Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties?	1	1
<b>Both projects were awarded a positive score (+1) because they are likely to provide significant benefits for fish and habitat and the parties involved are experienced.</b>		
<b>Partnerships &amp; Community Support Considerations</b>		
Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project?	0	0
Are the right partners involved to make the project successful?	1	1
<b>Both projects were awarded a positive point (+1) because the proposal demonstrates strong support from multiple stakeholders that have a good track record on previous projects.</b>		
Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal?	1	1
<b>Both projects were awarded a positive point (+1) because they are located on WDFW wildlife areas (Oak Creek and L.T. Murray). WDFW is fully supportive of these two projects and is providing wood to put into the two creeks.</b>		
At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources?	0	0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>

Committee members wish to split the NF Manastash/SF Cowiche project into two distinct projects (#1 and #11, respectively) because the Cowiche worksite is a higher priority and has a better cost-benefit ratio.

## Gold Creek Instream Habitat Design

### Cultural & Social Considerations

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the project has the potential to protect or enhance cultural resources for the Yakama Nation and its members.**

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community? 0

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to ESA liabilities for community members? 0

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to recreational opportunities? 0

Does project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component? 0

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large? 0

### Economic Considerations

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential short-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 0

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential long-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 0

Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation)? 0

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested? 1

**Awarded a positive point (+1) because the cost of the project is reasonable compared with the level of benefit associated with designing in-stream habitat features that will support a population of bull trout that is at risk of extinction.**

### Project Context & Organization Considerations

If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature? 0

Is the project innovative, standard, or problematic? 1

**Awarded a positive point (+1) because the nature of the dewatering issue in Gold Creek is unique in our basin, so any actions to address the problem will be innovative.**

How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions? 1

<b>Awarded a positive point (+1) because this project compliments the previous I-90 bridge construction project, land purchases, and the Gold Creek Assessment.</b>	
Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties?	1
<b>Awarded a positive point (+1) because KCT has worked on large complex projects successfully and has demonstrated the ability to complete this in-stream habitat preliminary design project.</b>	
<b>Partnerships &amp; Community Support Considerations</b>	
Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project?	1
<b>Awarded a positive point (+1) because the project sponsor has shown a commitment to working directly with the various landowners and stakeholders during this planning phase. The Scope of Work also contains budget for continued landowner engagement.</b>	
Are the right partners involved to make the project successful?	1
<b>Awarded a positive point (+1) because KCT has worked on large complex projects successfully and has demonstrated the ability accurately identify stakeholders and work to find collaborative solutions.</b>	
Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal?	0
At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources?	0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>7</b>

The Citizen Committee maintained the Technical Advisory Group’s decision to move the Gold Creek higher on the list because this project has the potential to create significant benefits for a bull trout population that is at high risk of extirpation.

## Naneum, Wilson, and Cherry Creek Assessment (Cost Increase)

Note. The responses below are from the 2013 evaluation.

### Cultural & Social Considerations

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the project has the potential to protect or enhance cultural resources for the Yakama Nation and its members.**

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because it will improve irrigation infrastructure.**

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to ESA liabilities for community members? 0

**The assessment may identify sites where take and entrainment are issues, but these can then be resolved cooperatively through projects identified in the assessment.**

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to recreational opportunities? 0

Does project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the outreach/education element with local community and landowners is a major component of the project.**

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large? 0

### Economic Considerations

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential short-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 0

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential long-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because it has the potential to reduce flood risk.**

Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation)? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because it is clear how the sponsor plans to spend SRFB grant funding and the budget is clear and reasonable for the work proposed.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because it should provide needed information and prioritized next steps in a large area that is important for salmon recovery.**

### Project Context & Organization Considerations

If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because this is the next logical step in developing projects for a large area upstream of past and current projects. Information that can help prioritize both habitat and flood hazard reduction, which is urgently needed in this area.</b>	
Is the project innovative, standard, or problematic?	0
How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because the project will gather information needed to identify and sequence projects in a high priority area important to priority species.</b>	
Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties?	0
<b>Partnerships &amp; Community Support Considerations</b>	
Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because much cooperative work has been completed in the area. Landowners are interested in the potential to see the flooding and infrastructure problems addressed through this assessment.</b>	
Are the right partners involved to make the project successful?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because the proposal demonstrates a strong collaborative approach involving Kittitas County, the Kittitas County Conservation District, and MCFEG. These partners are respected in the community. A number of stream surveys have been completed &amp; the partners can build from existing data.</b>	
Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal?	
Note. This question was not included on the 2013 form, so we do not have a response.	
At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because it has strong support from Kittitas County.</b>	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>11</b>

The Citizen Committee reviewed and discussed the 2015 cost increase request in detail. The items leading to increased costs were recommended and supported by the technical advisory group working on the assessment project. Like the TAG, the Citizen Committee decided to support the cost increase & to use the ranking scores from 2013 to determine the project’s placement on the 2015 ranked list.

## Yakima RM153 Side Channel Connection Enhancement

### Cultural & Social Considerations

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the project has the potential to protect or enhance cultural resources for the Yakama Nation and its members.**

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because it will improve irrigation conveyance and reduce maintenance needs.**

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to ESA liabilities for community members? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because once implemented, it will reduce ESA liability for Bull Canal users.**

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to recreational opportunities? 0

Does project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component? 0

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large? 0

### Economic Considerations

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential short-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because it is likely to create jobs and other opportunities for local contractors and businesses during the construction phase.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential long-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 0

Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation)? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because it is clear how the sponsor plans to spend SRFB grant funding and the budget is clear and reasonable for the work proposed.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because it is a low cost action with significant improvements to a side-channel of Yakima River and several miles of Wilson Creek due to flow benefits.**

### Project Context & Organization Considerations

If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature? <b>Project received a positive point (+1) because it addresses an urgent problem that kills juvenile fish every year.</b>	1
Is the project innovative, standard, or problematic?	0
How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions? <b>Project received a positive point (+1) because completion will immediately prevent dewatering of the Bull Ditch side channel and allow the irrigators to access Yakima R. water, thus increasing the flow in lower Wilson Creek for salmonid rearing. It is contributing to present and future salmon recovery actions, as it relates to resolving the overall Ellensburg area fish passage issues.</b>	1
Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties? <b>Project received a positive point (+1) because MCFEG and Al Potter will be able to successfully complete this project.</b>	1
<b>Partnerships &amp; Community Support Considerations</b>	
Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project?	0
Are the right partners involved to make the project successful? <b>Project received a positive point (+1) because Jeff Brunson of the Bull Ditch Canal Company attended the site tour and is supportive of fixing the rock weir structure.</b>	1
Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal? <b>Project received a positive point (+1) because MCFEG is working with Bull Ditch Canal Company, the City of Ellensburg, and other partners to make sure the project is a success.</b>	1
At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources?	0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>11</b>

## Naneum-Coleman Fish Passage Projects (Cost Increase)

### Cultural & Social Considerations

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the project has the potential to protect or enhance cultural resources for the Yakama Nation and its members.**

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community? 1

**Project was awarded a positive point (+1) because this project will improve irrigation infrastructure.**

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to ESA liabilities for community members? 1

**Project was awarded a positive point (+1) because the screens will prevent fish entrainment.**

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to recreational opportunities? 0

Does project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component? 0

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large? 0

### Economic Considerations

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential short-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 1

**Awarded a positive score (+1) due to the potential to create jobs and other opportunities for local contractors and businesses during the construction phase.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential long-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 0

Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation)? 0

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested? 1

**Awarded a positive point (+1) because the cost of the project is reasonable compared with the level of benefit associated with the removal of significant barriers to listed species in a priority reach.**

### Project Context & Organization Considerations

If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature? 1

<p><b>Project received a positive point (+1) because these are the next fish passage and screening projects in the Naneum and Coleman Cr. systems and provide immediate benefits for fish.</b></p> <p>Is the project innovative, standard, or problematic?</p>	0
<p>How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions?</p> <p><b>Awarded a positive point (+1) because this has been a proposed project for several years and it will make upstream projects on Coleman Creek more effective by getting the downstream to upstream project sequencing right.</b></p>	1
<p>Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties?</p> <p><b>Project was awarded a positive point (+1) because the project, if implemented as proposed, is likely to provide significant benefits for fish and habitat and the parties involved are experienced.</b></p>	1
<p><b>Partnerships &amp; Community Support Considerations</b></p>	
<p>Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project?</p>	0
<p>Are the right partners involved to make the project successful?</p> <p><b>Project received a positive point (+1) because the Yakima Screen Shop is involved.</b></p>	1
<p>Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal?</p> <p><b>Project received a positive point (+1) because the landowners are involved and supportive.</b></p>	1
<p>At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources?</p> <p><b>Project received a positive point (+1) because they have applied for EQIP &amp; Conservation Commission funding.</b></p>	1
<p><b>Total:</b></p>	<b>11</b>

## Yakima River Floodplain Assessment & Final Design

### Cultural & Social Considerations

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the project has the potential to protect or enhance cultural resources for the Yakama Nation and its members.**

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community? 0

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to ESA liabilities for community members? 0

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to recreational opportunities? 0

Does project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component? 0

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large? 0

### Economic Considerations

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential short-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 0

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential long-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 0

Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation)? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because it is clear how the sponsor plans to spend SRFB grant funding and the budget is clear and reasonable for the work proposed.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested? 0

### Project Context & Organization Considerations

If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature? 0

Is the project innovative, standard, or problematic? 0

How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because this proposal complements the BOR's Shaake work and the SRFB Yakima River Hansen Pit to Ringer Loop Assessment, plus the Bull Canal proposal just upstream.**

Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because reviewers believe the assessment and design will result in beneficial fish and habitat projects.**

**Partnerships & Community Support Considerations**

Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project? 0

Are the right partners involved to make the project successful? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because they are working closely with the landowner and DNR. Reviewers expect the project sponsor will build upon and utilize existing modelling from adjacent complementary projects.**

Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because a support letter from the landowner was included in the application showing high commitment to improving his property for ecosystem health and fish.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources? 0

**Total: 6**

## Williams Creek Aquatic Habitat Restoration

### Cultural & Social Considerations

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the project has the potential to protect or enhance cultural resources for the Yakama Nation and its members.**

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community? 0

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to ESA liabilities for community members? 0

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to recreational opportunities? -1

**Project received a negative point (-1) because it will decommission roads that are popular with ORV users.**

Does project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component? 0

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large? 0

### Economic Considerations

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential short-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 1

**Awarded a positive score (+1) due to the potential to create jobs and other opportunities for local contractors and businesses during the construction phase.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential long-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 0

Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation)? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the budget seems reasonable with most funding going to on-the-ground construction.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested? 0

### Project Context & Organization Considerations

If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature? 0

Is the project innovative, standard, or problematic? 0

How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because it is coordinated with the USFS Swauk Pines Watershed Restoration Project.**

Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties? 0

**Partnerships & Community Support Considerations**

Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project? 0

Are the right partners involved to make the project successful? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because reviewers expect KCT to be successful in cooperation with the Cle Elum Ranger District.**

Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because USFS is a project partner and is very interested in the outcome.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources? 0

**Total: 5**

## Ahtanum Creek Riparian Enhancement 2015

### Cultural & Social Considerations

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because the project has the potential to protect or enhance cultural resources for the Yakama Nation and its members.</b>	
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community?	0
How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to ESA liabilities for community members?	0
How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to recreational opportunities?	0
Does project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component?	0
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large?	0

### Economic Considerations

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential short-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy?	1
<b>Awarded a positive score (+1) due to the potential to create jobs and other opportunities for local contractors and businesses during the construction phase.</b>	
At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential long-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy?	0
Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation)?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because it is clear how the sponsor plans to spend SRFB grant funding and the budget is clear and reasonable for the work proposed.</b>	
At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?	0

### Project Context & Organization Considerations

If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because it is being implemented in coordination with a Yakama Nation in-stream restoration project.</b>	
Is the project innovative, standard, or problematic?	0
How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because the proposal corresponds well with the</b>	

<b>2014 assessment project.</b>	
Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because reviewers believe the sponsor can successfully implement the work proposed and that it will result in immediate and longer term benefits to fish and habitat.</b>	
<b>Partnerships &amp; Community Support Considerations</b>	
Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because the project sponsor has been working with the landowners, the WA Cattlemen’s Association, and the Yakima Nation to address limiting factors for fish in Ahtanum Creek.</b>	
Are the right partners involved to make the project successful?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because they are partnering the Yakama Nation on the implementation of this work.</b>	
Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because three out of four landowner acknowledgement forms have been submitted and the fourth is in process.</b>	
At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources?	0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>9</b>

## Parke Creek - Caribou Creek Fish Passage

### Cultural & Social Considerations

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the project has the potential to protect or enhance cultural resources for the Yakama Nation and its members.**

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community? 1

**Project was awarded a positive point (+1) because this project will improve irrigation infrastructure.**

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to ESA liabilities for community members? 1

**Project was awarded a positive point (+1) because the consolidation to a pump diversion will prevent fish entrainment.**

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to recreational opportunities? 0

Does project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component? 0

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large? 0

### Economic Considerations

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential short-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 1

**Awarded a positive score (+1) due to the potential to create jobs and other opportunities for local contractors and businesses during the construction phase.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential long-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 0

Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation)? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because it is clear how the sponsor plans to spend SRFB grant funding and the budget is clear and reasonable for the work proposed.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested? 1

### Project Context & Organization Considerations

If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature? 0

Is the project innovative, standard, or problematic? 0

How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery 1

actions?

**Project received a positive point (+1) because these are the lowest barriers/diversions on Parke and Caribou Creeks.**

Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because reviewers believe the project sponsor can successfully complete the work proposed and provide immediate fish rearing benefits.**

**Partnerships & Community Support Considerations**

Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project? 0

Are the right partners involved to make the project successful? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because KCCD experienced with fish passage and irrigation reconfiguration projects.**

Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the landowners are supportive and KCCD has a great track record with private landowners.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources? 0

**Total: 10**

## Swauk RM 17.3 to 18.8 Floodplain Reconnection

### Cultural & Social Considerations

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the project has the potential to protect or enhance cultural resources for the Yakama Nation and its members.**

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community? 0

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to ESA liabilities for community members? 0

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to recreational opportunities? 0

Does project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component? 0

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large? 0

### Economic Considerations

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential short-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 1

**Awarded a positive score (+1) due to the potential to create jobs and other opportunities for local contractors and businesses during the construction phase.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential long-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 0

Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation)? 0

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested? 0

### Project Context & Organization Considerations

If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the project aligns well with the WSDOT culvert/passage work planned at US-97.**

Is the project innovative, standard, or problematic? 0

How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions? 0

Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties? 0

<b>Partnerships &amp; Community Support Considerations</b>	
Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project?	0
Are the right partners involved to make the project successful?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because MCFEG has been working closely with DOT partners on this project. High confidence that MCFEG will continue to engage the appropriate partners.</b>	
Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal?	0
At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources?	0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>4</b>

## Teaway Floodplain and Side Channel Protection

### Cultural & Social Considerations

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the project has the potential to protect or enhance cultural resources for the Yakama Nation and its members.**

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community? 0

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to ESA liabilities for community members? 0

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to recreational opportunities? 0

Does project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component? 0

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large? 0

### Economic Considerations

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential short-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 0

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential long-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 0

Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation)? 0

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested? -1

**Project received a negative point (-1) because it is expensive and many parts of property have low direct impact on habitat quality for anadromous fish.**

### Project Context & Organization Considerations

If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because there is an option to purchase the land now, but the owners will put the property on the market if the option is not exercised by early 2016.**

Is the project innovative, standard, or problematic? 0

How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions? 1

**The project received a positive point (+1) because the proposal is well sequenced with the Teanaway Community Forest purchase.**

Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties? 0

**Partnerships & Community Support Considerations**

Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project? 0

Are the right partners involved to make the project successful? 0

Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal? 1

**The project received a positive point (+1) because the landowners are motivated sellers; and would prefer to sell to TPL and WDFW to assure public ownership.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources? 1

**The project received a positive point (+1) because the sponsor is using SRFB funds to leverage significant additional funding.**

**Total: 4**

The Teanaway Floodplain and Side Channel Protection project was moved down from #7 to #12 because reviewers felt the proposal had limited benefit to salmon relative to the cost, and questioned the degree of risk to the riparian habitat if the property if it is not in conservation. Specifically, they wondered if the landowner could apply deed restrictions to the riparian area before selling. CC members questioned if SRFB was the best funding source for this project and were unable to justify allocating a large percent of funding to a project that they perceived to provide limited benefit for the dollars invested.

## Ensign Ranch - Big Creek Flow Enhancement Project

### Cultural & Social Considerations

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the project has the potential to protect or enhance cultural resources for the Yakama Nation and its members.**

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community? 0

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to ESA liabilities for community members? 1

**Project was awarded a positive point (+1) because fish entrainment will no longer be an issue after the irrigation diversion is closed and the new diversion on the Yakima River will have up to date and compliant screens.**

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to recreational opportunities? 0

Does project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component? 0

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large? 0

### Economic Considerations

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential short-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 1

**Awarded a positive score (+1) due to the potential to create jobs and other opportunities for local contractors and businesses during the construction phase.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential long-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 0

Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation)? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because it is clear how the sponsor plans to spend SRFB grant funding and the budget is clear and reasonable for the work proposed.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested? 0

### Project Context & Organization Considerations

If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature? 0

Is the project innovative, standard, or problematic? 0

How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because after completion of the Big Creek fish passage project, this is the next step to address the fish screening needs.**

Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because reviewers believe that WA Water Trust can successfully implement the project as proposed.**

**Partnerships & Community Support Considerations**

Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project? 0

Are the right partners involved to make the project successful? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because WA Water Trust specializes in water trust and conservation projects.**

Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the landowner participated in 2014 with the Yakama Nation's Big Creek Fish Passage Project and remains interested in completing this work.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the project sponsor is using this grant to leverage other funding sources (water acquisition payments).**

**Total: 9**

The Citizen Committee agreed with the Technical Advisory Group that it would be appropriate for the sponsor to re-assess the need for the project once the PHABSIM data is available.

## Whiskey Creek Fish Passage at EWC

### Cultural & Social Considerations

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the project has the potential to protect or enhance cultural resources for the Yakama Nation and its members.**

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community? 1

**Project was awarded a positive point (+1) because this project will improve irrigation infrastructure.**

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to ESA liabilities for community members? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because the siphon will provide unimpeded fish passage.**

How will the project create benefits or raise concerns in regard to recreational opportunities? 0

Does project propose a planned and compelling education and outreach component? 0

Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large? 0

### Economic Considerations

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential short-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 0

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), what is the potential long-term impact on the Yakima Basin economy? 0

Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable for the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation)? 1

**Project received a positive point (+1) because it is clear how the sponsor plans to spend SRFB grant funding and the budget is clear and reasonable for the work proposed.**

At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), how much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested? 0

### Project Context & Organization Considerations

If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature? 0

Is the project innovative, standard, or problematic? 0

How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions? 0

Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties?	1
<b>Project was awarded a positive point (+1) because the project, if implemented as proposed, is likely to provide benefits for fish and the parties involved are experienced.</b>	
<b>Partnerships &amp; Community Support Considerations</b>	
Does the proposal demonstrate the breadth and strength of community/citizen involvement in the project?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because the Kittitas County Conservation District has a good reputation for involving the appropriate stakeholders in their projects.</b>	
Are the right partners involved to make the project successful?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because Ellensburg Water Company is involved and is supportive of the proposal.</b>	
Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal?	1
<b>Project received a positive point (+1) because the landowner is supportive and attended the site visit.</b>	
At the current stage of the proposed project (assessment/design/implementation), is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources?	0
<b>Total:</b>	<b>8</b>

The Citizen Committee agreed with the Technical Advisory Group that this proposal may be out of sequence with the assessment on Naneum, Wilson and Cherry Creeks other downstream barriers. The CC removed the “defer” classification from the official list so the project design can move forward, should funds become available.

## **Yakima & Naches Side Channel Enhancement Design**

The Citizen Committee agreed with the Technical Advisory Group’s “Do Not Fund” designation and did not complete the task of ranking this project as a group.

Several individual members did evaluate the proposal in advance of the meeting and felt that the Do Not Fund designation was appropriate based on their low scores. Reviewers thought the proposal lacked specific plans for each site and was in need of further scoping.