YAKIMA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY BOARD

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

September 14, 2012

Dear SRFB Staff and Review Panel,

We are pleased to present you with the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board's 2012 Lead Entity Ranked Project List and a Regional Area Funding Report that describes the process used to create this list. We look forward to working with you between now and December to review this list and present it to the SRFB Board for approval. Please feel free to contact us directly with any questions or comments.

Thank you for your ongoing support.

Sincerely,

Darcy Batura
Lead Entity Program Coordinator
dbatura@ybfwrb.org

Alex Conley
Executive Director
aconley@ybfwrb.org

2012 Yakima Basin Regional Area Funding Report

1. Internal Funding Allocations

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

The Mid-Columbia Region was allocated $ 1,776,600 for the 2012 SRFB grant round. As defined by the GSRO, the Mid-Columbia Region includes WRIAs #30 (Klickitat), #31 (Rock-Glade), #37 (Lower Yakima), #38 (Naches) and #39 (Upper Yakima).

The Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board is the Salmon Recovery Regional Organization for the Yakima Basin (WRIAs 37, 38 & 39). The Board is also under contract with RCO to serve as the Lead Entity for these three WRIAs. There is no regional organization serving WRIAs 30 and 31. WRIAs 30 & 31 are part of the Klickitat Lead Entity. The Klickitat Lead Entity also includes part of WRIA 29, which is not in the Mid-Columbia Region.

Because there is not a single regional organization that includes both the areas served by the Yakima Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board and that portion of the Klickitat Lead Entity's area that is within the Mid-Columbia Region, the two organizations enter into discussions each year about how to divide the Mid-Columbia allocation between them.

The YBFWRB and the Klickitat Lead Entity agreed to submit separate Lead Entity lists for 2012 and to divide funding between the two lists based on an agreed-upon allocation. The two groups initially planned around a 70/30% share, and continue to work together to adjust final project funding amounts to arrive at a negotiated split that matches the total allocation. The total SRFB funding request for the Yakima Basin LE project list is $1,335,900 (75.2%) and the Klickitat LE project list is $537,380 (30.2%), for a total of $1,873,280. This exceeds our regionals allocation by $96,680 or 5.4%. Our project sponsors are working to identify ways to reduce their overall request, which will allow our combined total to match the $1,776,600 regional allocation.

Funding & Requests	Totals	Percent (%)
Total Allocation	$1,776,600	100%
Yakima Basin LE List (without alternates)	$1,335,900	75.2%
Klickitat LE List (without alternates)	$537,380	30.2%
Remaining Balance	($96,680)	105.4%

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

2. Regional Technical Review Process

A. Explain how the regional technical review was conducted.

In the Yakima portion of the Middle Columbia River region, the Regional Organization and the Lead Entity are the same organization. We ran the Lead Entity process using the Yakima Lead Entity's existing Technical Advisory Group (TAG) as the technical review team. Given that 1) the area covered by the Lead Entity and the regional organization is identical, and 2) most potential candidates for serving on a

regional technical review team were already serving on the lead entity review team, the YBFWRB saw no reason to convene a separate review team. If in the future, there is agreement among all parties that we should develop a regional review that involves multiple Lead Entities, we would work with other parties to develop a separate regional technical review process.

B. What criteria were used for the regional technical review?

The Lead Entity used the same evaluation criteria for both the regional and local review. See the local review process below in question 4A.

C. Who completed the review, and are they part of the regional organization or independent?

Participants in the 2012 YBFWRB SRFB Technical Advisory Group are listed below. Participants were chosen to assure 1) a broad range of knowledge about fisheries and habitat restoration in the Yakima Basin, 2) inclusion of participants from all parts of the basin (upper, mid and lower), and 3) representation of the full range of organizations active in fisheries and watershed management in the basin. The TAG is a long-standing committee that the Lead Entity has used in past SRFB project reviews, and in the Yakima Subbasin Review of BPA proposals conducted by the YBFWRB in the spring of 2006. All of the voting members are independent of the regional organization in that they work with the Lead Entity as representatives of their individual organizations, and are not otherwise directly affiliated with the regional organization.

Yakima Basin Technical Advisory Group:

Richard Visser, US Fish & Wildlife Service, Restoration Biologist
Dale Bambrick, NOAA Fisheries, Eastern Washington Branch Chief
John Easterbrooks, WDFW, Regional Fish Program Manager
Joel Freudenthal, Yakima County, Fish & Wildlife Biologist
Anna Lael, Kittitas County Conservation District, District Manager
Paul LaRiviere, WDFW, Instream Flow Biologist
David Lind, Yakama Nation, Fisheries Biologist
Pat Monk, US Fish & Wildlife Service, Fisheries Biologist
Scott Nicolai, Yakama Nation, Yakima Klickitat Fisheries Project Habitat Biologist
Tom Ring, Yakama Nation, Hydrogeologist
Jeff Thomas, US Fish & Wildlife Service, Fisheries Biologist
Sean Gross, NOAA Fisheries, Fisheries Biologist
Rebecca Wassell, MCRFEG, Project Manager
David Child, Fish Biologist, Yakima Basin Joint Board
Arden Thomas, Fish Biologist, Bureau of Reclamation

D. Were there any projects submitted to the SRFB for funding that were not specifically identified in the regional implementation plan or habitat work schedule? If so, please provide justification for including these projects to the list of projects recommended to the SRFB for funding. If the projects were identified in the regional implementation plan or strategy but considered a low priority or in a low priority area, please provide justification.

All but one of the projects submitted for the 2012 SRFB grant round are identified in the Yakima Steelhead Recovery Plan. The actions database included in the plan is recognized as our implementation schedule of actions as per correspondence dated October 20, 2008 from the Governor's Salmon

Recovery Office. The one project not identified in the Yakima Steelhead Recovery Plan is the Gold Creek Habitat Assessment + Conceptual Design project, which is identified as a high priority project in the just completed Yakima Bull Trout Action Plan (BTAP). We are currently working to incorporate both Bull Trout and Steelhead actions into a joint implementation schedule.

3. How did your regional review consider whether a project:

A. Provides benefit to high priority stocks for the purpose of salmon recovery or sustainability. In addition to limiting factors analysis, SASSI and SSHIAP, what stock assessment work has been done to date to further characterize the status of salmonid species in the region? Briefly describe.

Steelhead and bull trout are the ESA listed species in the Yakima Basin, and all stocks are high priority for recovery actions. The Yakima Steelhead Recovery Plan dated August 2009 contains the most current data and local knowledge of the status of steelhead populations. As indicated in the plan, "Ongoing monitoring of steelhead populations will be required to allow objective comparisons between current status and trends of key VSP parameters and recovery criteria. This work should be closely coordinated among NOAA Fisheries, the Interior Columbia Technical Recovery Team, WDFW, the Yakama Nation, and the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board." The draft Yakima Bull Trout Action Plan was completed this year in cooperation with U.S. Fish & Wildlife as an update to the Board's 2005 Salmon Recovery Plan. The TAG utilizes a matrix that is designed to prioritize projects based on their specific contributions to habitat protection and enhancement for target species:

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

B. Address cost effectiveness. Provide a description of how cost-effectiveness was considered.

Both our TAG and CC evaluated project budgets as a part of the ranking process. The TAG assigned each project a high, medium, or low certainty of success score based on:

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

Our CC also scores projects based on their assessment of whether a budget is reasonable relative to other similar projects and the proposal's expected benefits. The scores for each project for both the TAG and CC process are included in question 4.

As both committees have evaluated projects over the past few years, they have been concerned about the increasing cost of implementing projects. As in previous years, the focus was proactive – asking sponsors to adjust their budgets and remove cost elements from projects that they felt weren't the best use of limited salmon recovery funds. In response to these concerns, our TAG is considering the addition of a new "cost effectiveness weighting factor" in their scoring matrix.

4. Local Review Process

A. Provide project evaluation criteria and documentation (local technical reviewer and citizen committee score sheet or comment forms) of your local Citizens Advisory Group and Technical Advisory Group ratings for each project, including explanations for difference between the two group's ratings.

Local Pre-Application Process

The Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board requested pre-applications for potential projects that qualified for SRFB funding in March 2012. We posted the RFP on the YBFWRB website and distributed it via email networks that we expanded from previous years. On April 2, 2012, the Board received 19 pre-applications.

2012 Yakima Basin SRFB Pre-Applications

1	Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem Restoration, Ph 2	City of Yakima
2	Yakima Floodplain/WSDOT Property Design Extension	City of Yakima
3	Ellensburg Water Co - Coleman Creek Intersection	Kittitas County Cons District
4	Olson Ditch - Dry Creek Intersection	Kittitas County Cons District
5	West Side Irrigation Co - Manastash Creek Intersection	Kittitas County Cons District
6	Caribou-Parke Creek Projects	Kittitas County Cons District
7	Hanson Pits Floodplain Project	Kittitas County Cons District
8	Gold Creek Bull Trout Assessment & Conceptual Design	Kittitas Conservation Trust
9	Upper Yakima Tributary Nutrient Enhancement	Mid-Columbia RFEG
10	Wide Hollow Creek Restoration Feasibility Analysis	Mid-Columbia RFEG
11	Toppenish Creek Passage Enhancement	Mid-Columbia RFEG
12	Scott Ditch Fish Screening	N. Yakima Cons District
13	CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water	N. Yakima Cons District
14	CCWUA Pump Station & Barrier Removal	N. Yakima Cons District
15	Wapato Reach Flood Fencing & Riparian Planting	Yakama Nation
16	L Cowiche Channel Restoration	Yakima County
17	Lester Property Acquisition	Yakima County

18	Sportsmen/Greenway Habitat Enhancement	Yakima County
19	Comprehensive Study to Exchange Water from the Tieton Basin to the Cowiche Basin through the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District Main Canal and Delivery System	Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District

Board staff compiled these proposals, and scheduled pre-application conferences with the proponents on April 10, 11, 12, and 16. The pre-application review committee was comprised of:

Darcy Batura, Program Coordinator, YBFWRB
Alex Conley, Executive Director, YBFWRB
Yuki Reiss, Recovery Coordinator, YBFWRB
Jennifer Scott, YTAHP (Yakima Tributary Access and Habitat Program) Permit Writer

The purpose of the pre-application conferences was to provide suggestions and feedback to the applicants regarding their proposals, and to address any potential problems early in the process. Proponents also used these conferences as an opportunity to discuss other potential projects with the committee and further flesh out their ideas. On May 10, 2012, applicants submitted 12 of the 19 pre-applications.

2012 Yakima Basin SRFB Applications

Project #	Project Name	Sponsor
12-1328	CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water	North Yakima Conservation District
12-1324	CCWUA Pump Station & Barrier Removal	North Yakima Conservation District
12-1350	YTID Tieton to Cowiche Delivery Assessment	Yakima Tieton Irrigation District
12-1353	Ellensburg Water Co - Coleman Creek Intersection	Kittitas County Conservation District
12-1306	Gold Creek Habitat Assessment + Conceptual Design	Kittitas Conservation Trust
12-1358	Yakima River Assessment - Hansen Pits to Ringer Loop	Kittitas County Conservation District
12-1327	Naches River Ramblers' Acquisition and Restoration	Yakima County
12-1317	Yakima River Gap to Gap Habitat Enhancement	Yakima County

12-1321	Toppenish Creek Passage Enhancement	Mid-Columbia FEG
12-1356	West Side Irrigating Co - Manastash Crk Siphon	Kittitas County Conservation District
12-1319	Wide Hollow Creek Restoration Feasibility Analysis	Mid-Columbia FEG
12-1307	Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem, Ph 2	City of Yakima

Board staff reviewed these applications for completeness, and then compiled reference binders containing color copies of each application in its entirety. We distributed binders to Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and Citizens Committee (CC) members that requested hard copies for review between May 16 and 24. We also sent copies to the state review panel members scheduled to visit our basin. Extra copies were available after that date for other interested parties. Approximately 50% of our committee members opted for an electronic review via PRISM Snapshot rather than receiving a binder.

Site Tour with State Review Panel Representatives

The Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board invited the SRFB Review Panel to tour our 12 project sites on June 4 – 6, 2012. The panel members selected to visit the Yakima Basin projects were Patty Michak and E. Steven Toth, with Kay Caromile of the RCO joining them. Panel members received copies of the application binders to review prior to the tour. The tour visited all project sites except for the YTID Tieton to Cowiche Delivery Assessment site, as we agreed before the visit that sponsor would prepare an office presentation for this project.

Board staff invited TAG and CC members to participate in this process. David Child (TAG), Sean Gross (TAG), Pat Monk (TAG), Arden Thomas (TAG), Becca Wassell (TAG), Onni Perala (CC), McClure Tosh (CC), and Cynthia Wilkerson (CC) joined us for the site visits. The panel members asked questions and addressed their concerns with project applicants and Board staff. A summary of on-site discussion and potential concerns was sent to project sponsors immediately following the site visits. Kay Caromile forwarded the State Review Panel's official written comments to the YBFWRB staff on June 18. These comments were shared with applicants and TAG and CC members, and applicants were asked to address these issues to strengthen their proposals as they entered them into PRISM.

Between June 6 and July 3, applicants had the opportunity to submit any changes or adjustments to their applications so a packet containing amended applications could be prepared two weeks prior to the TAG review.

See Appendix B: SRFB Site Visit Agenda

Presentations to Reviewers

On June 28, applicants presented their projects to members of the TAG and CC. Each applicant had 30 minutes to present an overview of their projects and answer questions posed by TAG and CC members present. This initial meeting was an opportunity for TAG and CC members to become more familiar with the projects, and to raise any potential issues that they would like to see sponsors address.

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

Technical Advisory Group Review Process

The TAG met on July 17 from 8:30 am – 4:30 pm in the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board office in Yakima to review the applications. The Board staff provided the members with updates and changes to proposals. To help expedite the review, Board staff converted the TAG Biological Matrix into an online survey and encouraged committee members to complete their review in advance of the TAG meeting. Those results were averaged and presented to the TAG members as a starting point for the project scoring.

TAG Criteria

For the regional and local technical review, we used two sets of criteria to rank projects.

1. TAG Biological Matrix: The TAG used this tool to award projects a score based on its possible and intended biological benefit. The maximum score a project can receive is listed under possible score – projects can receive partial points. This score is adjusted based on two weighting factors; habitat quantity and quality and biological certainty. The final score was normalized so that the maximum possible score for a project cannot exceed 100.

2. TAG Evaluation Form: This worksheet lists several "certainty of success" categories, and TAG members use it as a guide to discuss factors not addressed in the matrix. The main intent of these forms is to help maintain consistency in the project evaluations, and to help LE staff document the discussion.

See Appendix D: TAG Matrix

See Appendix E: TAG Evaluation Sheet

See Appendix F: TAG Meeting Minutes

Citizens Committee Review Process

The Citizens Committee membership was selected based on location within the basin and representation of a wide variety of interests within the community.

2012 Yakima Basin Citizens Committee participants

Mark Charlton, Matt Eslinger, Cynthia Wilkerson & David Bowen	(Kittitas County)
Neil McClure & Don Chaplin, Onni Perala, & Bill Gillespie	(Yakima County)
Tony Monroe, Tuck Russell, McClure Tosch, & Emily Washines	(Yakama Nation)
Jack Clark, Kathryn Knutson, Ben Dow, & John O'Leary	(Benton County)
TAG representation: Sean Gross & John Easterbrooks	
Staff: Alex Conley, Darcy Batura, & Heather Hadsel	

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

See Appendix G: Community Evaluation and Scoring Criteria

The Citizens Committee convened on August 9, 2012, at the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board Office to evaluate the SRFB projects. Prior to meeting, they received updated project applications, comments from the state review panel visit, and notes and priority ranking from the TAG review.

See Appendix H: Citizen's Committee Scoring Results

See Appendix I: Citizen's Committee Meeting Minutes

The TAG and the CC each have distinctive roles in the prioritization of projects. The TAG is responsible for determining the technical validity of a project, and how valuable the project is to salmonid populations. The CC 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's Committee (CC) and approved by the Board of Directors (Board). The Technical Advisory Group (TAG) develops a recommended ranking by considering the TAG 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 TAG then submits its recommended ranking to the Citizen Committee for review. The Citizen's committee then evaluates the project based on its set of criteria, and adjusts the TAGs proposed ranking based on its evaluation. The CC's proposed project ranking is then submitted to the Board for approval. Note that the Board can remand the list to the CC 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.

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

Yakima Basin Technical Advisory Group

Richard Visser, US Fish & Wildlife Service, Restoration Biologist
Dale Bambrick, NOAA Fisheries, Eastern Washington Branch Chief
John Easterbrooks, WDFW, Regional Fish Program Manager

Joel Freudenthal, Yakima County, Fish & Wildlife Biologist
Anna Lael, Kittitas County Conservation District, District Manager
Paul LaRiviere, WDFW, Instream Flow Biologist
David Lind, Yakama Nation, Fisheries Biologist
Pat Monk, US Fish & Wildlife Service, Fisheries Biologist
Scott Nicolai, Yakima Klickitat Fisheries Project Habitat Biologist
Tom Ring, Yakama Nation, Hydrogeologist
Jeff Thomas, US Fish & Wildlife Service, Fisheries Biologist
Sean Gross, NOAA Fisheries, Fisheries Biologist
Rebecca Wassell, MCRFEG, Project Manager
David Child, Joint Irrigation Board, Fish Biologist
Arden Thomas, US Bureau of Reclamation, Fish Biologist

C. Explain how and when the SRFB Review Panel participated in your process (e.g., early in the process, throughout, late; technical and citizen processes).

The SRFB participation started with the site visits on June 4, 5 and 6. They provided feedback to staff and applicants on site, and followed up with their written comments. They also provided LE staff with feedback on some of the technicalities of applications such as eligibility, budget formatting, and wording. Patty Michak attended our TAG review on July 17. They were both tremendous assets to our process as they provided feedback to our TAG members based on site visits while at the same time taking into consideration the local expertise when the TAG evaluated projects. We are pleased with how well their involvement enhances our review process, and will continue to work to increase their involvement.

5. Local Evaluation Process and Project Lists

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

The August 2009 Yakima Steelhead Recovery outlines a list of 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 project in their application, and during the TAG evaluation process, we determined if a project had a high, medium or low fit to the recovery plan. This information is included in the summary of our TAG discussion in the outline of the local review process in question 4.

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

Upon completion of the TAG's review and scoring, the Lead Entity's CC reviews and ranks the projects. Citizen's committee members may include individual citizens, local, state, federal and tribal government representatives, community groups, environmental and fisheries groups, conservation districts, and industry. The citizen's committee is critical to ensure that biological priorities and projects identified by the TAG 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 CC reviews the TAG'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 & effective resource use, community support, and partner support. The Citizens Committee develops the final recommended ranked project list. The Committee takes the recommendations of the TAG into consideration, but they are not obligated to maintain the same ranking given to projects by the TAG if they feel a project's ranking needs to be adjusted based the Citizen's Committees evaluation.

On August 16, the Board met and reviewed the ranked Lead Entity list submitted by the Citizen's Committee, and approved the list unanimously.

See Appendix J: LE Ranked List (SRFB Appendix F)

Appendices

Regional Area Project Matrix

For more information on questions 3C-3I, see Appendix N.
Region: Middle Columbia River - Yakima Basin

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	3 C. Primary Fish Stock Benefited	3 C. Name of listed species	3 C. Other species benefiting from this project	3 D. Preserves high quality habitat	3 E. Priority in recovery plan or strategy (list page)	3 F. Match percentage	3 G. Sponsor record of SRFB project implementation	3 H. Veteran involved	3 I. Puget Sound Partner	3 I. Listed in Action Agenda
1	12-1328	CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water	North Yakima Conservation District	Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Spring Chinook, Coho, Bull Trout	N/A	Naches Action #21, Reduce irrigation diversions from Cowiche Creek (p. 173). Naches Action #22, Improve riparian, floodplain and temperature conditions in Cowiche Creek (p. 174).	37.85%	10 Awarded 7 Complete	No	N/A	N/A
2	12-1327	Naches River Ramblers' Acquisition and Restoration	Yakima County Public Services	Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Spring Chinook, Coho, Bull Trout	Yes	Naches Action #5: Restore lower Naches River floodplain (p. 163). Naches Action #6: Improve sediment transport in lower Naches River (p. 164).	15.19%	9 Awarded 4 Complete	No	N/A	N/A
3	12-1358	Yakima River Assessment - Hansen Pits to Ringer Loop	Kittitas County Conservation District	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Spring Chinook, Coho, Bull Trout	N/A	Upper Yakima Action #12: Reduce confinement of Upper Yakima River (p. 196).	19.63%	14 Awarded 9 Complete	No	N/A	N/A
4	12-1306	Gold Creek Habitat Assessment + Conceptual Design	Kittitas Conservation Trust	Gold Creek Bull Trout population	Columbia River Bull Trout DPS	N/A	N/A	Gold #1: Conduct complex hydro-geomorphic evaluation in lower Gold Creek to determine the causal mechanisms (and possible solutions) for annual dewatering (Yakima Bull Trout Action Plan p. 141).	15%	7 Awarded 5 Complete	No	N/A	N/A

5	12-1317	Yakima River Gap to Gap Habitat Enhancement	Yakima County Public Services	Upper Yakima and Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Coho, spring Chinook, Rainbow, Cutthroat, Pacific Lamprey	N/A	Lower Mainstem Action #6: Restore mainstem and side channel habitats in the Union Gap reach (p. 156). Basin wide Action #12: Improve Recruitment of Cottonwoods (p. 151).	16.18%	5 Awarded	No	N/A	N/A
6	12-1350	YTID Tieton to Cowiche Delivery Assessment	Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District	Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Spring Chinook, Coho, Bull Trout	N/A	Naches Action #21, Reduce irrigation diversions from Cowiche Creek (p. 173). Naches Action #22, Improve riparian, floodplain and temperature conditions in Cowiche Creek (p. 174).	75%	No previous projects	No	N/A	N/A
7	12-1307	Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem, Ph 2	City of Yakima	Upper Yakima and Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Coho, spring Chinook, Rainbow, Cutthroat, Pacific Lamprey	N/A	Lower Mainstem Action #6: Restore mainstem and side channel habitats in the Union Gap reach (p. 156).	23.08%	2 Awarded 1 Complete	No	N/A	N/A
8	12-1353	Ellensburg Water Co - Coleman Creek Intersection	Kittitas County Conservation District	Upper Yakima steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Spring Chinook, Coho	N/A	Upper Yakima Action #11: Restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries (p. 195).	23%	14 Awarded 9 Complete	No	N/A	N/A
9	12-1319	Wide Hollow Creek Restoration Feasibility Analysis	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	Upper Yakima and Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Spring Chinook, Coho, Bull Trout	N/A	Naches Action #28: Protect Ahtanum Creek riparian areas to lessen development impacts (p. 177).	15.07%	13 Awarded 3 Complete	No	N/A	N/A

10	12-1324	CCWUA Pump Station & Barrier Removal	North Yakima Conservation District	Naches steelhead	Mid Columbia steelhead	Spring Chinook, Coho, Bull Trout	N/A	Naches Action #21, Reduce irrigation diversions from Cowiche Creek (p. 173). Naches Action #22, Improve riparian, floodplain and temperature conditions in Cowiche Creek (p. 174).	25.53%	10 Awarded 7 Complete	No	N/A	N/A

Appendix B: Yakima Basin SRFB Site Visits Agenda

2012 YBFWRB SRFB Site Visit Schedule
June 4 – 6, 2012

Monday, June 4:	**Yakima County**
1:00 – 1:30 pm	Overview of Day's Presentations & Tour
1:30 – 2:15	YTID Tieton to Cowiche Delivery Assessment (Office)
2:30 – 3:00	Travel to Cowiche Creek Area
3:00 – 3:45	CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water CCWUA Pump Station & Barrier Removal
4:00 pm	Option to join us for a short hike along the Cowiche Canyon Trail, or return to YBFWRB Office.
Tuesday, June 5:	**Yakima County**
8:30 – 9:00	Overview of Day's Presentations & Tour
9:00 – 10:00	Travel in vans from YBFWRB Office to Toppenish
10:00 – 10:45	Toppenish Creek Passage Enhancement
11:30 – 12:15	Wide Hollow Creek Restoration Feasibility Analysis
12:20 – 1:20 pm	LUNCH (Overview of Gap to Gap @ KOA)
1:45 – 2:30	Yakima River Gap to Gap Habitat Enhancement
2:45 – 3:30	Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem, Ph 2
3:50 – 4:35	Naches River Ramblers' Acquisition and Restoration
5:00 pm	Return to YBFWRB Office
Wednesday, June 6:	**Kittitas County**
8:30 am	Leave YBFWRB Office
9:15 – 9:30	Overview of Day's Presentations & Tour (@ Bar 14)
9:45 – 10:30	Hanson Pits Floodplain Project
11:00 – 11:45	Ellensburg Water Co - Coleman Creek Intersection
12:00 – 12:45 pm	LUNCH @ Dakota Café
1:15 – 2:00	West Side Irrigating Co - Manastash Crk Siphon
3:00 – 3:45	Gold Creek Bull Trout Assessment & Conceptual Design
5:15 pm	Return to YBFWRB Office

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

2012 SRFB Sponsor Presentations
June 28, 2012 • 8:30 am – 4:45 pm
1110 West Lincoln Avenue, YBFWRB Office

Time	Project Name
8:30 - 9:00	Welcome, Introductions, Overview of Process
9:00 - 9:30	West Side Irrigating Co - Manastash Crk Siphon
9:30 - 10:00	Ellensburg Water Co - Coleman Creek Intersection
10:00 - 10:15	BREAK
10:15 - 10:45	YTID Tieton to Cowiche Delivery Assessment
10:45 - 11:15	CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water
11:15 - 11:45	CCWUA Pump Station & Barrier Removal
11:45 - 12:30	LUNCH
12:30 - 1:00	Yakima River Gap to Gap Habitat Enhancement
1:00 - 1:30	Hanson Pits Floodplain Restoration Project
1:30 - 2:00	Toppenish Creek Passage Enhancement
2:00 - 2:30	Wide Hollow Creek Restoration Feasibility Analysis
2:30 - 2:45	BREAK
2:45 - 3:15	Naches River Ramblers' Acquisition and Restoration
3:15 - 3:45	Gold Creek Habitat Assessment + Conceptual Design
3:45 - 4:15	Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem, Ph 2
4:15 - 4:45	Additional discussion & wrap up

2012 TAG/CC SRFB Proposal Presentations – Minutes

Those present:
CC members: Ben Dow, Bill Gillespie, Kathryn Knutson, Onni Perala, Don Chaplin, Tuck Russell

TAG members: John Easterbrooks, Joel Freudenthal, David Lind, Richard Visser, Anna Lael, Paul LaRiviere, Sean Gross, Becca Wassell, David Child, Tom Ring, Arden Thomas

Sponsors: David Gerth, Anna Lael, Justin Bader, Mike Tobin, Joel Freudenthal, Becca Wassell, Ryan Anderson, Rick Dieker

Staff – Darcy Batura, Alex Conley, Yuki Reiss, & Heather Hadsel

The meeting began with introductions and a review of the agenda. Darcy provided an overview of the grant process, goals of the sponsor presentations, and reviewed the roles of presenters and committee members.

West Side Irrigating Co - Manastash Crk Siphon

Sponsor and committee members agreed that we need to identify the current condition once creek levels drop to determine if it is still a barrier or partial barrier. Committee members asked the sponsor to explain the problem with the siphon and what will change. Sponsor replied that there will be no change to the siphon – it was a poor design to begin with and only had 1 foot of fill over it. Landowners wanted to change to a flume, but it would be within 1 foot of the 100 year flood. Approach to the problem involves constructing a roughened channel over the siphon (Easty asked if it will wash away during flood events?). Sponsor will try to complete a barrier inventory by July 3. Committee members stated that it may be premature to make a call if this is a passage issue. Might be reasonable to wait and watch. What do you & Brent think the real risks are? Please try to provide specifics about when will it be a passage problem, when do those flows occur, and what life stages are affected. What is the back-up plan if they don't get funding? If it is not a barrier – replacing a siphon for other reasons isn't a SRFB concern.

Ellensburg Water Co - Coleman Creek Intersection

Anna Lael gave an overview of the project and continuing work with downstream landowners on addressing barriers. Two irrigation diversions left at Olmstead Park and they are looking for options. The park has gone through major budget cuts, lost their ranger, etc. Working with the downstream landowner is working – KCCD got signed commitment. KCCD is also doing a sprinkler conversion. Committee members asked about the next barrier upstream. Sponsor explained that it involves dual perched culverts, and that she is working with GIS staff on a map to illustrate the barriers. Project sponsor applied to Ecology's 319 in 2011 to address the $212K budget shortfall; however, it was thrown out for eligibility. They plan to try again this fall.

YTID Tieton to Cowiche Delivery Assessment

Project sponsor gave an overview of the YTID irrigation system and an update on the Board's position; they still have concerns but remain engaged in discussions. CCWUA have questions about cost to them. Sponsor was asked if there has been an analysis about the quantity of water

that could be delivered with current system. Mr. Dieker replied that they could convey 10 cfs. The plumbing is the easy part. Mike will display the turnouts in his presentation. Sponsor was asked about the specific benefits to fish and explained that the benefits are derived from water left in Cowiche Creek from Lust all the way to the mouth of Cowiche.

CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water / CCWUA Pump Station & Barrier Removal

Project sponsor explained both applications and how both approaches to will benefit fish in Cowiche Creek. CCWUA have a very old priority date, so it is valuable for trust and/or purchase. TU has a water rights evaluation process that they complete prior to purchase. Estimated value of the water to be trusted is $250K. If the YTID Board decides not to participate, the CCWUA plans to install a pump station below Zimmerman Bridge. Sponsor was asked if they would need to maintain the pump station, and they replied no; they can install an off channel vault that will eliminate need for a fish screen.

Yakima River Gap to Gap Habitat Enhancement

Sponsor explained the proposals goals and objectives. Committee members asked the sponsor to confirm that they are essentially proposing to make 'nicks' to encourage the natural process, and they replied yes; create pilot channels and let the river do what the river will do. When asked how they plant to get rid of the reed canary grass, they explained that they will shade it out with plantings. Plant the largest cottonwoods they can & mulch & mow.

Yakima River Assessment Hanson Pits to Ringer Loop

Sponsor explained that the proposed assessment extends from Thorp Rd. to Thrall Rd. and the Schaake setback, just upstream of the reach. The County is currently updating its shoreline master plan & CAO. Lidar, air photos, bathometric data are already complete. Sponsor plans to utilize a Technical Working Group and provide a technical memo as a deliverable. Committee members suggested expanding the line to the mouth of Wilson Creek as the downstream limit.

Toppenish Creek Passage Enhancement

Sponsor explained the proposal which aims to provide passage to stranded fish. Refuge is screened, but that does not prevent juveniles from enter during flooding events (just about every year). Committee members had many questions about how the passage channels will persist after repeated flooding. Committee members asked the sponsor to consider if there are operational changes that they can implement that will help address the issue…the less flow manipulation we do, the better for fish. Any part of your proposal that reduces flow modification will benefit fish.

Wide Hollow Creek Restoration Feasibility Analysis

Project sponsor explained the goals and objectives. Committee members expressed concern that the City representative seemed clear that this project was about where (not if) to move the creek. The project sponsor agreed that's their interest, but they are only one stakeholder of many. Attendees asked the sponsor to consider the water quality of Wide Hollow and if we will

potentially contaminate Ahtanum Creek by routing Wide Hollow into it? Major stakeholders should include the people who live along and/or have water rights along Wide Hollow Creek.

Naches River Ramblers' Acquisition and Restoration

Sponsor explained that the County is conducting other work in the reach with emergency funds – the SRFB proposal is the acquisition of the four parcels. Committee members asked what the fish benefits include. Sponsor explained that Coho spawn in this reach, but have almost zero survival; let's try to restore the river function.

Gold Creek Habitat Assessment + Conceptual Design

The project sponsor was asked to explain what they meant by addressing the levee/floodplain in the pond reach. Sponsor explained that they will look at how the pond interacts with the Gold Creek floodplain above and adjacent to the pond. Pond system is a huge drain, sucking the hyporheic flow. Group discussed if there was any potential for the USFS to fill a third of the pond. WSDOT staff in attendance mentioned that they are aware of the precarious issue with the bull trout population – so WSDOT did not want to move forward with any pond filling actions until the data gap was filled. Bull trout tend to spawn in the pond outflow which is not optimal due to temp. Sponsor was asked what they know about the subsurface geology. Sponsor replied that they don't know very much at this time and that will be part of the investigation. Brook trout & cut throat in the system too. Not very prevalent due to cold temps. Best thing going for BT in the Upper basin.

Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem, Ph 2

The project sponsor revised their SRFB request from $802,000 to $615,792. When asked to speak to the outfall and conveyance channels removed from this version of the proposal, the sponsor explained that this revised proposal would have benefits without moving the wastewater treatment outfall; however, the tasks included in this revision need to be completed in order to achieve the ecological benefits needed to apply for the extended mixing zone. Sponsor indicated that the essential element in the project proposal is the need to remove the levee and relocate the Greenway Trail. A committee member with Yakima County indicated that the levee removal is a significant project on its own and the county is willing to help get the project done. Sponsor was asked to clarify how much topsoil will be moved and how that will change floodplain inundation? They responded that inundation occurs at least every 5 years – more frequently once the armory is pulled back. Sponsor was asked to clarify the $71,000 needed for dewatering and explore if they could isolate the area and dig in the wet?

Appendix D: TAG Scoring Matrix

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

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

Appendix E: TAG Evaluation Sheets

2012 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form – Protection and Restoration

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: In order for a project to be successful, the landowner has to have full support of a project. The landowner should be involved in discussions regarding this project early in the planning process, and should be aware of, and willing to wait through, the grant administration process. The SRFB requires that the landowner sign a Landowner Acknowledgement form before an applicant can submit a grant for evaluation, and a signed commitment by the landowner before funding is approved.

Appraisal: A landowner's expectations of his/her property's value are a critical component of land acquisitions. Has the land been appraised and are the landowner's expectations reasonable?

Project Sequencing: Immediate usefulness of projects. Are we implementing projects in the correct order? A project should build upon and complement existing or future actions, and/or pave the way for additional habitat projects. Correctly sequencing and coordinating projects is an efficient use of limited resources and maximizes potential beneficial impacts. The proposal should complement and support local and state salmon recovery regulations and programs, including land use and development regulations, critical area ordinances, storm water management regulations, shoreline master plans, forest management regulations, etc.

Reasonable Budget: A proposed budget should be analyzed to determine if it is complete and the prices quoted are reasonable as compared with similar projects.

Threats to Habitat Values: The most urgent acquisitions are those properties with high quality habitat where there is a short term development threat that will degrade the quality of the habitat and existing regulations and/or ordinances will not adequately provide protection.

Organizational Capacity: The success of a project is ultimately tied to the ability of the sponsor to plan, design, and implement a proposal. Project sponsors should demonstrate the ability and/or intent to involve expertise outside of their own organization. Their proposal should be well-researched and demonstrate knowledge of current priorities within the basin, and be well planned, and organized in a logical sequence. They should be able to recognize any potential limitations and constraints, and identify how to deal with these.

Uncertainties and Constraints: A project should be reviewed to determine if there are any technical, legal, financial, or environmental constraints that could affect the outcome of the project or its permitability.

Future Stewardship: The SRFB requires a stewardship plan with the final documentation at the close of the project for acquisition and restoration projects on lands owned or controlled by the applicant. The proposal should indicate some plan for maintenance and monitoring of the project for at least 10 years.

Fit to Regional Plan: The proposal should implement actions identified in the Yakima Subbasin Salmon Recovery Plan.

Design Adequate for Goals: Project design should be cost effective and based on proven methods. The design should match the goals outlined in the proposal, and meet standards established by WDFW. Innovative and experimental approaches should be considered if proven methods are not feasible, if the conditions they were designed for cannot be corrected through conventional methods, if the potential benefits exceed that of traditional designs, and if the cost to benefit ratio is high.

Value to Education and Outreach: If a project is in a highly visible location, it can be a valuable tool for teaching the community the importance of protecting and/or restoring salmonid habitat. It can also foster a sense of ownership and pride. In order for projects to be valuable in this role, however, they need to be properly executed, innovative, and meet local regulations and ordinances.

2012 YBFWRB TAG Evaluation Form

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

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment	**Project Sequence**	**Reasonable Budget**	**Threats to Habitat Value**
☐High	☐High	☐High	☐High
☐Medium	☐Medium	☐Medium	☐Medium
☐Low	☐Low	☐Low	☐Low
☐Unknown	☐Unknown	☐Unknown	☐Unknown

Organizational Capacity	**Uncertainties and Constraints**	**Fit to Regional Plan**	**Appraisal (A)**
☐High	☐Low	☐High	☐High
☐Medium	☐Medium	☐Medium	☐Medium
☐Low	☐High	☐Low	☐Low
☐Unknown	☐Unknown	☐Unknown	☐Unknown

Reasonable Design Goals (D)	**Design Adequate for Goals (R)**	**Future Stewardship (P&R)**	**Value to Education & Outreach (P&R)**
☐High	☐High	☐High	☐High
☐Medium	☐Medium	☐Medium	☐Medium
☐Low	☐Low	☐Low	☐Low
☐Unknown	☐Unknown	☐Unknown	☐Unknown

Strengths of Proposal:

Weaknesses of Proposal:

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

Final Ranking and Rationale:

Appendix F: TAG Meeting Minutes

Ellensburg Water Co - Coleman Creek Intersection

Matrix Score: 4.4

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: Medium	Proposal Has A High Level of Uncertainties/Constraints: Yes
Project Sequence: Low	Fit to Regional Plan: High
Reasonable Budget: Moderate	Value to Education/Outreach: Not Evaluated
Organizational Capacity: Proven	Future Stewardship: High
Appraisal (Acquisition): N/A	Threat to Habitat Values (Acquisition): N/A

Summary of Discussion:

This project builds upon a design only proposal funded by the SRFB in 2008, and was awarded $333,313 in the 2011 grant round for construction, which was insufficient to fully fund the project. It addresses the Steelhead Recovery Plan's Upper Yakima Actions #11 (restore passage, separate irrigation conveyance, and screen diversions in Ellensburg-area tributaries) and #19 (coordinate water quality improvements in Reecer, Wilson, Naneum, Cherry, and Dry creeks). The design is solid and it is similar to comparable projects the sponsor has completed in the past. This project could potentially provide fish passage and screening for anadromous fish and is a good example of work that benefits the agricultural community as well as fish. The project scored points for water quality as it would reduce the impact of sediment and contaminants from treating the canal. The majority of TAG members feel the total project cost of $559,000 is expensive for a maximum of ~one mile of access (and as little as 0.25 miles) to low quality habitat that has other partial/seasonal passage barriers. The understanding of the TAG is that there are no plans to pursue additional fish passage upstream past the Vantage highway, which significantly limits the long-term benefits of this project. The TAG recommended not funding this proposal due to the very high cost/benefit ratio and instead to defer any additional SRFB funding until there appears to be a real prospect of improving passage at the Vantage highway and further upstream to make higher quality habitat accessible.

The main concerns with this project are: 1) the low certainty of success for providing full access from the Yakima River given the two existing downstream seasonal barriers (while some progress has been made working with downstream landowners, it is still unclear when and how these barriers can be fixed, so this proposal is still out-of-sequence), 2) the barrier at the Vantage Highway, approximately one mile upstream, which limits the amount of habitat opened up by this project, and the habitat to be made accessible is of low quality, and 3) the high cost of the project compared to expected benefits.

Recommendations to Improve Project:

The TAG supported this proposal in 2011 as a lower priority due to reservations about other passage issues and cost/benefit, but the TAG did not express support for the 2012 request for additional funding, due to the high cost benefit ratio.

West Side Irrigating Co - Manastash Crk Siphon

Matrix Score: 0 – Do Not Fund

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: High	Proposal Has A High Level of Uncertainties/Constraints: Yes
Project Sequence: Low	Fit to Regional Plan: Low
Reasonable Budget: Moderate	Value to Education/Outreach: Not Evaluated
Organizational Capacity: Proven	Future Stewardship: High
Appraisal (Acquisition): N/A	Threat to Habitat Values (Acquisition): N/A

Summary of Discussion:
The TAG did not score this proposal as recent communication with Brent Renfrow (WDFW) indicated that the passage barrier at this site is no longer there (previous assessments were of a passage barrier at the associated rock weir, which was washed away in 2011). With no barrier present, the proposed project has no fish benefit.

Recommendations to Improve Project:
TAG members recommended that this project should not be funded because of the lack of a fish passage barrier at the site. Future options for riparian and floodplain improvements at the site should be evaluated as part of the assessment of Manastash Creek that is currently underway.

Yakima River Assessment - Hansen Pits to Ringer Loop

Matrix Score: 13.1

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: Unknown	Proposal Has A High Level of Uncertainties/Constraints: Medium
Project Sequence: High	Fit to Regional Plan: High
Reasonable Budget: Yes	Value to Education/Outreach: Not Evaluated
Organizational Capacity: Proven	Future Stewardship: N/A
Appraisal (Acquisition): N/A	Threat to Habitat Values (Acquisition): N/A

Summary of Discussion

The TAG supported this assessment, which could result in projects that improve fish habitat in the floodplain and potential side channels of the upper Yakima River for spring Chinook, coho, steelhead and possibly bull trout. This assessment potentially addresses the LWD deficiency; channel stability and confinement limiting factors as well as Upper Yakima Action #12 (reduce confinement of Upper Yakima River). TAG members recognized that the project is timely, has a sound budget, and addresses a high value reach with significant potential for restoration. The prospect of additional levee maintenance in response to anticipated flood-fighting efforts makes this effort particularly timely. The sponsor has established a collaborative partnership with Kittitas County that adds value to the project.

Recommendations to Improve Project:

TAG members would like to confirm the project boundary extends down to the mouth of Wilson Creek. One TAG member encouraged the sponsor to consider the negative effects of releasing the non-native fish species currently in ponds during any eventual breach. Additional suggestions for improvement include ensuring the budget is realistic for the downstream extent of the project and taking advantage of the opportunity to coordinate with the YRBWEP project upstream.

Gold Creek Habitat Assessment + Conceptual Design

Matrix Score: 9.4

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: Med/High	Proposal Has A High Level of Uncertainties/Constraints: Moderate
Project Sequence: High	Fit to Regional Plan: High
Reasonable Budget: Yes	Value to Education/Outreach: Not Evaluated
Organizational Capacity: Proven	Future Stewardship: N/A
Appraisal (Acquisition): N/A	Threat to Habitat Values (Acquisition): N/A

Summary of Discussion:

TAG members support this assessment and design proposal as it potentially addresses the large-scale seasonal dewatering limiting factor. The proposal is also closely aligned with recommendations from the Bull Trout Action Plan, specifically Gold #1: Conduct complex hydro-geomorphic evaluation in lower Gold Creek to determine the causal mechanisms (and possible solutions) for annual dewatering. Some TAG members expressed concern that a two-year study will not capture annual variability in flow conditions. Some TAG members are concerned that the assessment may not identify a feasible solution. TAG reviewers moved this project above the Yakima Floodplain Enhancement project, recognizing that this is a needed proposal that addresses the biggest limiting factor for a population of bull trout that is at high risk of extinction. The importance of this population is high, given the extinction and severe declines of other nearby populations. Given the current population status of Gold Creek bull trout, further delay in an assessment or action may be detrimental. Due to uncertainty created by the existing knowledge gap, WA-DOT mitigation efforts were not directed towards attempting to alleviate dewatering in this reach. The TAG noted that the proposal seeks to address the problem at an appropriate (reach level) scale. TAG members also acknowledged that the scoring matrix is inherently biased against projects that benefit a single (versus multiple) species. This was another reason given for moving the project higher on the list despite the final numerical score. The TAG was pleased to see the involvement of WDFW staff (William Meyer) with long term experience with research and management of bull trout and flow issues in the Gold Creek Basin.

Recommendations to Improve Project:

TAG members recommend that the sponsor carefully screen potential consultants for direct experience working in glaciated alpine valleys, because their hydrology can be complex and different from other riverine systems. If the assessment leads to on-the-ground projects, long-term monitoring of flows will be critical to assessing project benefits. Sponsor is encouraged to use the assessment as an opportunity to build landowner support for future restoration projects.

Toppenish Creek Passage Enhancement

Matrix Score: 1.2

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: High	Proposal Has A High Level of Uncertainties/Constraints: Yes
Project Sequence: Low	Fit to Regional Plan: Low*****
Reasonable Budget: Yes	Value to Education/Outreach: Not Evaluated
Organizational Capacity: Proven	Future Stewardship: Medium/Low
Appraisal (Acquisition): N/A	Threat to Habitat Values (Acquisition): N/A

Summary of Discussion

A separate, four-year study has been proposed by the Fish and Wildlife to evaluate the scale of the stranding/entrainment problem, but PIT tag detectors will not be installed until 2013. TAG members expressed uncertainty about future stewardship, as the longevity and maintenance needs of the channels are unclear and the culverts and outlets would not be lowered to mimic natural flow or drainage regimes that provide the natural environmental cues for juvenile fish to emigrate. Additional concern was expressed by State Review Panel members around the possibility that NEPA process for the Refuge Management Plan may be behind this project, giving the public the impression that a decision is being made before public input is received, as recently occurred with a SRFB project in Willapa Bay. The refuge manager that was shepherding the project has recently left, and it is unclear when there will be a replacement. It is also very unclear what the scope and scale of the stranding problem is.

Some TAG members would like to see refuge management consider how refuge operations can be modified to help reduce stranding issues. Current management focuses on waterfowl, and from a fisheries perspective, floods the ponds too early and drains them too late to optimize juvenile anadromous fish benefits and survival. Aligning water management with natural timing of floodplain inundation and allowing fish to escape would be better for fish.

Recommendations to Improve Project:

TAG members recommend deferring this project until the proposed study indicates the extent of fish use of the wetlands and the severity of the stranding problem. TAG members would also prefer to see a project of this type proposed after refuge management has first considered operational changes that would reduce entrainment and stranding of fish.

Actions to address stranding issues were not identified in the Salmon Recovery Plan; however, if stranding is shown to be a significant cause of mortality, then it would likely be considered for addition to the Plan during the next revision.

Wide Hollow Creek Restoration Feasibility Analysis

Matrix Score: 4.7

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: Unknown	Proposal Has A High Level of Uncertainties/Constraints: Moderate
Project Sequence: Medium	Fit to Regional Plan: Medium
Reasonable Budget: Yes	Value to Education/Outreach: Not Evaluated
Organizational Capacity: Proven	Future Stewardship: N/A
Appraisal (Acquisition): N/A	Threat to Habitat Values (Acquisition): N/A

Summary of Discussion:

This assessment proposal potentially addresses Naches Action #28 (protect Ahtanum Creek riparian areas to lessen development impacts). The TAG recognizes that the proposal provides a good opportunity to offer feedback to the DOT and the City of Union Gap on lower Wide Hollow and Spring Creeks. While the project is helpful for mitigation and urban planning for the project area, the salmon benefits are not immediately evident. Some TAG members expressed concern that due to the project stakeholders' strong bias towards moving Wide Hollow Creek, it will be difficult to write an objective assessment. Some TAG members stated that it would be difficult to justify re-routing Wide Hollow Creek as a salmon benefit because it would reduce the amount of habitat and possibly degrade water quality of Ahtanum Creek; therefore a more thorough analysis would be required. The majority of TAG members noted that Wide Hollow is generally of low priority for restoration.

Recommendations to Improve Project:

Clearly define the goals and objectives of the project in regard to water quality, development and future habitat conditions, and pursue the project with a funding source that better matches the project.

Yakima River Gap to Gap Habitat Enhancement

Matrix Score: 12.4

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: High	Proposal Has A High Level of Uncertainties/Constraints: Moderate
Project Sequence: High	Fit to Regional Plan: High
Reasonable Budget: Yes	Value to Education/Outreach: Not Evaluated
Organizational Capacity: Proven	Future Stewardship: High
Appraisal (Acquisition): N/A	Threat to Habitat Values (Acquisition): N/A

Summary of Discussion

This habitat enhancement proposal addresses the limiting factors of maximum temperature, confinement, and hyporehic discontinuity. It aligns with the Steelhead Recovery Plan by focusing on Lower Mainstem Action #6 (restore mainstem and side channel habitats in the Union Gap reach), and Basin wide Action #12 (improve recruitment of cottonwoods). TAG members recognized the project's value as a part of the larger Gap-to-Gap project. The proposal has an excellent cost-benefit ratio and uses experienced Yakima County staff in implementation of project.

Some TAG members expressed uncertainty about the role and dynamics of the side channels. There was general agreement that the toe rock should be removed. The TAG noted that it is uncertain how long the reconnected side channels will persist, although the side channel work probably adds only a small increment of cost since equipment will already be mobilized for the toe rock removal. However, given the low price, the level of risk is reasonable and concerns about future stewardship are alleviated by the sponsor's track record ensuring that that long-term maintenance will continue as needed.

Recommendations to Improve Project:

Naches River Ramblers' Acquisition and Restoration

Matrix Score: 14.4

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: Unknown	Proposal Has A High Level of Uncertainties/Constraints: No
Project Sequence: High	Fit to Regional Plan: High
Reasonable Budget: Yes	Value to Education/Outreach: Not Evaluated
Organizational Capacity: Proven	Future Stewardship: High
Appraisal (Acquisition): Unknown	Threat to Habitat Values (Acquisition): N/A

Summary of Discussion:
This acquisition and restoration proposal addresses the limiting factors of riparian/LWD and confinement. It also aligns with the Steelhead Recovery Plan by addressing Naches Actions #5 (restore lower Naches River floodplain), and #6 (improve sediment transport in lower Naches River. There was widespread agreement that the setback would improve sediment transport and reduce river confinement. This proposal has strong leadership, builds on other restoration projects and is part of a larger restoration strategy for this high priority area.

Recommendations to Improve Project:
One TAG member would like to see the project sponsor consider if purchasing the islands is necessary given that they are in the floodway where the channel is likely to migrate across them regardless of ownership. However, most TAG members thought that the low cost (~$5000) of the island parcels made it prudent to acquire them in order to reduce potential landowner property rights issues with the proposed and future levee setbacks in the area. TAG members also expressed interest in relocating and reusing the buildings instead of demolishing them.

Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem, Ph 2

Matrix Score: 11.5

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: High	Proposal Has A High Level of Uncertainties/Constraints: Yes
Project Sequence: High	Fit to Regional Plan: High
Reasonable Budget: No	Value to Education/Outreach: Not Evaluated
Organizational Capacity: Unproven	Future Stewardship: High
Appraisal (Acquisition): N/A	Threat to Habitat Values (Acquisition): N/A

Summary of Discussion

This project proposal addresses the limiting factors of maximum temperature, confinement, and hyporheic discontinuity. It aligns with the Steelhead Recovery Plan by focusing on Lower Mainstem Action #6 (restore mainstem and side channel habitats in the Union Gap reach), and Basin wide Action #12 (improve recruitment of cottonwoods). TAG members recognize that the sponsor has been very proactive in the larger Gap to Gap initiative and this levee relocation project provides a critical step toward achieving the larger Gap to Gap project goals. The TAG noted that it is unclear how proposed groundwater channel would be maintained, that the proposed channel construction is costly, and that it is highly likely that future floods would fill and rework the channel. The budget does not seem to include the amount of planting that will be necessary.

While the TAG does not question the overall organizational capacity of the city, this certainty of success category is listed as unproven for this type of project because Phase One (SRFB 2011 funding) has not yet been implemented. Since Phase One has not been implemented, uncertainty remains around the ability to deliver projects that meet biological goals and adjust to construction surprises that come up while implementing floodplain projects. The levee removal and trail rebuild is costly, but there will be very high benefit, so the tradeoff is good. Given the uncertainty about groundwater channel persistence, some TAG members think the budget for constructed channels is high for the expected benefits. TAG members do not believe the proposal addresses Basin wide Action 8; continue Coho, Sockeye, Summer Chinook reintroduction.

Recommendations to Improve Project:

While TAG members generally support this project, they recommend partial funding due to uncertainties and high cost of the proposed channel excavation. Rather than fund all the project elements, they would like the sponsor to focus on pulling the levee back and letting the river rework its own floodplain. In addition to the levee setback, the TAG would like to see the trail relocation funded. The TAG recommends that SRFB funds not be used for the channel construction element of the plan. The TAG suggests that the sponsor continue to engage the Technical Work Group to refine plans for all the project phases.

YTID Tieton to Cowiche Delivery Assessment

Matrix Score: 5.4

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: Med/High	Proposal Has A High Level of Uncertainties/Constraints: Moderate
Project Sequence: Med/High	Fit to Regional Plan: High
Reasonable Budget: Yes	Value to Education/Outreach: Not Evaluated
Organizational Capacity: Unproven	Future Stewardship: N/A
Appraisal (Acquisition): N/A	Threat to Habitat Values (Acquisition): N/A

Summary of Discussion

This project received a lower score, and the TAG noted that fish benefit is not the primary purpose of the assessment, which focuses on evaluating alternatives for replacing the YTID main canal. However, the project proposal does address the major limiting factors in Cowiche Creek (flow and maximum temperature), and would assess the feasibility of one method of implementing Naches Actions #21 (reduce irrigation diversions from Cowiche Creek), and #22 (improve riparian, floodplain and temperature conditions in Cowiche Creek). TAG members recognized this as a good faith effort to explore moving points of diversions (i.e., source of water) from Cowiche Creek to the Tieton River, which the TAG supports. Additional strengths of the proposal include the 50% match and the proposed involvement of professional managers from the YTID in future management of Cowiche Creek. The TAG expressed concern that that the cost for water beyond the CWUA diversion would result in a high (unaffordable) cost-benefit ratio, which contributed to a moderate certainty of success score.

Some TAG members expressed concern that the proposed assessment is narrowly focused on flow and does not include other potential habitat improvement projects. Additional concerns were raised about landowner participation and long-term costs, both of which will determine whether or not the assessment identifies feasible projects with real benefits.

Recommendations to Improve Project:

This assessment proposal would be improved by clarifying the amount that the Bureau is willing to contribute. Some TAG members thought that this would be appropriate for the Bureau's YRBWEP program to fund.

CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water

Matrix Score: 26.5

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: High	Proposal Has A High Level of Uncertainties/Constraints: Moderate
Project Sequence: High	Fit to Regional Plan: High
Reasonable Budget: Yes	Value to Education/Outreach: Not Evaluated
Organizational Capacity: Proven	Future Stewardship: High
Appraisal (Acquisition): N/A	Threat to Habitat Values (Acquisition): N/A

Summary of Discussion:
This proposal received a high score because it addresses the major limiting factors in Cowiche Creek (screening and passage, flow and maximum temperature), and implements Naches Actions #21 (reduce irrigation diversions from Cowiche Creek), and #22 (improve riparian, floodplain and temperature conditions in Cowiche Creek).

The TAG noted that this is a strong proposal that addresses a recognized problem with a straightforward way to improve flows in Cowiche Creek. The 7.915 cfs CCWUA water right will be transferred from Cowiche Creek (which is flow limited) to the Tieton River (which is supplied by regulated releases from Rimrock Lake). CCWUA will be able to receive their full water rights without depleting Cowiche Creek during late summer months when the creek is almost dewatered. The project will also eliminate the need for fish screening at the two current points of diversion for the CCWUA, and remove one partial barrier. While this project has a high cost, it also returns a very high benefit.

Some TAG members expressed concern about the uncertainties associated with the ongoing negotiations between the Cowiche Creek Water Users and the YTID. The different payments and funding sources involved in the project are confusing and there is still risk that the partners may not successfully reach agreement on necessary details.

Recommendations to Improve Project:

CCWUA Pump Station & Barrier Removal

Matrix Score: 13.3

Certainty of Success Categories

Landowner Commitment: High	Proposal Has A High Level of Uncertainties/Constraints: No
Project Sequence: High (qualified)	Fit to Regional Plan: High
Reasonable Budget: Yes	Value to Education/Outreach: Not Evaluated
Organizational Capacity: Proven	Future Stewardship: High
Appraisal (Acquisition): N/A	Threat to Habitat Values (Acquisition): N/A

Summary of Discussion:
The project proposal received a high score because it addresses the major limiting factors in Cowiche Creek (screening and passage, flow and maximum temperature) and implements Naches Actions #21 (reduce irrigation diversions from Cowiche Creek) & #22 (improve riparian, floodplain and temperature conditions in Cowiche Creek).

The TAG felt this project is consistent with recovery actions and addresses the limiting factors of two unscreened diversions, a seasonal barrier, and low flows. The landowner commitment is strong, as CCWUA supports this (and the Trust Water) proposal. Reviewers have confidence in the organizational capacity of the sponsor (NYCD) to complete this project without the cooperation of YTID. No active fish screening would be needed, provided the pump vault is effective.

The TAG was unanimous that the Trust Water proposal is a better solution than this proposal, as the Trust Water approach has greater biological benefit (because the benefits extend for several more miles to the mouth of the creek) and lower capital and long-term operation and maintenance costs. The TAG also noted that completing the pump station project would likely preclude any future YTID tie-ins, and thus implementation of this project would preclude the best-case long-term solution.

Recommendations to Improve Project:
The TAG recommended not funding the pump station alternative if the Trust Water project is approved and implemented. If the Trust Water project does not move forward, this alternate project should be included in the funding list below the Naches River Rambler's project.

Appendix G: Community Evaluation and Scoring Criteria

An important step in evaluating projects for SRFB funding is how the proposed project affects the community in which sponsors implement them. The task of the Citizen's Committee is to evaluate individual projects based on their value within the community. Using this matrix, committee members will determine what level of effect the project has on the specific issues indicated in each of four categories.

In this matrix, the committee will not award projects scores based on a numeric scale, rather each point will be designated with a +1, 0, or – 1 as follows:

+1 = positive effect
0 = no significant effect
-1 = negative effect

We will assess the positive, neutral, and negative marks for each project and use this information, with the recommendations of the TAG, as a guide to rank the projects. In the comments section, explain why the project received the values it was awarded if necessary.

Cultural & Social Benefits

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

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

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

How will the project affect ESA liabilities for community members?

How will the project affect recreational opportunities?

Will the project create defined educational/outreach opportunities?

Economic Considerations

What is the potential impact of the project on the community's economy?

How will the project affect recreational spending?

Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable?

How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

Project Context & Organization

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

Is the project innovative, standard, or outdated?

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

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

Partnerships & Community Support

What is the breadth and strength of the community/citizen involvement in the project?

What is the breadth and strength of the partnership supporting the project (technical support, financial and in-kind contributions, labor)?

Will partner/citizen involvement increase the likelihood of the project's success or is this involvement lacking?

Appendix H: Citizens Criteria Scores

Cultural and Social Benefits																
	CCWUA Pump Station	**CCWUA Trust Water**	**YTID Assessment**	**Gold Creek**	**Yakima River Assessment**	**EWC – Coleman Creek**	**Naches River Ramblers**	**City of Yakima Floodplain**	**Gap to Gap Habitat**	**Toppenish Creek Passage**	**Wide Hollow Creek**					
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the Yakama Nation & its members?	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0					
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the agricultural community?	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0					
Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for the community at large?	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1					
How will the project affect ESA liabilities for community members?	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0					
How will the project affect recreational opportunities?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0					
Will the project create defined educational/outreach opportunities?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0					

Economic Considerations																
	CCWUA Pump Station	**CCWUA Trust Water**	**YTID Assessment**	**Gold Creek**	**Yakima River Assessment**	**EWC – Coleman Creek**	**Naches River Ramblers**	**City of Yakima Floodplain**	**Gap to Gap Habitat**	**Toppenish Creek Passage**	**Wide Hollow Creek**					
What is the potential impact of the project on the community's economy?	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0					
How will the project affect recreational spending?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1					
How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?	0	1	0	1	1	-1	1	1	1	-1	0					

Project Context & Organization																
	CCWUA Pump Station	**CCWUA Trust Water**	**YTID Assessment**	**Gold Creek**	**Yakima River Assessment**	**EWC – Coleman Creek**	**Naches River Ramblers**	**City of Yakima Floodplain**	**Gap to Gap Habitat**	**Toppenish Creek Passage**	**Wide Hollow Creek**					
If the project is not funded now are key opportunities lost or is the proposal premature?	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	-1	0					
Is the project innovative?	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
How is the project coordinated with other past, present and future salmon recovery actions?	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1	0					
Are we confident that all the pieces of the project can come together as anticipated or are there uncertainties?	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	-1	1					

Partnership & Community Support																
	CCWUA Pump Station	**CCWUA Trust Water**	**YTID Assessment**	**Gold Creek**	**Yakima River Assessment**	**EWC – Coleman Creek**	**Naches River Ramblers**	**City of Yakima Floodplain**	**Gap to Gap Habitat**	**Toppenish Creek Passage**	**Wide Hollow Creek**					
What is the breadth and strength of the community/citizen involvement in the project?	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0					
What is the breadth and strength of the partnership supporting the project (technical support, financial and in-kind contributions, labor)?	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1					
Will partner/citizen involvement increase the likelihood of the project's success or is this involvement lacking?	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0					

Appendix I: Citizens Committee Minutes

Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board
Citizen Committee Minutes
August 9, 2012
9:00 am – 3:00 pm

Project:	Toppenish Creek Passage Enhancement
CC Score/Final Rank:	-2 / Defer
Comments:	The CC maintained the TAG recommendation to defer the project at this time. If the proposed Fish & Wildlife study identifies stranding/entrainment to be a significant problem, then the project would be appropriate for future SRFB review. The opportunity for outreach and education exists, but was not defined in the application and dollars were not allocated towards outreach.
Rank adjustment:	The CC maintained the TAG recommendation.

Project:	Wide Hollow Creek Restoration Feasibility Analysis
CC Score/Final Rank:	4 / 9
Comments:	Comments and discussion focused on "political obstacles" referred to in the application, but not expanded upon. The CC echoed the TAG concern that a study could be biased because of future infrastructure and transportation plans by DOT and the City of Union Gap.
Rank adjustment:	The CC maintained the TAG tier rank as a medium funding priority and listed the project as the second alternate on the project list.

Project:	Naches River Ramblers' Acquisition and Restoration
CC Score/Final Rank:	9 / 2
Comments:	The CC recognized that this project has broad benefits due to restoring the river toward its natural state and reduce flooding impacts. It is coordinated with past, present, and future salmon recovery actions in a priority area.
Rank adjustment:	The CC maintained the TAG ranking

Project:	Yakima River Gap to Gap Habitat Enhancement
CC Score/Final Rank:	7 / 5
Comments:	The CC noted that the project is clearly defined, reasonable and coordinated with other salmon recovery actions. Removal of the toe rock would provide minor benefits during a flooding event. The committee noted that the in-kind contributions were not defined, and asked the applicant to ensure the application budget is complete in the future.
Rank adjustment:	The CC moved this project down the list by one rank (from 4 to 5), as they did not think it was as time sensitive as other highly ranked proposals.

Project:	Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem, Ph 2
CC Score/Final Rank:	12 / 7
Comments:	The CC supports this project and noted that moving the trail benefits the community at large, and would no longer incur costly repairs. The original

	budget was high compared to the benefits, but the revised budget is appropriate. CC scoring was based on the revised budget. The committee feels the project is timely based on both the sequencing of the larger Gap to Gap project and the likelihood of a flood event requiring expensive repairs before the trail is moved.
Rank adjustment:	Moved from rank position 6 to 7 based on CC decision to raise the rank of the YTID Delivery Assessment.

Project:	Ellensburg Water Co - Coleman Creek Intersection
CC Score/Final Rank:	7 / 8
Comments:	The CC discussed the TAG ranking of 'Defer' and reviewed the supplemental information provided by the sponsor. Based on clarification of long-term prospects for addressing the barrier at Vantage Highway and downstream barriers, the CC decided to change the rank from 'defer' to alternate.
Rank adjustment:	The CC maintained the TAG tier rank as a medium funding priority and listed the project as rank position 8. This project is the first alternate on the project list.

Project:	West Side Irrigating Co - Manastash Crk Siphon
CC Score/Final Rank:	3 / Defer
Comments:	The proposal was written to address a passage barrier issue; however current conditions indicate that recent sediment transport corrected the passage barrier. Manastash is a high priority area, and an assessment is currently underway. If the proposal was implemented without a passage barrier present, it would be correcting an infrastructure issue for the irrigating company, but would not directly benefit salmon. If this proposal is resubmitted in the future, it should be supported by results of the assessment and clearly demonstrate the benefit to fish.
Rank adjustment:	Changed from "Do Not Fund" to "Defer"

Project:	Yakima River Assessment - Hansen Pits to Ringer Loop
CC Score/Final Rank:	8 / 3
Comments:	The CC supported the idea of an assessment for this reach of the Yakima River. They also appreciate the potential to tie into adjacent recovery efforts, such as the Bureau work on the Shaake property..
Rank adjustment:	The CC maintained the project's ranking.

Project:	Gold Creek Habitat Assessment + Conceptual Design
CC Score/Final Rank:	9 / 4
Comments:	The CC supports this proposal and noted that this population of bull trout is at risk of extinction. The project budget is reasonable; however the scope of the assessment seems broad, and concern was noted that if left too broad, the assessment may not identify projects that will address the problem.
Rank adjustment:	The CC moved this project from position 5 to 4 because of the importance of the Gold Creek bull trout population and the immediate threat to its

	viability. The Committee emphasized that prompt action is needed to prevent further population declines.

Project:	YTID Tieton to Cowiche Delivery Assessment
CC Score/Final Rank:	7 / 6
Comments:	The CC recognized that this project is an important and time-dependent complement to their top ranked project (CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water), and decided to move the proposal onto the recommended funding list. However, the CC recommends limiting the funding to $25,000.
Rank adjustment:	The CC moved this project up the ranked list by one spot (from 7 to 6) in order to support the top ranked project.

Project:	CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water
CC Score/Final Rank:	13 / 1
Comments:	The CC appreciated the work that has gone into developing this proposal. The CC agreed that while it is expensive, it builds upon previous recovery efforts and will yield significant benefits for steelhead in Cowiche Creek.
Rank adjustment:	The CC maintained the project's ranking.

Project:	CCWUA Barrier Removal & Pump Station
CC Score/Final Rank:	11 / Substitute
Comments:	The CC noted that this proposal offers a feasible alternative to the preferred approach detailed in the CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water proposal. While the pump station project could create real benefits for fish in Cowiche Creek, the benefits would be less than the preferred approach, even as the proposed cost is higher.
Rank adjustment:	This project was designated as a substitute to the CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water project. If the trust water project does not move forward, the funds from both the CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water proposal and the YTID Tieton to Cowiche Delivery Assessment could be combined to partially fund this project. The CC requested that the local TAG and CC review and approve any proposed change that would place this project on the ranked project list (prior to December) or shift how awarded funds would be used (via scope changes and contract amendments).

Appendix J: LE Ranked List (SRFB Appendix F)

Lead Entity:	Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board
Lead Entity Allocation:	$1,776,600

Signature of Lead Entity Authorized Representative: _____

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

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Prospective Sponsor	SRFB Request	Sponsor Match	Project Total Cost	Project Status	Response to Review Panel Comments (include attachment # in PRISM)
1	12-1328	CCWUA Barrier Removal & Trust Water	North Yakima Conservation District	$574,600	$350,007	$924,607		Attachment 16
2	12-1327	Naches River Ramblers' Acquisition and Restoration	Yakima County Public Services	$223,400	$40,000	$263,400		
3	12-1358	Yakima River Assessment - Hansen Pits to Ringer Loop	Kittitas County Conservation District	$62,230	$15,200	$77,430		Attachment 24
4	12-1306	Gold Creek Habitat Assessment + Conceptual Design	Kittitas Conservation Trust	$97,750	$17,250	$115,000		Attachment 21
5	12-1317	Yakima River Gap to Gap Habitat Enhancement	Yakima County Public Services	$57,000	$11,000	$68,000		
6	12-1350	YTID Tieton to Cowiche Delivery Assessment	Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District	$25,000	$75,000	$100,000	Partial Funding	Attachment 22
7	12-1307	Yakima Floodplain Ecosystem, Ph 2	City of Yakima	$295,920	$88,776	$384,696	Partial Funding	Attachment 23
8	12-1353	Ellensburg Water Co - Coleman Creek Intersection	Kittitas County Conservation District	$192,500	$57,500	$250,000	Alternate	N/A
9	12-1319	Wide Hollow Creek Restoration Feasibility Analysis	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	$60,000	$10,650	$70,650	Alternate	Attachment 17
10	12-1324	CCWUA Pump Station & Barrier Removal	North Yakima Conservation District	$656,596	$225,155	$881,751	Alternate	Project is considered a substitute for 12-1328 & 12-1350
			Totals:	**$2,244,996**	**$890,538**	**$3,135,534**		