

Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board

2013 LEAD ENTITY REVIEW & PROPOSED RANKED PROJECT LIST

As the State-designated Lead Entity for the Yakima Basin, the Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board (the Board) is responsible for providing the Washington Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) with an annual locally-reviewed and ranked list of salmon habitat improvement projects. Since 1999, the SRFB has provided a total of \$12.5 million to 82 projects proposed by the Lead Entity. The Board's annual lead entity project review is designed to ensure that ranked projects: 1) implement priority actions identified in the Board's recovery plans, 2) are technical sound and biologically beneficial, and 3) support local community values and economies. To accomplish this, proposed projects are reviewed by both a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) composed of local technical specialists and by a Citizen's Committee (CC) made up of 16 members (4 each from Benton, Yakima and Kittitas County and the Yakama Nation). For more information about the project review process, see the [Yakima Lead Entity Manual](#).

In March of 2013, the Board issued a Request for Proposals for salmon habitat improvement projects in the Yakima Basin. Twenty-two pre-proposals were submitted by the April 15 deadline. After meeting with the pre-proposal review committee, sponsors chose to develop full applications for 17 projects. Completed applications were due May 20, and local and state reviewers participated in site tours from June 5 to 7. Sponsors gave presentations to the TAG and CC on June 25. The Technical Advisory Group met to review and ranking projects on July 16 and 17 ([TAG meeting notes](#)). The TAG's proposed ranking and the notes of their meeting were then provided to the Citizen's Committee, which met on July 31 to rate the projects based on the Citizen's Committee criteria ([CC scoring notes](#)). The CC's final ranked list was presented to the Board for review and approved on August 7. Next, the ranked project list will be submitted to the state for consideration by the SRFB. The SRFB's annual funding meeting occurs in December.

The CC's proposed 2013 Ranked Project List is presented on the next page. Detailed information on each project can be seen by clicking on the title. A brief description of the CC's rational for adjustments it made to the TAG rankings is included on page 3. Page 4 provides an overview of anticipated funding levels and sources.

2013 YBFWRB Proposed SRFB Project Ranking

Project Name	Request	TAG Score	TAG Tier	CC Tier	CC Score	Final Rank	Cumulative Funding
Little Rattlesnake Creek Floodplain Reconnection	\$360,000	1	High Priority Fund	High Priority Fund	7	1	360,000
Naneum, Wilson, and Cherry Creek Assessment	\$254,000	2	High Priority Fund	High Priority Fund	11	2	614,000
Reed Diversion Removal Design	\$69,000	3	High Priority Fund	High Priority Fund	11	3	683,000
Cle Elum River Side Channel Restoration Phase 2	\$518,974	4	High Priority Fund	High Priority Fund	10	4	1,201,974
Robinson Landing Levee Setback Design	\$124,500	5	Priority Fund	Priority Fund	7	5	1,326,474
Bateman Island Causeway Modification Conceptual Design	\$215,581	6	Priority Fund	Priority Fund	7	6	1,542,055
Lower Cowlitz Floodplain Reconnection, Phase 3	\$268,419	8	Priority Fund	Priority Fund	9	7	1,810,474
Teanaway Forks Large Wood Trapping	\$139,454	9	Priority Fund	Priority Fund	5	8	1,949,928
Floodplain Restoration with Beaver Dam Analogs	\$56,910	10	Priority Fund	Priority Fund	8	9	2,006,838
Ellensburg Water Co - Coleman Creek Intersection	\$250,025	12	Fund	Priority Fund	9	10	2,256,863
Yakima Basin Bull Trout Task Force	\$47,640	7	Priority Fund	Priority Fund	4	11	2,304,503
Wise Manastash Creek Acquisition & Restoration	\$192,549	11	Fund	Fund	5	12	2,497,052
Ahtanum Creek Restoration Survey & Design	\$130,000	14	Fund	Fund	7	13	2,627,052
Naches River Riparian & Side Channel Design	\$84,730	13	Fund	Fund	1	14	2,711,782
Yakima Beaver Project	\$195,850	15	Fund	Fund	5	15	2,907,632
West Side Crossing Reach Instream Habitat Improvement Project	\$170,443	17	Do Not Fund	Fund	7	16	3,078,075
Healing Greens Project	\$166,500	16	Do Not Fund	Do Not Fund	-3	17	3,244,575

NOTES on the CITIZEN'S COMMITTEE RANKINGS

The CC chose to maintain the TAG's ranking for the first six projects, based on the fact that in general the TAG's highest ranked projects also received the highest scores based on the CC criteria. They noted that in the case of the one exception, the Little Rattlesnake Floodplain Reconnection Project, the CC's concerns could be addressed if the project sponsor implements effective public outreach and communication about the project and its impacts on road access. The CC emphasized that while the project has created some concerns for road users, significant efforts are being made to ensure that road access to areas above the closed section will be maintained.

CC changes to the TAG rank occurred for several projects further down the list:

- 1) The Yakima Basin Bull Trout Task Force was moved downward from #7 on the TAG's list to #11 on the CC list, based on its relatively poor CC score of 4 and CC concerns that portions of the work (outreach and monitoring) were not clearly eligible for SRFB funding while the case for the need and effectiveness of work to address other elements (recreational dams) was not well developed.
- 2) The Ellensburg Water Company Coleman Creek Intersection Project was moved upward from #12 to #10, based on its high CC score (9 vs 4 and 5 for the projects moved below it) and the CC's desire to see the project completed so as not to strand funded allocated to it in previous years.
- 3) The Ahtanum Creek Restoration Survey and Design Project was moved above the Naches River Riparian and Side Channel Design Project, trading the 13th and 14th spots in the list. The CC based this on the significantly higher CC score (7 vs 1) received by the Ahtanum Project.
- 4) The CC changed the TAG's 'Do Not Fund' recommendation for the West Side Crossing Reach to 'Fund', giving the project the 16th place on the list. The CC concurred with the TAG that the SRFB should not fund any work on the actual siphon site that might be considered a required element of the project to remove the siphon and replace it with a flume, but noted that there were fundable habitat improvement elements proposed downstream of the siphon site.
- 5) The CC confirmed the 'Do Not Fund' recommendation for the Healing Greens project, noting that while they commended the project sponsor for their interest in salmon recovery, the proposal did not clearly define what would be done, its potential benefits, and the capacity of the sponsor to effectively implement the project.
- 6) Finally, the CC considered the TAG recommendation that monitoring elements of the Bateman Island Causeway Design not be funded, but decided to provide that input as a recommendation to the sponsor, rather than as a condition of funding.

More information on the Citizen's Committee scores for each project can be found in the [CC Notes](#).

EXPECTED FUNDING LEVELS AND SOURCES

The proposed project list is longer (at 16 projects) and more expensive (at \$3.078 million) than we anticipate can be funded by the SRFB. Currently we expect the SRFB to have approximately \$1.2 million available for projects in the Yakima Basin, which would only fund projects 1-4 in full. However at this time we are recommending submission of the whole list to the SRFB due to the high likelihood that sponsors will secure other funding sources for some of the projects on the list. As sponsors find other funding and remove proposals from the list or reduce the requested funding amounts, we will move SRFB funds further down our ranked list.

Right now potential additional funding sources include:

- 1) Early Action funds from the Yakima Basin Integrated Plan, which are expected to go to projects #3, 6 and 11 on our list. Project sponsors are currently working with the Department of Ecology to route these funds to project-specific contracts with the Department of Ecology and/or the Recreation and Conservation Office.
- 2) BLM funds for habitat improvements near BLM lands on Cowiche Creek which would be used for #7 on our list. The Board is working with the BLM to secure \$75,000 for 2013, with the anticipation that this would be the first of 5 years in which the BLM would provide some funding to the top-ranked Cowiche Creek project in our funding list.
- 3) US Corps of Engineers 1135 funds which would go to #6 and 7 on our list. This funding has been proposed by the Corps and is awaiting final approval as part of the 2013 federal budget.
- 4) Other Department of Ecology Funds, which may be available to for projects 1, 2, 4, 6 and 10. More information on the likelihood of this funding should be available later in August.

If all of the above funds are secured, we might be able to fund 15 to 16 of the 16 projects on the proposed ranked project list! This would be a significant step forward for our SRFB process.

We are working closely with project sponsors and funding partners to clarify what funding will go to which projects, and how far down the ranked project list that allows us to move SRFB dollars.