

# APPENDIX I: Citizen Committee Matrix and Guidance

## Background:

The Citizen Committee evaluates projects proposed for SRFB funding based on their value to local communities. The Citizen Committee is made up of four representatives from each county in the lead entity (Kittitas, Yakima, and Benton) and the Yakama Nation, for a total of 16 members. Members are appointed by the YBFWRB Board of Directors following the procedures in its bylaws. Participants may represent counties, cities, conservation districts, tribes, environmental groups, business interests, landowners, citizens, volunteer groups, regional fish enhancement groups, and other stakeholder groups.

The Citizen Committee ensures that projects identified as biological priorities also have the community support they need to succeed. The committee works together to evaluate how the community's social, cultural and economic values are incorporated into salmon recovery projects. This is a vital part of ensuring that community support for salmon recovery increases over time.

The Citizen Committee develops the final ranked project list that is then approved by the Board and submitted to the SRFB for funding. The Citizen Committee takes the ranked list provided by the TAG, and utilizes it as the starting point for the development of the final ranked list. The TAG ranking serves as the local evaluation of the biological benefits of the projects, which is the primary driver of SRFB investments. Projects may be moved up or down in rank on the final ranked habitat project list when the committee provides sufficient justification that the social, cultural, and economic values of a project warrant changing its position from that recommended by the TAG. Committee decisions shall be made by consensus; on those rare occasions when consensus cannot be reached, the Citizen Committee bylaws allow a decision to be made using a super-majority vote of those present of 65%. Note that the Board can remand the list to the Citizen Committee for reconsideration, but the Board cannot re-rank projects. This process is set up to meet the requirements of the state statute creating the SRFB and the Lead Entity program, and is designed to ensure that projects proposed for SRFB funding are technically solid, address priority issues, and are broadly supported by diverse community groups.

## Scoring:

Citizen Committee members use the Community Evaluation and Ranking Matrix to determine how projects rate for multiple criteria in each of four categories; cultural and social, economic, context and organization, and partnerships and community support.

In this matrix, each criterion will be scored with a +1, 0, and – 1 assigned as follows:

- +1 = Project has a positive effect
- 0 = Project has no significant net effect
- -1 = Project has a negative effect

Scores are added to determine an overall positive or negative total for each project. The Citizen Committee uses these scores as they review the TAG ranked list and develop the final ranked habitat project list. A positive score means that a project has high community value, beyond what the TAG evaluated for benefits to salmon and habitat, and may be a candidate to move higher up the final ranked habitat project list. A negative score means that a project may have less community value, and may be a candidate for moving lower in the final ranked habitat project list. Note that a project with a total of zero (0) points, or slightly above or below zero points, may well be a solid project, the Citizen Committee score of 0 simply means that there is not a clear indication that the project's rank should be either raised or lowered as compared to the TAG recommendation.

### **Citizen Committee Matrix:**

1. How does the project affect the Yakama Nation and its members beyond contributing to salmon recovery?
2. How does the project affect agricultural interests?
3. How does the project affect recreational opportunities within the Basin?
4. How will the project change ESA liabilities for community members?
5. Does the project include a substantive benefit for wildlife or other habitat?
6. Does the project include substantive and compelling education and outreach components?
7. Are there economic effects associated with this project?
8. Are there specific elements of the project budget that either raise concerns or are particularly cost-effective?
9. How is the project coordinated with other past, present, and future actions?
10. Are the right partners involved to make the project succeed?
11. Are the landowners who are directly affected by the proposed project in strong support of this proposal?
12. At the current stage of the proposed project, is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources?

### **Guidance for Specific Questions:**

#### **Cultural & Social Considerations**

1. How does the project affect the Yakama Nation and its members beyond contributing to salmon recovery?

Citizen Committee members should consider project impacts to the protection of cultural resources, access for traditional activities and other benefits or issues of concern.

Elements of a project that benefit fish and their habitat should be considered neutral, positive points should be given for projects that create additional benefits or negative points for elements that create challenges for the Yakama Nation.

2. How does the project affect agricultural interests?

For agricultural operations, Citizen Committee members should consider project impacts to agricultural infrastructure, impacts on adjacent landowners, removal of land from agricultural production, impacts on agricultural water use and management, and other benefits or issues of concern. This is the space to evaluate whether there will be flood impacts that increase or decrease because of this project. Changes in ESA liability for community members should be evaluated separately under question 4 below and not as part of this question.

3. How does the project affect recreational opportunities within the Basin?

This question should foster discussion on how the project affects recreational opportunities within the Basin. Citizen Committee members should consider whether the project impacts access to recreational areas, impacts anglers, increases or reduces risk for recreationalists, and other benefits or issues of concern.

4. How will the project change ESA liabilities for community members?

Citizen Committee members should review TAG comments and utilize as the basis for their evaluation. The TAG will provide their consensus opinion on any changes to ESA liability but will not incorporate that information into their ranking.

CC members should focus on whether the project increases or decreases specific parties' potential liability for 'take' under the federal Endangered Species List (defined as harming of a listed species) – for example, if two projects are scored by the TAG as having similar biological benefits but one project significantly reduces a land manager's ESA liability and another does not, the CC may express a preference for the project that reduces community member ESA liability.

This is not the place to evaluate the broader biological benefits of the project to target species.

5. Does the project include a substantive benefit for wildlife or other habitat?

Citizen Committee members should review TAG comments and utilize as the basis for their evaluation. The TAG will provide their consensus opinion on any positives or negatives for wildlife or other habitat but will not incorporate that information into their ranking.

Citizen Committee members should focus on additional benefits to wildlife or other habitat noted by the TAG. For example, if two projects are scored by the TAG as having similar biological benefits for targeted fish species, but one project is likely to have additional benefits for wildlife,

the CC may express a preference for the project with broader benefits for non-target species of interest to the community.

6. Does the project include substantive and compelling education and outreach components?

Consider whether the project proposes to involve students and the public in the project implementation, provide educational signage, serve as sites for outreach events and tours, or otherwise serve as a venue where the public can learn about and become engaged in salmon recovery. An example would be a project that hosts a classroom tour to learn about salmon recovery and/or habitat restoration projects.

## Economic Considerations

7. Are there economic effects associated with this project?

Consider whether the project has significant economic impacts such as changing local infrastructure, creating or limiting recreational opportunities, creating or limiting (new or existing) economic opportunities and/or either increases or reduces the need for future investment in project maintenance or repair. For example, a floodplain restoration project that also reduces flood risk to existing developed areas would be given a positive point. A project that severely limits access to an existing recreational area may be given a negative point.

8. Are there specific elements of the project budget that either raise concerns or are particularly cost-effective?

The TAG has already incorporated the cost versus the biological benefit of the project into its ranking. This is the place for the Citizen Committee to reward projects that model particularly cost-effective approaches and/or to raise concerns about specific budget items that the Citizen Committee agree to be clearly unreasonable (either unrealistically low or too high). Match should be evaluated separately under question 12 below.

## Project Context & Organization Considerations

9. How is the project coordinated with other past, present, and future actions?

Consider whether the project's benefits are dependent upon the sequencing of other actions and how the overall sequence affects the community. The Citizen Committee should review TAG notes on project sequencing and if all known actions that might influence a project positive or negatively have been identified, a zero may be given. A project should receive a positive point

(+1) if it clearly complements ongoing or planned activities, and a negative point (-1) if the project is out of sequence with other actions in a way that would impact project efficacy and/or unnecessarily complicate other activities of importance to the community. A zero should be used for project where sequencing is irrelevant. For example, a salmon recovery land acquisition that also enables a planned or in progress dike setback that reduces community flood risk would be given a positive point. A salmon recovery land acquisition that complicates a planned municipal infrastructure project would be given a negative point.

## Partnerships & Community Support Considerations

### 10. Are the right partners involved to make the project successful?

Consider positive/neutral/negative aspects of the partnerships demonstrated in the proposal. Appropriate partners might be a water trust, conservation trust, riparian restoration experts, etc. This is also an opportunity for Citizen Committee members to consider community involvement in the project. For example, a project that is not only involving the right partners but also has strong community support may warrant a positive point (+1).

The following table is an example of how the two elements can be combined to derive a positive/neutral/negative score.

		Community Support and Involvement		
		Low	Med	High
Certainty that the right partners are involved	Low	-1	-1	0
	Med	-1	0	+1
	High	0	+1	+1

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

Citizen Committee members should review the TAG comments related to landowner commitment on the TAG evaluation form. If the CC agrees the TAG has sufficiently captured pros and cons, a zero should be given. If not, CC members should use the guidance below.

A proposal should receive a positive score (+1) when there is clear landowner support for the project. This can be shown through involvement in project development, in-kind or cash support, etc. Projects that complete the minimum related to landowner commitment (i.e. signed landowner acknowledgement form) should receive a neutral score (0). A proposal that is

missing the signed landowner acknowledgement form(s) at the time of the TAG meeting and/or has landowner opposition should receive a negative point (-1).

12. At the current stage of the proposed project, is the project sponsor using SRFB funding to leverage other funding sources?

Consider the project assessment, design, and implementation.

The project should receive a positive point (+1) if the sponsor demonstrates that they are using SRFB funds to leverage significant amounts from other funding sources (only 15% of which needs to be claimed for match within the SRFB grant), and/or the sponsor shows that they have received in-kind and/or financial support from the landowner or other source not generally dedicated to salmon recovery. An average match should receive a neutral point (0). This is the only question in which only a neutral or positive score are an option.

Please note: Project sponsors are required to submit reimbursements with the same percentage of match they put into PRISM. (i.e. if they designated a 35% match in PRISM, they would need to show receipts for 35% of every reimbursement request.) Because this can be an administrative headache, many sponsors list additional match beyond what is required in a separate column in their budget spreadsheet. Be sure to check the budget spreadsheet and not just the numbers noted in PRISM to ensure accurate match.