



2014 Salmon Recovery Grant Funding Report

December 2014



WASHINGTON STATE
RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE

Salmon Recovery
Funding Board

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Part 1 – Introduction.....	1
Introduction.....	1
2014 Grant Round.....	1
Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Large Capital Project List.....	3
Elements of the 2014 Grant Round.....	4
Habitat Work Schedule.....	5
PRISM Innovations.....	6
Part 2 – SRFB Review Panel Comments.....	7
Project Review Process.....	7
“Projects of Concern”.....	8
Adjustments to Project Lists.....	11
General Grant Round Process and Observations.....	12
Conditioned Projects.....	14
2014 Recommendations to Improve Projects and Evaluation Criteria.....	16
Part 3 – Region Summaries.....	19
Introduction.....	19
How is the Regional Review Process Implemented?.....	19
Attachment 1 – 2014 Grant Schedule.....	21
Attachment 2 – 2014 SRFB Review Panel Biographies.....	23
Attachment 3 – 2014 SRFB Review Panel Evaluation Criteria.....	26
Criteria.....	26
Attachment 4 – Projects Funded September 2014.....	29
Puget Sound Partnership.....	29
Hood Canal Coordinating Council.....	32
PSAR Large Capital Project List Funded September 2014.....	32
Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) Project List Funded September 2014.....	33
Attachment 5 – 2015-2017 PSAR Large Capital Project List.....	34
Attachment 6 – 2014 PSAR Large Capital Request for Proposals and Scoring Criteria.....	36
Attachment 7 – “Projects of Concern” and Project Condition Summary.....	43
“Projects of Concern” = 2.....	43
“Conditioned” Projects = 30.....	43
Project Summary.....	54
Draft Application Review and Site Visit – REVIEW PANEL comments.....	54

EARLY APPLICATION Review and Site VISIT – lead entity and project sponsor responses.....	56
Post Application – REVIEW PANEL comments.....	56
Post application – lead entity and project sponsor responses.....	58
FINAL REVIEW PANEL Comments.....	58
Project Summary	60
Draft Application Review and Site Visit – REVIEW PANEL comments.....	61
EARLY APPLICATION Review and Site VISIT – lead entity and project sponsor responses.....	61
Post Application – REVIEW PANEL comments.....	62
Post application – lead entity and project sponsor responses.....	63
FINAL REVIEW PANEL Comments.....	63
Attachment 8 – Funding Table By Region	65
Hood Canal Coordinating Council	65
Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board	67
Northeast Washington	68
Puget Sound Partnership.....	69
Snake River Salmon Recovery Board.....	82
Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board.....	83
Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership	84
Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board	86

Cover photograph by Marc Duboiski, Recreation and Conservation Office

Part 1 – Introduction

Introduction

The Legislature created the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) in 1999 to provide grants to protect and restore salmon habitat. The SRFB works closely with local watershed groups known as lead entities¹ to identify projects for funding. The SRFB has administered nearly \$705 million of state and federal funds to help finance more than 2,600 projects and activities statewide. This report presents information on the process used to review the 2014 applications, the SRFB Review Panel project evaluations, and staff analysis for the SRFB to consider at its December 3, 2014 meeting in Olympia.

Table 1. Regional Funding Allocation Formula, as Adopted by the SRFB

Regional Salmon Recovery Organization	Regional Allocation Percent of Total	2014 Allocation Based on \$18 million
Hood Canal Coordinating Council*	2.35%	\$1,195,165
Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board**	15%	\$2,700,000
Middle Columbia Salmon Recovery Board**	9.87%	\$1,776,600
Northeast Washington	2%	\$360,000
Puget Sound Partnership	42.04%	\$6,795,035
SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY BOARD	8.88%	\$1,598,400
Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board	10.85%	\$1,953,000
Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership	9%	\$1,620,000

* Hood Canal is in the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region for Chinook and steelhead, but is a separate salmon recovery region for summer chum. The Hood Canal Coordinating Council receives 10 percent (\$772,165) of the Puget Sound Partnership's regional SRFB allocation for Chinook and steelhead. The council also receives a regional allocation of \$423,000 from the SRFB for Hood Canal summer chum.

** One project (total \$516,162) submitted by the Klickitat County Lead Entity is in the Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region's allocation.

2014 Grant Round

The Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) grant award administered by National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, combined with returned funds and other available state funds, make an \$18 million grant cycle possible. RCO also sets aside \$500,000 for the upcoming year (2015) for unanticipated cost increases. The proposed regional allocations in the funding tables

¹ Lead entity groups, authorized under Revised Code of Washington Chapter 77.85, are established in a local area by agreement between the county, cities, and tribes. The groups choose a coordinating organization as the lead entity, which creates a citizen committee to prioritize projects. Lead entities also have a technical advisory group to evaluate the scientific and technical merits of projects. Consistent with state law and SRFB policies, all projects seeking funding must be reviewed and prioritized by a lead entity to be considered by the SRFB.

on Attachment 8 reflect the \$18 million funding target. Each regional area and corresponding lead entities prepared their respective lists of projects in consideration of the available funding. Several lead entities also identified “alternate” projects on their lists. These projects must go through the entire lead entity, region, and board review process. Project alternates within a lead entity list may receive funds within one year from the original board funding decision, and only if another project on the funded portion of the list cannot be completed or is funded by another entity other than RCO.

In the spring of 2014, sponsors submitted 215 salmon project applications into PRISM, RCO’s project database, for the 2014 grant cycle. Between April and June 2014, the lead entities coordinated project site visits with the review panel and RCO staff. The site visits were an opportunity to see the project sites, learn about the project specifics, and provide feedback to the sponsor in a project comment form. The deadline for salmon grant applications was August 15, 2014; lead entities were required to submit their ranked project lists by this time. The RCO staff and the Review Panel evaluated 185 salmon projects. In September 2014, the board approved 26 projects utilizing Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) funding and 6 projects within IMW areas utilizing salmon state and federal funds.

The 2014 grant cycle included submission and review of five components. The board funded the following three components, all shown in Attachment 4 at the September 2014 board meeting:

- Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) projects: This allocated the remaining 2013-15 PSAR funds. The amount approved for 26 projects and 9 alternate projects was \$8,151,016.
- PSAR large capital projects: This allocated the remaining 2013-15 PSAR large capital funds. The amount approved for two projects was \$16,714,230.
- Intensively Monitored Watershed projects: The SRFB approved up to \$2 million a year for the next three grant rounds for design and restoration projects in Intensively Monitored Watershed complexes. The amount approved for six projects was \$1,937,647.

At the December 2014 meeting, the board will be asked to approve the remaining two components:

- Funding (state and federal) for salmon applications on the lead entity ranked lists: The funding amount this grant round is \$18 million. These projects are shown in Attachment 8.
- PSAR large capital projects for the 2015-17 biennium: The Puget Sound Partnership released a request for proposals with specific criteria for 2015-17 large capital

projects to be submitted by August 15, 2014. The technical review panel reviewed all projects entered into PRISM. The partnership reviewed and ranked the large capital projects and the Puget Sound Partnership Salmon Recovery Council approved the list. Funding for the PSAR large capital project list will not be approved unless the Legislature funds the PSAR account in 2015. The list will be shared with the Office of Financial Management and the Legislature. The PSAR large capital regional list is shown in Attachment 5.

All projects described in the above components have used *Manual 18, Salmon Recovery Grants* as guidance and been through the technical review process with the SRFB Review Panel. Applications were due July 1, 2014 for 2013-15 PSAR and Intensively Monitored Watershed projects, and August 15, 2014 for all other projects. It is of note that all projects went through the same review process and timeline identified in Manual 18, so there were some efficiencies to the grant round. For example, all project types listed above were reviewed during one scheduled site visit for each lead entity, taking place over a day or two.

Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Large Capital Project List

The state 2013-2015 Capital Budget included \$70 million to accelerate implementation of the *Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan*. The budget included two components with two processes for allocating funds: \$30 million was allocated to local watersheds to advance projects that ensure every watershed in Puget Sound is making significant progress, and \$40 million was allocated to a regional, large capital project list that was prioritized by the Puget Sound Partnership using criteria for ranking pre-proposals and approved by the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council. The SRFB distributed these funds in coordination with the Puget Sound Partnership. The 2013-2015 PSAR large capital projects were approved at the December 2013 and September 2014 board meetings.

This year, the Puget Sound Partnership put out a Request for Proposals for regional large capital projects in advance of the legislative session. The Legislature will meet and approve a 2015-2017 Capital Budget by the end of April 2015. The intent of the request is to have a list of ranked and prioritized projects approved and ready to proceed once the legislature funds the PSAR account. All of the projects must have preliminary designs complete at a minimum. A total of 24 applications were received and the Puget Sound Partnership ranked and prioritized the completed applications. The final list approved by the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council includes 22 projects requesting \$90 million and is shown on Attachment 5.

Regional large capital PSAR funds are intended to be allocated to strategic, large capital projects that are high priority and significantly large in scope (i.e., scale, complexity, and cost) irrespective of the project's geographic location (i.e., watershed), and ready to advance. These projects cost more than is typically available in the standard PSAR allocations or SRFB grants. Final approval

of the regional, large capital project list is subject to having the project approved through the regular SRFB grant approval process. The projects have been vetted locally and technically reviewed by the SRFB Review Panel. Attachment 6 includes the request for proposals and criteria for ranking the projects.

Criteria for prioritizing projects include:

- Results in an improvement in abundance, productivity, diversity, and/or spatial distribution for one or more populations of listed Evolutionary Significant Units.
- Benefits multiple listed salmon and steelhead populations.
- Level of design work completed for project (for restoration projects).
- Stage of project development (for acquisition projects).
- Match funding provided by project sponsor.
- Makes progress toward a Puget Sound *Action Agenda* target for protection or restoration of habitat (e.g. shoreline armoring, eelgrass, estuaries, etc.).

Elements of the 2014 Grant Round

The basic elements of a regional funding allocation approach that carry over from the previous funding cycles include:

- Reliance on regional salmon recovery plans and lead entity strategies.
- Review of individual projects by the SRFB Review Panel to identify “Projects of Concern.”
- Provision of flexibility, recognizing different circumstances across the state.
- Efficiencies by shortening the grant schedule and reducing evaluation steps.
- Streamlined process while transitioning toward more use of regional recovery plans, where such plans are in place or being developed.

The SRFB also committed to continuing the following key principles:

- Salmon recovery funds will be allocated regionally.
- The SRFB Review Panel will not evaluate the quality of lead entity strategies that are part of recovery plans already submitted to the Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s National Marine Fisheries

Service (NOAA-Fisheries). Regional organizations ensure the submitted lists of projects are consistent with the regional recovery plans.

- The evaluation process will be collaborative. The SRFB Review Panel will work with lead entities and project applicants early to address the project design issues and reduce the likelihood that projects submitted are viewed as “Projects of Concern” by the review panel or the SRFB.
- Each region has different complexities, ranging from varying numbers of watersheds to areas with vastly differing sizes of human populations. These complexities require different approaches to salmon recovery.
- Lead entities will continue to be a crucial and fundamental part of the recovery effort.
- Support continues for areas without regional recovery plans (coast and northeast).
- A statewide strategic approach to salmon recovery will continue.
- Funds must be used efficiently to address both listed and non-listed species.

In February 2014, the SRFB adopted *Manual 18, Salmon Recovery Grants* with several changes that were a result of feedback from the SRFB, regions, lead entities, sponsors, review panel, and RCO staff to improve the grant process. Manual 18 is updated annually to reflect a new grant timeline, process improvements, and administrative updates, and remains the guidance document for entities applying for funding through the SRFB.

Habitat Work Schedule

Lead entities continue to update the Habitat Work Schedule. The Habitat Work Schedule tracks a lead entity’s progress on salmon recovery projects and activities implemented, proposed, conceptual, and completed. During this grant round, lead entities have been ensuring that data is current and complete. Some lead entities have been using the Habitat Work Schedule for projects beyond those funded by the SRFB, including monitoring, restoration, protection, and some programmatic efforts. Lead entities also have worked with the Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office and RCO to develop an interface between RCO’s online grant database, PRISM, and the Habitat Work Schedule that allows for some data fields entered into the Habitat Work Schedule to populate project applications and create a link between the systems. Once the project link is established between PRISM and the Habitat Work Schedule, the user can see the shared project information from either system.

PRISM Innovations

RCO has implemented several innovations for PRISM, the project database. An innovation that came out of the Habitat Work Schedule-PRISM interface is PRISM Snapshot. This feature allows PRISM project information to be published to a Web page and viewed anywhere with an Internet connection.

In addition, the RCO Web site hosts [Project Search](#), which allows visitors to select different criteria for projects (grant recipient, project location, grant program, type of project, project status, etc.) and have grant information displayed graphically in charts or graphs. Web visitors can get a full range of information on funding, status, and milestones, as well as see photographs, maps, and other grant agreement documents. These new features don't require visitors to download PRISM, and greatly improve the ability of visitors to learn about and track projects. Readers viewing this report electronically and connected to the Internet may access these features throughout this document. Anytime the project number is in blue, readers may click on the project number to view PRISM Snapshot and additional information for that project. Please note that on some computers readers may have to right click on the project number and select "open hyperlink."

RCO is transitioning PRISM for outside users to a Web-based interface. The first piece of this transition was moving the application to a Web-based system. This grant round was the second SRFB grant round to use this online application system. RCO staff spent many hours developing and testing the system and it is working effectively and efficiently to input, review, and process applications. A new feature, similar to the PRISM Snapshot outlined above, is the Application Report, where one can go view an entire application with one link. This was helpful to provide information efficiently to the review panel and saved staff time in this process.

RCO enhanced the PRISM database by creating a compliance tool, the compliance workbench, where staff will be able to input project inspections and compliance issues using a Web interface from a tablet out in the field.

Staff recently launched the development of electronic billing (e-billing) as the third in this series of improving the PRISM database to be more user friendly. The last paper invoices will be accepted in March 2015, and starting in April 2015, PRISM e-billing will be used to accept electronic invoices.

Part 2 – SRFB Review Panel Comments

The SRFB Review Panel is comprised of eight members. The technical members are experts in salmon recovery with a broad range of knowledge in salmon habitat restoration and protection approaches, watershed processes, ecosystem approaches to habitat restoration and protection (also referred to as process-based restoration), restoration project development, and watershed planning. Members also have expertise in a number of different project types (passage, near-shore, assessments, acquisition, in-stream, etc.). Attachment 2 contains short biographies of review panel members.

The SRFB Review Panel helps the board meet the requirements of the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund program's technical review process. The panel reviews all grant applications to help ensure that each project is: 1) technically sound, meaning that a proposed project provides a benefit to salmon; 2) likely to be successful; and 3) does not have costs that outweigh the anticipated benefits. Applications not meeting these criteria are labeled "Projects of Concern" and will be forwarded to the SRFB for funding consideration unless the lead entity withdraws the application. The review panel does not otherwise rate, score, or rank projects. Members of the panel also are available to review project designs to satisfy project conditions or at staff request.

Project Review Process

The review panel worked throughout the year reviewing projects both before and after the application deadline. This was intended to help lead entities and sponsors improve their project concepts and benefits to fish. The benefit and certainty criteria used by the review panel in its evaluation of projects can be found in *Manual 18, Salmon Recovery Grants*, Appendix H and is also Attachment 3 in this report. The panel based its evaluations and comments on:

- Early project site visits and consultations.
- Attendance at some local technical and citizens committee project evaluation and ranking processes used by lead entities and regional organizations.
- Application materials submitted by lead entities and regional organizations.
- Discussions with lead entities, project sponsors, and regional organizations during the regional area project meetings October 27-28.

As with past rounds, the 2014 project review process involved an effort to provide early feedback to project sponsors, lead entities, and regional organizations. Starting in early spring, and completed by June 30, 2014, well before the August 15 application deadline, the panel participated in field and office reviews of potential projects around the state, and provided an early comment form for each project. The review panel met in mid-July to review the PSAR

projects and to review and discuss any projects that the panel had identified concerns with from the early review site visits and draft applications. The review panel also reviewed the final PSAR large capital projects.

After the early project reviews, 185 final applications were submitted by August 15, 2014 for funding consideration. The review panel reviewed all final applications and responses to early comments. The panel then met from September 22-24 to discuss final project proposals and responses to applications. Review panel project comment forms were updated with post-application comments by October 3. Projects at that time were given a status of either: Clear, Conditioned, Need More Information, or Project of Concern.

Projects with complete applications that met all review criteria and were ready to be recommended for funding were given a status of "Clear." Some applications still lacked sufficient information to complete the technical review and were given a status of "Need More Information." In most cases, providing additional information addressed the concerns. If the review panel saw potential issues with projects not meeting evaluation criteria, the projects were noted as "Projects of Concern" and the panel specifically identified the concerns, and if and how sponsors could address them.

Sponsor responses to post-application comments were due October 16. The panel reviewed additional information and responses to comments, and cleared projects if possible by October 22. Projects with a remaining "Project of Concern" status were invited to the regional area project meetings to discuss the project issues in detail with the panel. The purpose of the regional area project meetings is to have regions present an overview of their recovery programs' goals and objectives, how the project lists achieve these goals, and their processes for project selection. It is also the opportunity for the lead entities and project sponsors to discuss any project issues identified with the review panel.

After the regional area project meetings, the review panel evaluated all projects by the review criteria to determine if any had low benefit to salmon, low certainty of being successful, or were not cost-effective. Projects that did not clearly meet one or more of these SRFB criteria were identified as "Projects of Concern." Panel determinations were made available to lead entities and regional organizations by November 6.

"Projects of Concern"

After the regional area meetings, only two projects remained as "Projects of Concern." The two remaining "Projects of Concern" are submitted to the board for review and decision. The review panel labeled 30 projects as "Conditioned" because it felt the projects needed to meet specific conditions for approval. Attachment 3 contains SRFB evaluation criteria for projects; Attachment

7 contains a summary of the “Conditioned” projects and the “Projects of Concern” review panel comment forms.

Table 2. Number of Projects and Projects Status in 2014

Lead Entity	Projects Reviewed Early Site Visits	Projects Submitted by Due Date	Projects Withdrawn After Review	“Projects of Concern” October	Need More Info October	Final “Projects of Concern”
Chehalis Basin County Lead Entity	11	10	3	2	1	0
Green, Duwamish, and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9) Lead Entity	4	3	1	0	0	0
Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity	18	17	1	3	0	1
Island County Lead Entity	6	6	0	0	1	0
Kalispel Tribe-Pend Oreille Lead Entity	3	2	1	0	0	0
Klickitat County Lead Entity	3	2	1	0	1	0
Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8) Lead Entity	6	5	1	0	1	0
Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity	25	21	1	0	0	0
Nisqually River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity	5	5	0	0	1	0
North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon	8	7	1	0	2	0
North Pacific Coast Lead Entity	3	2	1	0	0	0
Pacific County Lead Entity	3	3	0	0	2	0
Pierce County Lead Entity	10	9	1	0	0	0
Quinault Indian Nation Lead Entity	4	2	2	0	0	0
San Juan County Community	6	5	1	0	0	0

Lead Entity	Projects Reviewed Early Site Visits	Projects Submitted by Due Date	Projects Withdrawn After Review	“Projects of Concern” October	Need More Info October	Final “Projects of Concern”
Development Lead Entity						
Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity	13	12	1	0	2	0
Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity	14	14	1	1	2	0
Snohomish Basin Lead Entity	6	5	2	0	0	0
Stillaguamish River Salmon Recovery Co-Lead Entity	3	4	0	0	0	0
Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity	17	10	1	1	1	0
West Sound Watersheds Council Lead Entity	8	8	1	0	3	0
WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity	14	12	1	0	2	0
WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee	7	7	2	1	1	1
WRIA 14 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee	8	7	0	2	2	0
Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board Lead Entity	10	10	1	0	1	0
Total	215	185	25	10	23	2

The number of projects submitted in 2014 was within the range submitted during the past several years. The percentage of “Projects of Concern” is similar to that of the past several grant rounds. The interaction with the review panel and the feedback to sponsors is meant to improve projects and ensure a clear benefit to salmonids in each watershed. It is the goal of this thorough review process to have top priority projects submitted to the SRFB for funding.

Table 3. “Projects of Concern” 2004-2014

Grant Round	Eligible Projects Submitted	“Projects of Concern”					
		Pre-Draft, Flagged NMI or “Projects of Concern”		October		Final Report Nov. 20, 2013	
2004	180	NA				19	11%
2005	167	49	29%	24	14%	16	10%
2006	115	27	23%	9	8%	1	1%
2007	219	40	18%	18	8%	4	2%
2008	131	NA		16	12%	6	5%
2009	179	59		16	8%	6	3%
2010	159	18		10	6%	1	0.63%
2011	177	21		27	15%	1	0.6%
2012	175	17		35	20%	1	0.68%
2013	192	32		15	8%	0	0
2014	185	33		10	5%	2	1%

The 2014 SRFB policies governing a “Project of Concern” are the same as in previous grant rounds. Lead entities and regional organizations were asked to notify RCO of their final lists by November 11. A regional organization or lead entity had to decide by that date whether to leave a “Project of Concern” on its list and have the SRFB consider it for funding in December. However, if a “Project of Concern” is left on the list and a convincing case is not made to the SRFB that the project merits funding, that dollar amount will not remain in the target allocation. If lead entities withdraw a “Project of Concern” before the funding meeting, alternates may be considered for funding.

The intent of this policy is both to signal that the SRFB is unlikely to fund a “Project of Concern” and to ensure that lead entities and regional organizations are convinced of the merits of such projects before submitting them to the SRFB for funding.

The table of projects by lead entity is found as Attachment 8.

Adjustments to Project Lists

From the time of the SRFB’s pre-allocation decisions through the August application deadline, lead entities and regional organizations worked collaboratively to meet their funding targets. Sometimes, when projects were withdrawn because of a “Project of Concern” designation or because it was funded with other resources, regions and lead entities had to work with grant applicants to adjust project funding amounts and scopes to fit the funding targets. Applicants working through the lead entity and region could make adjustments in project costs (if warranted) up through November 11. Those adjustments are defined as:

- Any “Conditioned” project that needed a change in the application.
- Any “Project of Concern” where a scope or budget change would address the review panel recommendation and remove the designation.
- Any project where the review panel removes the designation of “Project of Concern” after considering new information submitted by lead entities and regional organizations.
- Any project that has been modified, without a significant change in scope, to meet the intra-regional funding allocation determined by the regional organization and its partners.

General Grant Round Process and Observations

In 2014, the review panel was comprised of eight members who completed field and project reviews as well as design reviews. During 2014, 215 projects were reviewed at the early project proposal stage with 185 projects coming forward as final project submittals. At the early project proposal stage, applicants submitted draft application materials and review panel members conducted site visits in all lead entity areas. The draft application material and site visits helped the review panel identify technical concerns and communicate these issues to project sponsors early in the review process.

Similar to the past couple of years, a number of design and acquisition projects came forward that are setting the stage for future large, complex, and costly restoration actions. While this is a first step in accomplishing the future restoration, the review panel was concerned about the likelihood that these projects will obtain adequate funding in the future for implementation. Some lead entities are getting increasingly sophisticated in leveraging and securing sizable funds through other sources, which allows for the implementation of larger, more complex projects requiring greater amounts of collaboration. We continue to see significant matching funds (or in some cases full funding of projects off the region lists) from floodplain restoration funds from the Department of Ecology, Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration fund, Bonneville Power Administration, various Federal Energy Relicensing Commission relicensing settlement agreements, public utility districts, and other mitigation funds.

The review panel continues to bring these projects to the SRFB’s attention to keep board members apprised of the teeing up of large-scale and high-cost projects, some with potentially substantial benefits to fish. The review panel sees a need for additional resources or tools related to evaluating these larger more expensive projects in a comparably robust technical way. An adaptive approach including more specific or different cost-benefit criteria and an appropriate evaluation tool or process is required. Value Engineering and access to an environmental economist are suggestions that have come from review panel members. The

benefit of Value Engineering has been proven in other capital improvement programs, including by the Washington Department of Transportation, which requires Value Engineering for projects costing more than \$25 million and bridge projects more than \$20 million. These values are much higher than the average restoration project, and a more appropriate level of funding (total project costs) would be in the \$3 million to \$5 million range. This is consistent with federal guidance for new agency projects that requires Value Engineering for projects with total costs of \$5 million or more. The review panel is seeking SRFB support to investigate options for value analysis or cost-benefit resources that the panel could use to evaluate higher cost projects. Given the trend of funding expensive projects using capital program funds, we feel it is very important to note the lack of transparent cost controls and to be mindful of taxpayer dollars.

Another observation of the panel is the continued need for appropriately scaled, implementation funding sources that need to be available statewide, not just in Puget Sound. While the panel acknowledges the importance of the Puget Sound targeted funding, we also see a major gap in funding larger, high-benefit projects around the rest of the state. The panel also sees the need for a flexible funding pool that could be applied to lead entity project lists outside of Puget Sound when they have unique, high benefit, and time-sensitive project opportunities that are technically ready for funding. This could be a separate competitive pool that could be used to fund projects anywhere outside of Puget Sound.

The review panel finds it difficult in some cases to determine actual total costs of projects in which the SRFB invests. Sponsors are required to submit cost details for SRFB funds and up to 15 percent of match (50 percent for Road Maintenance and Abandonment Plan projects) in PRISM and many also include information about additional match or costs above the 15 percent but this is not done consistently. We completely understand the administrative burden of tracking amounts above the required match, but it leaves RCO with a data gap and no way of consistently determining actual costs across the SRFB program. This is problematic for example when evaluating cost-benefit of a project, which we currently do qualitatively based on best professional judgment and a working knowledge of developing, designing, and implementing restoration projects. The review panel would like to use the substantial amount of information in PRISM to develop a range of typical project element costs as a resource for staff, sponsors, and us. However, without an accurate record of final, actual, detailed project costs including as-builts at project closeout, we are using incomplete information, because projects frequently evolve between proposal and implementation.

The review panel has observed a pattern of sponsors having significant challenges when working with some larger agencies whose primary mission is not salmon recovery but who have an obligation to contribute to ecosystem restoration. For many years we have seen projects involving stakeholder or funding agencies, including Washington Department of Transportation and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, add significant time, costs, and complications to projects. The

issue of the Department of Transportation participation in projects is important because many fish passage projects involve state highway infrastructure. We are seeing a need for higher-level, agency-to-agency coordination to develop consistent guidance for Department of Transportation regions and for sponsors on early project input, requests for cost reimbursement for items like design review and construction inspection, and added protection elements for infrastructure. With the Army Corps of Engineers, the challenges are different. The corps can be a significant funding partner through its various funding avenues; however its involvement always increases the cost, time, and review process for projects. In some cases, we have seen projects lose a lot of fish benefit between concept and implementation. In others, we have seen the Corps of Engineers spend nearly a decade in plan formulation using SRFB funds as match, and not produce deliverables in a reasonable time. The Corps of Engineers issue may improve because the agency has done a “process improvement” on its ecosystem restoration but by outside standards, it is still onerous.

Conditioned Projects

The review panel is conditioning an increasing number of projects for review of products or design deliverables – in part, because projects are coming in for implementation funding before their assessment or design deliverables are complete. The review panel conditioned a total of 30 projects this year, requiring design review at different points in the design process, typically of alternatives identified before selection of a preferred alternative, or of preliminary design products before proceeding to final design. The summary of the projects with their conditions can be found in Attachment 7. There were more projects conditioned this year than last year, and that is due to the higher number of complex, multi-phase projects coming forward.

Overall, the conditioning of projects for future review has been valuable to verify that funded design projects are achieving the goals and objectives as proposed. Conditioning for design review allows projects that are at a conceptual stage to proceed forward in the design process, while allowing the panel to check in on projects and ensure they are headed towards a fundable design for salmon recovery. The review panel is increasingly using conditioning as a way to strengthen projects and to avoid a “Project of Concern” designation when relatively straightforward adjustments to the objectives or designs can be made.

At times the review panel is requested to review project sites and as-built drawings as part of post-construction site visits before grant close-out, or because a project in progress encounters constraints that change the original objectives. In 2014, this occurred on three projects as noted below with an asterisk.

In 2014, the following projects were brought back to the review panel for design reviews as part of complying with conditions of earlier grant funding:

- [11-1410](#), Jim Creek Restoration, Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region
- [09-1429](#), Fenster Phase 2B Levee Setback Project, Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region
- [11-1380](#), Grays River Reach 2D Restoration, Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region
- [14-1058](#), Similk Beach Estuary Restoration Feasibility, Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region
- [12-1333](#), Abernathy Creek Reach 5A Side Channel Project (Hatchery Site), Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region
- [12-1252](#),* Filucy Bay Bulkhead Removal, Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region
- [13-1315](#), Naneum, Wilson and Cherry Creek Assessment, Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region
- [12-1524](#), Middle Fork Nooksack Large Wood Debris Design, Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region
- [12-1334](#), Upper Elochoman River Reach 9, Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region
- [13-1037](#), Lewis County Tributary to Bunker Creek Barrier Removal, Washington Coast Salmon Recovery Region
- [11-1266](#),* West Daybreak Restoration Project on the East Fork Lewis River, Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region
- [13-1029](#), Scammon Creek Barrier Removal, Washington Coast Salmon Recovery Region
- [09-1440](#), Barnaby Reach of Skagit River, Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region
- [13-1573](#), 3 Crabs Nearshore and Estuarine Restoration Project on the Dungeness River, Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region
- [13-1193](#), Keta Park, Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region
- [13-1109](#), East Fork Lewis Restoration Design Review, Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region
- [09-1279](#), Smith Island, Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region, staff request

- [13-1133](#), Sammamish River Side Channel, Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region , staff request

2014 Recommendations to Improve Projects and Evaluation Criteria

Cost-Benefit Criteria and High Project Costs

The review panel has a unique perspective on the cost-benefit of projects because it reviews projects statewide, across region and lead entity boundaries, and sees how the process and the costs of identifying, developing, designing, and implementing restoration projects varies from one area to another. The review panel would like to work with SRFB staff to review typical restoration activities, project element costs including a range of reported costs for projects from PRISM, and other sources as a resource for project sponsors and lead entities to gauge the relative cost of their project elements with others.

Last year, during discussions between the review panel chair, the Puget Sound Regional Implementation Team chair, and Puget Sound Partnership staff, the idea of a review of typical projects costs presented in ranges was seen as having benefit for many folks involved in restoration projects. One idea that was discussed was to require a more detailed cost-benefit analysis of more expensive projects that are over a certain dollar amount (yet to be determined). This type of tool would be especially valuable for PSAR large capital projects. Following the review of published costs, the review panel would prepare a table of typical project element price ranges for inclusion in Manual 18. One issue that has been raised as we have explored this is the challenge in PRISM to compare project costs because they are not reported in standard terminology and whole project budgets are not always reported for all projects. In some cases, it has been estimated that as much as 85 percent of actual projects costs outside of SRFB funds and matching funds may be unreported. The goal would be to have a preliminary review prepared for the beginning of the 2015 grant round, and would be brought to the SRFB before inclusion in Manual 18.

Concerning high-cost projects, the review panel has been seeing overall project costs increasing and panel members have concerns about lack of consistent and transparent cost-controls across projects. One observation of the review panel this year is the lack of cost criteria in the Request for Proposals for the PSAR large capital projects. The review panel appears to be the only review of costs and cost-benefit as part of this year's PSAR large capital project review process and given the huge amount of money allocated to that program (more than \$100 million), we have questions about requirements for cost-control considerations. As noted above, we are recommending the SRFB support the review panel to investigate Value Engineering as an evaluation tool to improve cost effectiveness in large-scale restoration projects. We would review available data, look for patterns in local and state review comments about cost benefit,

and recommend a total dollar threshold that would trigger a Value Engineering analysis during the appropriate project development or design process.

Manual 18

The review panel does not have any major policy revisions to suggest for Manual 18. The panel is working with staff to clarify and reduce redundancy in the application proposal section, to guide sponsors on better identification of objectives, and an overall logic framework. We are asking for more details on:

- S.M.A.R.T objectives.
- Information on site-specific, species-specific life stage fish use of project areas and/or reaches, and how projects are targeting restoration solutions for limiting factors specific to those life stages. These also should be tied into objectives – how are project actions intended to benefit specific species and life stages?
- Information on organizational cost-controls.
- Enhanced coordination between project sponsors and Intensively Monitored Watershed principal investigators within Intensively Monitored Watershed to better distribute monitoring results and incorporate into project designs.
- Budget template.
- Scope of work template.

Other Emerging Issues

Process-Based Restoration and a Flexible Funding Pool

There is tremendous variability around the state concerning the capacity and sophistication of lead entities and sponsors to identify, develop, and implement larger, reach-scale, process-based restoration strategies – they require much greater levels of collaboration, planning for multiple phases, and leveraging multiple funding sources to make these projects happen. A gradual shift is taking place that will require SRFB to adapt to be able to fund these larger, more expensive projects being developed *around the state* – not just the large capital projects in Puget Sound. At times, smaller lead entities with lower allocations outside the Puget Sound are able to put together noteworthy, large, and meaningful projects but they have little access to the larger pots of funding to accomplish these cost-effective projects. The example this year is the Klickitat County Lead Entity, which had a very strong project list and three excellent projects worthy of funding, including two projects that fit the Noteworthy category. It was able to fund only one of those projects given its allocation and the review panel would encourage the SRFB

to have a statewide competitive pool that can be used to fund these outstanding opportunities when they become ripe for funding.

Noteworthy Projects

Noteworthy project proposals may be large, impressive projects that take multiple years of phased construction or implementation to accomplish, have a high cost benefit, or be a complex, collaborative approach to salmon recovery or a combination thereof. A number of past noteworthy projects were phased projects – leading to potential future noteworthy projects when fully completed. This year’s project proposals resulted in four noteworthy projects:

Table 4. Noteworthy Projects

Project Number and Name	Sponsor Lead Entity Region	Goal	Phase/Funding
14-1737 Barkley Irrigation Company – Under Pressure	Trout Unlimited Upper Columbia Fish Recovery Board Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Region	A collaborative effort to improve in-stream flows by 6-10 cubic feet per second and reduce mortality of Endangered Species Act-listed salmon with irrigation efficiencies.	Construction/SRFB funding
14-1366 Kilisut Harbor Restoration Construction Phase	North Olympic Salmon Coalition Hood Canal Lead Entity and North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity Hood Canal and Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Regions	Replace two culverts and road with a bridge to improve nearshore habitat and passage, opening up to 20 acres of tidal channels	Construction/Funded with Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program and 2013-15 PSAR large capital project funding. Proposed for 2015-2017 PSAR large capital project funding.
14-1382 Lower Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration	Clallam County North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region	Set back levees and restore up to 130 acres of floodplain habitat	Construction/Proposed for 2015-2017 PSAR large capital project funding.
14-1857 Rock Creek Conservation Easement Assessment	Eastern Klickitat Conservation District Klickitat County Lead Entity Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region	Protect up to 850 acres with 18 miles of riparian habitat	Conservation Easement/SRFB funding

Part 3 – Region Summaries

Introduction

In 2014, the SRFB continued its approach of allocating funding regionally rather than to individual lead entities. To inform the SRFB of the processes used at the regional and local levels to develop SRFB project lists, RCO posed a series of questions in *Manual 18, Salmon Recovery Grants*. Each region responded to these questions, providing significant supporting documentation. The following section of the report provides links on the RCO Web site to a region-by-region summary of the responses received. The responses are direct submittals from the regions. The structure of these summaries focuses around the key questions asked of each region and their local entities.

Regional organizations were required to respond to questions regarding their:

- Internal allocation process across lead entities and watersheds.
- Technical review process, including evaluation criteria and technical advisory group membership.
- Consideration of SRFB criteria in developing their project lists.

Lead entities were asked to:

- Describe their local review processes – including criteria, local technical review team membership, and SRFB Review Panel participation.
- Describe how multi-year implementation plans or habitat work schedules were used to develop project lists.

The summaries encompass the key processes and concepts provided by the regions and are intended as a reference for staff and the board.

How is the Regional Review Process Implemented?

SRFB staff concluded that processes in regional areas generally were consistent with the processes laid out in *Manual 18, Salmon Recovery Grants*, which, is informed by the Salmon Recovery Act RCW 77.85.¹ This is based on the information from the regional responses (provided at the links below), application materials, and presentations to the review panel at the Regional Area Meetings in October in Olympia. Staff notes that the pre-proposal meetings and

¹ Revised Code of Washington 77.85

site visits, coupled with the early and continual feedback from the review panel, helped improve projects.

There is one issue with the lists we received from the regions. In the Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Region, the citizen's committee provided a ranked list to the region (Hood Canal Coordinating Council). The region then recommended moving a project up on its funding list into the funding allocation. State law says that the list submitted to the SRFB is the citizen's list. As a result, staff have presented the citizen's committee list and the region's recommendation is provided in the regional area submittal, provided as a link below. This issue is complicated by the fact that the project that was moved up on the list by the region has been identified as a "Project of Concern" by the review panel. This issue will be presented in the Hood Canal region's presentation to the SRFB at its December 2014 meeting.

For the most part, regional organizations and areas used the same or similar review approaches as in previous years (fit of the projects and lists to their regional recovery plans or strategies). The type and extent of regional technical review continues to vary between regions.

Region Overview

- [Hood Canal](#)
- [Lower Columbia River](#)
- [Middle Columbia River](#)
- [Northeast Washington](#)
- [Puget Sound](#)
- [Snake River](#)
- [Upper Columbia River](#)
- [Washington Coast](#)

Attachment 1 – 2014 Grant Schedule

Date	Phase	Description
January-June 30	Technical review (required)	RCO staff and review panel members meet with lead entities and grant applicants to discuss project ideas and visit sites. Requests for site visits are due to RCO by February 14, 2014. Site visits must be completed before June 30, 2014. Puget Sound lead entities review Appendix B for early action dates.
January-May 31	Project draft application materials due (required)	Projects are submitted through PRISM Online. Work with your lead entity to get a project number from the Habitat Work Schedule. Project sponsors enter draft application materials in PRISM Online for the SRFB Review Panel. This step should be completed as early as necessary to fit lead entities' schedules, and at least three weeks before the site visit . Complete draft application materials are required to secure a site visit by the review panel.
February-June	Application workshops (on request)	RCO staff offer application workshops or online meetings, on request, for lead entities. Lead entity coordinators shall schedule with the appropriate RCO grants manager.
February-June 30	SRFB review panel completes draft project comment forms	Two weeks after visiting projects, the review panel will provide comments to lead entities and grant applicants. The review panel's comments will specify in which sections of the proposal modifications should be made, and what additional information is needed. Applicants must address review panel comments through revisions to the draft proposal (using the MS Word track changes feature).
August 1	OPTIONAL early application and lead entity submittal due	Lead entities may choose an early submittal option of August 1. This will allow RCO staff more time to review applications, more time for sponsors to correct applications as needed, and more time for the review panel to do its work. Draft ranked lists are due from lead entities that submit early.
August 15	Due Date: Applications and lead entity submittals due	Application materials, including attachments, must be submitted via PRISM Online by August 15. Draft ranked lists (Appendix J) are due from lead entities. Lead entities without regional organizations must submit responses to the information questionnaire. (Appendices L and M)
August 18-29	RCO grants manager review	All applications are screened for completeness and eligibility. If applications are submitted to PRISM Online before August 15, RCO staff can make them available to the review panel earlier.
August 29	Review panel begins review of final applications	RCO staff forwards all application information to review panel members for evaluation.

Date	Phase	Description
September 5	Due Date: Regional submittal	Regional organizations submit their recommendations for funding, including alternate projects (only those they want the SRFB to consider funding), and responses to the information questionnaire (Appendices L and M).
September 22-25	SRFB Review Panel meeting	Review panel meets to discuss projects. The review panel will consider application materials and site visits to prepare comment forms and determine the status of each project.
October 3	SRFB Review Panel updates project comment forms	Within one week of the review panel meeting, the review panel will provide comments for lead entities and grant applicants. A status will be identified for all projects as either Clear, Conditioned, Need More Information (NMI), or Project of Concern (POC).
October 16	Due Date: Response to project comment forms	Grant applicants with projects that are labeled Conditioned, NMI, or POC should provide a response to review panel comments through revisions to the project proposal attached in PRISM. If no response to comments is received from the grant applicant by this date, RCO will assume the project has been withdrawn for funding consideration.
October 22	Review panel list of projects for regional area meeting	The review panel will review the responses to comments and identify which projects have been cleared. It also will recommend a list of POCs to be presented at the regional area project meeting.
October 27-30	Regional area project meetings	Regional organizations, lead entities, and grant applicants present projects identified by the review panel. Regional presentations of strategies and/or recovery goals and objectives. Discuss lists of projects and how they achieve these goals.
November 6	Review panel finalizes project comment forms	The review panel will finalize comment forms by considering application materials, site visits, grant applicants' responses to comments, and presentations by the regions and during the regional area project meeting.
November 11	Due Date: Lead entity submits signed copy of ranked lists	Lead entities submit signed copies of their final lead entity ranked project lists. No changes to the lists will be accepted after this date. Please plan your meetings accordingly, in advance. The grant funding report will not incorporate any updates submitted after this date.
November 19	Final 2014 grant report made available for public review	The final funding recommendation report is available online for SRFB and public review.
December 3-4	Board funding meeting	Board awards grants. Public comment period available.

Attachment 2 – 2014 SRFB Review Panel Biographies

Michelle Cramer, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia

Ms. Cramer is a senior environmental engineer. She provides statewide technical assistance and recommendations to habitat managers on planning and design of fresh and marine bank protection, habitat restoration, flood hazard management, and fish passage projects. She is the managing editor of the *Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines* and a principal author of the *Integrated Streambank Protection Guidelines*. Ms. Cramer earned a bachelor of science degree in environmental engineering from Humboldt State University and is a licensed professional engineer in Washington State.

Kelley Jorgensen, consultant, Portland, Oregon.

Ms. Jorgensen is owner and principal ecologist for Kelley Jorgensen Consulting, and conservation manager for a 1,600-acre property in Clark County, Washington. During the past more than 20 years, she has worked as an applied ecologist in the Pacific Northwest. She received her bachelor of science degree in ecology and natural history of the Pacific Northwest from The Evergreen State College. Ms. Jorgensen is active with a number of restoration groups – she is a Technical Advisory Committee member for Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board and on the board of directors for River Restoration Northwest.

Jennifer O’Neal, consultant, Mount Vernon

Ms. O’Neal is a senior fisheries biologist and project manager at Tetra Tech with 18 years of experience in stream restoration monitoring, salmon habitat restoration design, and riparian ecology. Her field and research experience includes writing sampling protocols for monitoring salmonid populations, measuring the effectiveness of habitat restoration projects, determining data quality levels in monitoring efforts across the Pacific Northwest, and assessment of trophic interactions between macroinvertebrates and fish. Her current focus is using remote sensing techniques and topographic survey to assess changes in floodplain habitat and fish use due to restoration actions. Ms. O’Neal received her bachelor of arts degree in environmental science from the University of California, Berkeley, and her master of science degree in fisheries and aquatic science from University of Washington.

Patrick Powers, consultant, Olympia

Mr. Powers is the principal and owner of Waterfall Engineering, LLC, a limited liability engineering consulting firm that specializes in fish passage and stream restoration. He brings 28 years of experience designing projects with particular specialties in fishways, fish screening, hydraulics, hydrology, river engineering, and marine and near-shore restoration. He served as the chief engineer for the Washington State Fish and Wildlife Habitat Program and was involved in the development of guidance documents on stream restoration and fish passage. He received his master of science degree in civil and environmental engineering from Washington State

University with an emphasis on the fisheries engineering program. He is a nationally recognized expert for his master's thesis on analyzing fish barriers at natural obstructions.

Paul Schlenger, consultant, Seattle

Mr. Schlenger is a principal and owner at Confluence Environmental Company. He is certified by the American Fisheries Society as a fisheries professional. He has worked extensively throughout Puget Sound estuarine and nearshore environments on restoration and projection planning and design projects. He has 19 years of experience working on salmon recovery, habitat restoration, and salmon ecology projects. He holds a bachelor of arts degree in environmental sciences from the University of Virginia and a master of science degree in fisheries from the University of Washington.

Tom Slocum, PE, Mount Vernon

Mr. Slocum directs the engineering services program for San Juan, Skagit, Whatcom, and Whidbey Island conservation districts, based in Mount Vernon. He has expertise in engineering, permitting, grant writing, and project management related to salmon habitat restoration, water quality protection, and storm water management. He received his law degree from Seattle University Law School, his master of science degree in civil engineering from Northeastern University, and his bachelor of arts degree from Dartmouth College.

Steve Toth, consulting geomorphologist, Seattle

Mr. Toth is a licensed engineering geologist with more than 25 years of experience working in forest lands of the Pacific Northwest. He has been the principal and owner of his own company doing business as a consulting geomorphologist since 1997. He has expertise in fluvial geomorphology and channel migration zones, assessing slope stability and geologic hazards, evaluating surface water and groundwater hydrology, and conducting large-scale watershed analyses and habitat conservation plans to address bull trout and salmon recovery. He was a Fulbright Scholar in Hungary working on watershed management issues and gained a College of Forest Resources Graduate School Fellowship at the University of Washington. He earned his bachelor of arts degree in biology from Carleton College and received his master of science degree in forest hydrology from the University of Washington.

Marnie Tyler, consultant, Olympia

Dr. Tyler is the principal and owner of Ecolution, an environmental consulting firm specializing in salmon recovery and habitat restoration. She brings 23 years of experience as an ecologist with particular field expertise in riparian and wetland ecology. In addition to technical skills, Dr. Tyler brings experience in salmon recovery planning and policy through government service, including the Recreation and Conservation Office, Office of Washington Governor Chris Gregoire, Northwest Power and Conservation Council, Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Puget Sound Action Team. She also serves on the SRFB monitoring panel. She earned a doctor of philosophy in ecosystems assessment from the University of Washington, master of science in

environmental science and master of public affairs from Indiana University, and a bachelor of science in forestry from the University of Missouri.

Attachment 3 – 2014 SRFB Review Panel Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria is from Appendix H in Manual 18.

To help ensure that every project funded by the SRFB is technically sound, the SRFB Review Panel will note for the SRFB any projects it believes have:

- Low benefit to salmon
- A low likelihood of being successful
- Costs that outweigh the anticipated benefits of the project

Projects that have a low benefit to salmon, a low likelihood of success, or that have costs that outweigh the anticipated benefits will be designated as “Projects of Concern.” The review panel will not otherwise rate, score, or rank projects. It is expected that projects will follow best management practices and will meet local, state, and federal permitting requirements.

The SRFB Review Panel uses the SRFB Individual Comment Form to capture its comments on individual projects. To download a template of the comment form, visit the RCO Web Site at www.rco.wa.gov/doc_pages/app_materials.shtml#salmon.

When a project of concern is identified, the sponsor will receive a comment form identifying the evaluation criteria on which the status was determined. Prior to the regional area meetings, the regional recovery organization that represents the area in which the project is located¹ can contact the review panel chair if there are further questions. At the regional area meetings there is an opportunity for the review panel to discuss project issues and work with the regional recovery organization and representative from regional technical team advisors to determine if the issues can be resolved before the list of “Projects of Concern” is presented to the SRFB.

Criteria

For acquisition and restoration projects, the panel will determine that a project is not technically sound and cannot be significantly improved if:

1. It is unclear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing. For acquisition projects, this criterion relates to the lack of a clear threat if the property is not acquired.
2. Information provided or current understanding of the system, is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of, the project.
 - A. Incomplete application or proposal.

¹ For Puget Sound, this will be the Puget Sound Regional Implementation Technical Team chair.

- B. Project goal or objectives not clearly stated; or do not address salmon habitat protection or restoration.
 - C. Project sponsor has not responded to review panel comments.
 - D. Acquisition parcel prioritization (for multi-site proposals) is not provided or the prioritization does not meet the projects goal or objectives.
3. The project is dependent on other key conditions or processes being addressed first.
 4. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits and the project sponsor has failed to justify the costs to the satisfaction of the review panel.
 5. The project does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed.
 6. The project may be in the wrong sequence with other habitat protection, assessments, or restoration actions in the watershed.
 7. The project does not work towards restoring natural watershed processes, or prohibits natural processes.
 8. It is unclear how the project will achieve its stated goals or objectives.
 9. It is unlikely that the project will achieve its stated goals or objectives.
 10. There is low potential for threat to habitat conditions if the project is not completed.
 11. The project design is not adequate or the project is sited improperly.
 12. The stewardship description is insufficient or there is inadequate commitment to stewardship and maintenance and this likely would jeopardize the project's success.
 13. The main focus is on supplying a secondary need, such as education, streambank stabilization to protect property, or water supply.

Additional Criteria for Planning Projects

For planning projects (e.g., assessment, design, inventories, and studies), the review panel will consider the criteria for acquisition and restoration projects (1-13) and the following additional criteria. The review panel will determine that a project is not technically sound and cannot be improved significantly if:

14. The project does not address an information need important to understanding the watershed, is not directly relevant to project development or sequencing, and will not clearly lead to beneficial projects.
15. The methodology does not appear to be appropriate to meet the goals and objectives of the project.

16. There are significant constraints to the implementation of projects following completion of the planning project.
17. The project does not clearly lead to project design or does not meet the criteria for filling a data gap.
18. The project does not appear to be coordinated with other efforts in the watershed; or does not use appropriate methods and protocols.

Attachment 4 – Projects Funded September 2014

Puget Sound Partnership

PSAR Project List Funded September 2014

Green, Duwamish, and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9) Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding
1	14-1001	Mill Creek Side Channel (Leber 2014)	City of Kent	\$357,221	\$357,221
Total Funded:					\$357,221

Island County Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding
2	14-1114	Waterman Acquisition	Whidbey Camano Land Trust	\$10,000	\$10,000
3	14-1074	Kristoferson Culvert Replacement	Snohomish Conservation District	\$100,000	Alternate
4	14-1152	Camano Island State Park Feasibility Assessment	Skagit River System Cooperative	\$100,000	Alternate
5	14-1076	Iverson Stakeholder Integration	Island County	\$50,000	Alternate
6	14-1075	Feeder Bluffs and Armoring Parcel ID	Northwest Straits Foundation	\$50,000	Alternate
Total Funded:				\$196,991	

Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8) Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding
1	14-1193	Cedar River Stewardship in Action	Seattle Public Utilities	\$95,000	\$95,000
2	14-1330	Riverbend Levee Setback/Removal Preliminary Design	King County	\$255,000	\$255,000
Total Funded:					\$350,000

North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	PSAR Request	Funding
6	14-1384	Dungeness Habitat Protection- RM 6.5 to 7.5 Phase	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe	\$655,397	\$655,397
Total Funded:				\$655,397	

Pierce County Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	PSAR Request	Funding
1	14-1504	South Prairie Creek (RM4.0- 4.6) Floodplain Phase 0	South Puget Sound SEG	\$193,000	\$193,000
2	14-1180	South Fork Puyallup Floodplain Restoration PH 2B Construction	Pierce Co Surface Water Management	\$782,256	\$782,256
3	14-1377	Middle Boise Creek Habitat Restoration - Vanwieringen	King County Water and Land Resources	\$200,000	Alternate
4	14-1188	Puyallup River RM 27.2 - 28.6 LB Acquisition and Design (Orville Rd)	Pierce Co Surface Water Management	\$136,388	Alternate
4	14-1188	Puyallup River RM 27.2 - 28.6 LB Acquisition and Design (Orville Rd)	Pierce Co Surface Water Management	\$288,612	Alternate
5	14-1239	Calistoga	City of Orting	\$564,000	Alternate
Total Funded:					\$975,256

San Juan County Community Development Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	PSAR Request	Funding
1	14-1888	San Juan County Land Bank	Huntley Conservation Easement	\$286,400	\$286,400
2	14-1933	San Juan Preservation Trust	Fishery Pt. Neighborhood Shoreline CE Acquisition	\$371,000	\$371,000
3	14-1913	Friends of the San Juans	West Sound Pocket Beach Restoration	\$47,731	\$47,731
4	14-1931	West Beach Road Barrier Correction	Skagit Fisheries Enhancement Group		Alternate
Total Funded:					\$705,131

Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	PSAR	
				Request	Funding
2	14-1260	Illabot Creek Protection & Riparian Restoration	Skagit Land Trust	\$275,290	\$275,290
3	14-1261	SRFB Conservation Property Stewardship	Skagit Fisheries Enhancement Group	\$100,000	\$100,000
4	14-1242	Skagit Basin Ongoing Project Maintenance	Skagit River System Cooperative	\$97,750	\$97,750
5	14-1263	Martin Slough Riparian Restoration	Skagit County Public Works	\$155,550	\$155,550
8	14-1262	Skagit Riparian Habitat Strategy	Skagit Watershed Council	\$145,146	\$145,146
9	14-1246	Illabot Creek Alluvial Fan Restoration - Phase 2	Skagit River System Cooperative	\$1,096,675	\$1,096,675
10	14-1248	Hansen Creek Restoration Acquisition	Skagit River System Cooperative	\$20,787	\$20,787
Total Funded:				\$1,891,198	

Stillaguamish River Salmon Recovery Co-Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	PSAR	
				Request	Funding
1	14-1356	Stillaguamish Floodplain Protection / Restoration	Stillaguamish Tribe	\$934,181	\$934,181
2	14-1289	North Meander Reconnection Wood Placement	Snohomish County	\$157,250	\$157,250
Total Funded:				\$1,091,431	

West Sound Watersheds Council Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	PSAR	
				Request	Funding
1	14-1375	West Sound Nearshore Integration & Synthesis	Kitsap County Dept. of Community Development	\$63,765	\$63,765
Total Funded:				\$63,765	

Hood Canal Coordinating Council

PSAR Project list Funded September 2014

Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	Request	PSAR Funding
1	14-1321	Lower Big Quilcene River Riparian Protection	Jefferson Land Trust	\$161,160	\$161,160
2	14-1369	Skokomish Estuary Restoration Phase 3C	Mason Conservation Dist.	\$463,600	\$463,600
3	14-1322	Duckabush Riparian Habitat Acquisition	Jefferson Land Trust	\$746,000	\$746,000
4	14-1326	Beards Cove Restoration	Great Peninsula Conservancy	\$302,868	\$302,868
5	14-1300	Dosewallips Estuary Barge Removal	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group	\$190,998	\$190,998
Total Funded:					\$1,864,626

PSAR Large Capital Project List Funded September 2014

Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	Request	PSAR Large Capital Funding
6	14-1022	Fir Island Farm Restoration Construction	Dept. of Fish & Wildlife	\$13,600,000	\$13,600,000
Total Funded:					\$13,600,000

Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	Request	PSAR Large Capital Funding
10	14-1366	Kilisut Harbor Restoration - Construction Phase	North Olympic Salmon Coalition	\$12,110,614	\$3,114,230
Total Funded:					\$3,114,230

Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) Project List Funded September 2014

Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	PSAR	
				Request	Funding
1	14-1889	Little Anderson Ck IMW Stream Enhancement	Hood Canal SEG	\$240,647	\$240,647
2	14-1284	Lower Big Beef Creek Restoration - Construction	Hood Canal SEG	\$700,000	\$700,000
Total Funded:					\$940,647

Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	PSAR	
				Request	Funding
2	14-1311	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Abernathy Creek Cameron Site	\$432,900	\$432,900
9	14-1296	Cowlitz Conservation Dist	Abernathy Creek Davis Site	\$139,100	\$139,100
14	14-1310	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Abernathy Creek Wisconsin Site Project	\$305,000	\$305,000
18	14-1459	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Abernathy Headwaters Design	\$120,000	\$120,000
Total Funded:					\$997,000

Attachment 5 – 2015-2017 PSAR Large Capital Project List

Lead Entity	Project Number	Project Name	Amount ¹
Nisqually River Salmon Recovery	14-1688	Busy Wild Creek Protection	\$5,889,000
North Olympic Peninsula	14-1382	Lower Dungeness River	\$11,867,000
WRIA 1	14-1665	MF Porter Creek Reach	\$3,088,656
Hood Canal Coordinating Council	14-1366	Kilisut Harbor Restoration	\$8,986,384
WRIA 1	14-1666	NF Nooksack (Xwqelem) Farmhouse	\$5,796,581
Island County	14-1114	Waterman Nearshore Acquisition	\$845,029
WRIA 1	14-1667	SF Nooksack (Nuxw7iyem) Nessel Reach	\$3,247,295
Skagit Watershed Council	14-2170	Illabot Creek Alluvial Fan Restoration	\$2,994,205
Pierce County/ WRIAs 10/12	14-1184	Neadham Road Acquisition and Levee	\$6,887,266
WRIA 9	14-1389	Downey Farmstead Restoration	\$4,890,965
Pierce County/ WRIAs 10/12	14-1189	South Prairie Creek	\$3,330,487
Hood Canal Coordinating Council	14-1376	Skokomish River Natural Rehabilitation	\$1,835,607
WRIA 9	14-1327	Porter Levee Setback, Floodplain	\$4,675,000
North Olympic Peninsula	14-1385	Dungeness Landscape Protect	\$8,009,650
North Olympic Peninsula	14-1371	Pysht Estuary Saltmarsh	\$4,291,267
Pierce County/WRIAs 10/12	14-1187	Alward Road Acquisition	\$4,514,100
San Juan	14-1887	Kellet Bluff/Hart Property	\$825,000
WRIA 14 Kennedy-Goldsborough	14-1403	West Oakland Bay Restoration	\$1,906,499
WRIA 8	14-1194	Evans Creek Relocation	\$2,500,000

¹ The total reflects only project cost and not program management costs. Final costs may vary as other funding becomes available.

Lead Entity	Project Number	Project Name	Amount ¹
WRIA 13 Deschutes	14-1407	The Big Three Culvert Package	\$3,644,273
WRIA 14 Kennedy-Goldsborough	14-1397	Little Skookum Inlet Shoreline	\$596,010
Total			\$90,620,274

Attachment 6 – 2014 PSAR Large Capital Request for Proposals and Scoring Criteria

Request for Proposals

The Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council and the Puget Sound Partnership are developing a ranked list of large, high priority capital projects to fund as a regional package of habitat acquisition and restoration projects. Proposed projects should be ready to advance as soon as funds are available and cost more than what Puget Sound salmon recovery lead entities are typically able to support through the standard funding process (see glossary - project cost). Attached to this Request for Proposals is a glossary of key terms that have been defined to assist in the understanding of their usage. This ranked list will be an important component of the 2015 -2017 Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) budget request. The Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council has approved the approach, eligible project types, prerequisites, and criteria listed below.

Each Puget Sound salmon recovery lead entity may submit **up to three** projects by the deadline **August 15, 2014**. Project sponsors must have completed SRFB applications submitted in PRISM and reviewed through the sponsoring lead entity's local process. All policies for SRFB projects in Manual 18 apply to these project proposals except where there is a narrowing of what is eligible for the PSAR large capital proposal process. Project sponsors must also submit in PRISM as an attachment to their project proposal answers to the supplemental proposal questions listed below. Because of the project limit per watershed, project sponsors must work with their lead entity and have approval as described below, to apply.

Eligible project types

- Restoration
- Acquisition
- Planning projects (Assessments, Designs, Inventories, and Studies) – the results of this type of project must directly and clearly lead to preliminary or final project design.
- Combination Projects (Acquisition and restoration OR acquisition and planning)
- Phased projects

Prerequisites for proposed PSAR Large Capital projects

Each project must:

1. Address a high priority need identified in:
2. A watershed chapter of the Puget Sound Chinook Salmon Recovery Plan; or
3. The Hood Canal and Eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca Summer Chum Salmon Recovery Plan; or
4. A clear, science-based strategy, submitted as part of a watershed's 3 year work plan update, to benefit a Treaty rights salmon population or other ESA-listed species population.
5. Demonstrate significant benefit to one or more listed salmon populations and/or salmon populations that benefit Treaty rights.
6. Require only funding for implementation (i.e. no other barriers with respect to authorizing environment or project implementation exist) and be consistent with lead entity priorities and/or the three-year work plan.
7. Begin implementation during the 2015-2017 biennium. Implementation is defined as beginning work on one of the eligible project types above.
8. For restoration projects, conceptual and preliminary design is complete, final design is complete or anticipated to be complete within the first six months of the award, and permit applications are started. Project construction must commence within one year of contract award or the next available fish window.
9. For engineering and design projects, at a minimum, a conceptual design as described in SRFB Manual 18 (Appendix D) will have been completed and meet all appropriate requirements as identified in the SRFB process.
10. Be approved through the lead entity SRFB review process in 2014.

Project Sponsors will complete the RCO PRISM Application process. Project Sponsors will submit answers to the standard SRFB questions and to the PSAR Large Capital Supplemental Questions as provided in RCO Manual 18 Appendix C (copy attached to this document).

Review Process

Final proposals must be completed in PRISM no later than 11:59 p.m. (PST) on August 15, 2014. The review process will be conducted to develop a regionally ranked list of projects using the following steps:

1. PSP project staff review proposals for completeness and eligibility. Proposals are packaged and sent out to reviewers for scoring.

2. The following entities will be requested to score various aspects of the proposals:
 - a. Puget Sound Science Panel representatives
 - i. Review Action Agenda Targets Criteria
 - b. Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Implementation Technical Team (RITT)
 - i. Review the VSP Parameters
 - c. the Watershed Leads and PSP staff
 - i. Review all criteria with the exception of the VSP criterion.
 - d. Additional reviewers may include representatives from NOAA, USFWS, WDFW or other regional experts to assist with scoring of VSP and Action Agenda Targets Criterion.
3. The Executive Committee reviews and evaluates the ranked list based on scores and develops a recommendation for the full Recovery Council.
4. The Puget Sound Recovery Council will review and make a decision on the final ranked list at the September 25 meeting.
5. The ranked list is packaged for use by OFM, the Governor's office and the legislature as part of the full PSAR request of \$80M for the region (\$30M for the allocation formula and \$50M for the ranked project list).
6. Following final approval of funds by the legislature, project sponsors above the funding cutoff line will be notified.
7. If a project can be funded only partially, the Recovery Council will offer that partial funding to the relevant project sponsor. The project sponsor may decline the funding. If the project sponsor chooses to accept the funding, the sponsor also must commit to completing the full project scope within the timeframe allotted to capital funds (two biennia, or four years).
8. Funding for the remaining projects on the list will be sought via other sources.

Criteria and Scoring Guidelines

Proposals will be evaluated using the following criteria:

1. **(40 points)** Expected to result in an improvement in abundance, productivity, diversity, and/or spatial distribution for one or more populations from listed Puget Sound Chinook or Summer Chum ESUs or a Treaty rights salmon population or other ESA-listed species population as defined in Prerequisite 1, above.
 - a. (40): The proposal clearly describes a significant improvement in one or more VSP parameters that will result if project is executed; the populations for which the changes are expected to occur are identified; the proposal documents a high level of certainty that the VSP parameters will improve as predicted, and the hypothesis is testable.
 - b. (0-39): points will be awarded depending on the degree to which the above criteria are present. Point allocation should represent much of the range from 0 to 39, and should clearly discern most projects in rank order of magnitude of improvement to VSP.

2. **(20 points)** Makes progress toward a Puget Sound Action Agenda target for protection and restoration of habitat, such as Shoreline Armoring, Eelgrass, Land Cover and Land Development, Floodplains, Estuaries, or Water Quantity/Quality. Proposals should clearly describe this connection.
 - a. (20): The proposal clearly describes how the project will significantly advance at least one of the Action Agenda targets for protection and restoration of habitat in the region using quantitative metrics.
 - b. (0-19): points will be awarded depending on the degree to which progress is made. Point allocation should represent much of the range from 0 to 19, and should clearly discern most projects in rank order of magnitude of improvement to Vital Signs.
3. **(10 points)** The proposal should identify the link to a strategy in the results chains of the watershed's draft monitoring and adaptive management framework or the clear science-based strategy to benefit Treaty rights populations or other ESA-listed species populations that were submitted as part of a watershed's 3 year workplan update.
 - a. 0 - Points if no linkage is made
 - b. 10 points for demonstrating this linkage
4. **(10 points)** Project Readiness (shovel, acquisition, design, or appraisal ready). Projects that claim to be Shovel or Acquisition ready will automatically receive **10 points** added to their overall score. Projects that claim to be Design or Appraisal ready will automatically receive **5 points**. Project readiness will be evaluated throughout the contracting process, and projects that do not truly meet the Readiness Criteria (consult glossary of terms) may have their project deemed ineligible for funding.
 - a. (10): Shovel Ready or Acquisition Ready
 - b. (5): Design Ready or Appraisal Ready

5. **(5 points)** Match funding**

- a. (5): Project sponsor can provide at least 15% match.
- b. (3): Project sponsor can provide match from 6 to 14%.
- c. (1): Project sponsor can provide 1 to 5% match.
 - i. Match should be documented and broken out as to what funds are currently secured and those that are pending (i.e., positive success in another grant application or from a project partner donation etc.)

**Match will be defined using SRFB Manual 18 to include cash, bond funds, grants (unless prohibited by the funding entity), labor, equipment, materials, staff time, and donations. See http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/manuals&forms/Manual_18.pdf.

Project scoring:

- Final scores will be represented as sum total of points earned (coded (i.e., blind) individual scores are also available) for review.
- Upon completion of project scoring by reviewers the partnership staff will compile results and place projects into rank order.
- The Ranked List will be presented to the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will review the ranking and make a recommendation to the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council to accept the list as ranked by the scoring or provide a recommended change to the order of the ranked list. The ranked list is the culmination of a significant amount of thorough scientific review and investigation of the merits of each project proposed. This ranked list would not be “re-ordered” unless there was a strong policy reason to do so. This type of policy review is consistent with the charge of the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council. If changes are suggested they will be done in a transparent fashion and will accompany a written explanation as to why the policy change was recommended.
- The full Recovery Council will be presented with both the original ranked list and the adjusted list (if one was created) for discussion and a final decision at the September 25, 2014 Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council meeting.

Questions/Contact information

Project sponsors must coordinate with the Lead Entity Coordinators for submission:

http://www.psp.wa.gov/SR_lead_entities.php

Please contact the PSAR Program Manager or the appropriate Ecosystem Recovery Coordinator at the Puget Sound Partnership with any questions:

Michael Blanton 360.464.2007 | michael.blanton@psp.wa.gov Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Program Manager

Suzanna Stoike 360.701.4604 | suzanna.stoike@psp.wa.gov

Review Team

- A. VSP Criteria were scored by:
 - The RITT: Kirk Lakey, Mindy Rowse, Greg Blair, Ken Currens, and Ed Connor
 - Marc McHenry (USFS)
 - Carrie Cook-Tabor (USFWS)
 - Doris Small (WDFW)
 - Thomas Sibley (NOAA)

- B. Link to action agenda was scored by:
 - Lawrence Sullivan (WDOH)
 - Christopher Konrad (USGS)
 - Michelle Wilcox (Ecology)
 - Ron Thom (Battelle)
 - Steve Copps (NOAA)

- C. Project Readiness was scored by:
 - Tristan Peter-Contesse and Michael Blanton (PSP)

- D. Link to Strategy and Match Funding was scored by:
 - Michael Blanton (PSP)

Attachment 7 – “Projects of Concern” and Project Condition Summary

“Projects of Concern” = 2

There are two “Projects of Concern” submitted on project funding lists to the SRFB. The comment forms follow the “Conditioned Projects” below. The first project is [14-1434](#), the South Fork Skokomish Canyon Fish Passage Assessment in the Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Region. The second project is [14-1405](#), Pioneer Park Restoration in the Puget Sound Recovery Region.

“Conditioned” Projects = 30

Chelan County Lead Entity

- [14-1736](#) Lower Peshastin Creek Restoration Design

Condition: The panel believes this project needs to generate additional restoration alternatives that meet landowner constraints and create desirable habitat outcomes. Additional information needs to be collected and presented to the review panel about the specific property boundaries (specifically the southern property owner) such that additional considerations about the road location may be considered. The specific project site historically functioned as an alluvial fan and designs should reflect a better recognition of this concept and allow for natural processes. Additionally, the preliminary designs for this project also will need to be submitted to the review panel for review and approval before proceeding to final design. Finally, the review panel will need to review information documenting stakeholder outreach as part of development of the project alternatives such that there is sufficient confidence that the project would move forward with neighboring landowners’ support.

- [14-1739](#) Upper Peshastin Migration Barrier Design

Condition: The geological assessment of the slide will be submitted to the review panel for review and approval before moving forward with the next step in the design process. Please allow on two weeks for review panel review. In addition, the sponsor will coordinate with the U.S. Forest Service and the Washington Department of Transportation for input and review of the assessments, and concurrence with the preferred alternative, before moving forward with design. A letter of support, by both parties, for the preferred alternative should be submitted to the RCO grants manager before moving forward with design.

- [14-1732](#) Skinney Creek Floodplain Restoration Design

Condition: Please provide the results of the feasibility study and alternatives analysis for panel review and approval before proceeding with the preliminary design process.

Grays Harbor County Lead Entity

- [14-1267](#) Scammon Creek (RM 1.15) Barrier Removal

Condition: The review panel must review and approve the preliminary design before construction funds are released by RCO.

Green, Duwamish, and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9) Lead Entity

- [14-1327](#) Porter Levee Setback, Floodplain Reconnection

Condition: In order to ensure the restoration project reflects the preliminary designs submitted with the large capital PSAR application, the SRFB Review Panel will review the 60 percent engineering plans and design report being prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Review panel approval of the design must be secured before sponsor applies for construction permits. The review panel will require a 30-day review period to provide comments to the project sponsor, once all documents have been provided.

Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity

- [14-1328](#) Skokomish River General Investigation 2014

Condition: The SRFB has previously funded five projects which had deliverables related to the Skokomish General Investigation (GI). To date, only one of these projects completed all of the deliverables identified in the project’s original scope of work. The deliverable of this one successfully completed project was also a deliverable included in a prior GI project agreement. Given this history, the SRFB Review Panel is concerned about timely completion of the project deliverables identified in the current proposal. The USACE GI project manager provided an email (PRISM attachment #207260) listing milestones for completion of specific project-related tasks from 2014-2015. RCO will incorporate those milestones as part of the project agreement, adapted as follows to be consistent with its requirements. If any of the following project milestones are not met, the agreement will be terminated and no further funds will be reimbursed for the project:

USACE Language	SRFB Language	Deliverable Date
Corps Reviews	Civil Works Review Board (national USACE milestone to include Headquarters); includes review of final draft 35% design and EIS	July 2015 – October 2015

Final State & Agency Review; Development of Chief's Report	State & other federal agency review of final draft 35% & EIS	September 2015 – December 2015
Chief's Report Milestone	USACE Headquarters approves final feasibility report for congressional approval (major milestone; Chief of Engineers signs Chief's Report) and gives final approval of 35% design and EIS (this version to be delivered to SRFB)	January 2015

- [14-1366](#) Kilisut Harbor Restoration-Construction Phase

Condition: Construction funding will be released upon the following conditions.

- The SRFB Review Panel will review and approve the consultant's report of sediment transport and channel stability hydraulic modeling and the final project design to assure that the channels will have a high likelihood of remaining open to fish passage at the design tidal ranges over a long-term (i.e. several decades) planning horizon. Alternatively, if the modeling predicts that the channels are likely to shoal in over this planning horizon, the final project design must include an operations plan that assures future funding for maintenance dredging.
- Within 6 months of funding approval, the sponsor must provide documentation from Puget Sound Partnership that the partnership has made good faith efforts to work with the Washington Department of Transportation regional and statewide management to work out an arrangement for the transportation department to fund its own construction management responsibilities, rather than charging this \$1.27 million budget item to PSAR funding.
- *The United States District Court, Western District of Washington at Seattle, Case No. CV 70-9213 injunction known as the "Culvert Case" requires the Washington State Department of Transportation to correct the culverts in the causeway connecting Indian and Marrowstone Islands on State Route 116 for improved fish passage. Before this project can proceed, the project sponsor must receive a cost estimate from the Washington State Department of Transportation for the department's share of this fish passage project in order to meet the court injunction. In addition, the project sponsor must obtain a commitment from the Washington Department of Transportation to provide financial support, in-kind labor costs, or other expenditures associated with the project up to the amount

of the cost estimate in support of the full restoration project at Kilisut Harbor on State Route 116 funded by this grant agreement (RCO #14-1366). No construction funds shall be expended without the Washington State Department of Transportation’s participation in this project.

*Review panel context on condition #3 above: This condition is in response to the SRFB motion approved 9/18/14 relating to SRFB monies applied to Washington State Department of Transportation-owned barriers which the department has a legal obligation to correct (i.e. those barriers which are included on the March 2013 federal court injunction relating to fish passage barriers). The SRFB’s intent in approving this motion was that the Washington State Department of Transportation would assume responsibility for the expense of correcting the passage barrier to the minimum requirements specified within the injunction. SRFB funds may be used for costs associated with passage solutions that go above and beyond the transportation department’s minimum requirements.

Klickitat County Lead Entity

- [14-1857](#) Rock Creek Riparian Easement

Condition: The project is conditioned for review by the review panel (allow up to 30 days for our review process) of the following deliverables before release of funding:

- Reviewed appraisal. The current project budget did include funds for a review of the appraisal. See RCO acquisitions manual for agency requirements.
- Geomorphic assessment under development by Yakama Tribe partners.

Lake Washington/Cedar/ Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8) Lead Entity

- [14-1193](#) Cedar River Stewardship in Action

Condition: Funding for riparian replanting will only be used on properties where the landowner allows coniferous and deciduous trees to be included in the riparian planting plan. Only native species will be included in the planting plan.

As described in the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s Salmon Habitat Restoration Guidelines (Technique 5), the goal is for a riparian planting plan that incorporates conifers and reflects the historical plant community at the site. The guidelines also includes guidance on plant spacing once the plant composition is developed.

Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity

- [14-1308](#) Clear Creek Fish Passage

Condition: The next iteration of design must be submitted to the review panel for review to evaluate consistency with SRFB evaluation criteria to ensure that the extent of riprap is minimized to maximize habitat benefit to fish. Plan on three weeks for panel review.

- [14-1340](#) Washougal Racetrack Restoration Design

Condition: The results of the stakeholder processes, including the conceptual designs and alternatives, will be submitted to the review panel for review and approval before releasing funds for development of a preliminary design. Allow three weeks for panel review.

- [14-1342](#) Lower Kalama Restoration Phase 1

Condition: The final design must be submitted to the review panel for review and approval before releasing funds for implementation. Sponsor should plan on three weeks for panel review.

Nisqually River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity

- [14-1935](#) Wilcox Farm Floodplain Restoration Design

Condition: After the sponsor has completed the design of conceptual alternatives, participated in stakeholder and landowner review and has developed a preferred alternative which has support, the review panel will review and comment on the next design phase in terms of tasks and budget. The review panel will require a 30-day review period to provide comments to the project sponsor, once all documents have been provided. The project agreement may be renegotiated at this time.

North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon

- [14-1382](#) Lower Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration

Condition: The review panel must review and approve the preliminary (60 percent) and final (90 percent) designs before construction funds are released by RCO.

- [14-1371](#) Pysht Estuary Saltmarsh Restoration

Condition: The cost amount granted for the Indian Creek bridge (railroad flatcar bridge purchased and installed and sheet pile back walls) will not exceed \$96,000. The cost for the bridge foundation (\$138,350) is not included in this condition. Any cost above \$96,000 will need to be obtained from other funding sources. In addition, the successful bid from the contractor shall be submitted to the RCO SRFB project manager and the review panel for review and comment before a contract is awarded. The intent here is to secure a higher level of confidence on the cost before construction funds are released.

North Pacific Coast Lead Entity

- [14-1661](#) Squaw Creek Culvert Replacement

Condition: The review panel shall review and approve the preliminary designs before construction funds are released by RCO. Typical elements for a preliminary design are defined in Manual 18 Appendix D-2.

- [14-1660](#) Haehule Creek Culvert Replacement

Condition: The review panel shall review and approve the preliminary designs before construction funds are released by RCO. Typical elements for a preliminary design are defined in Manual 18 Appendix D-2.

Okanogan County-Colville Lead Entity

- [14-1753](#) Goat Creek Complexity for Confluentus

Condition: The final design must be submitted to the review panel for review and approval before releasing funds for implementation. Sponsor should plan on three weeks for panel review.

Pierce County Lead Entity

- [14-1504](#) South Prairie Creek (RM 4.0-4.6) Floodplain Phase 0

Condition: The review panel needs to review the Preliminary Design Basis for Design Report that accompanies all the technical design reports and explains what alternatives were considered, how alternative selection was made, and describes decision criteria, as well as knits together in a narrative all the disparate pieces of the design. This review needs to occur before funding agreement implementation.

Quinault Indian Nation Lead Entity

- [14-1506](#) Miller Creek Culvert Replacement

Condition: The review panel shall review and approve the preliminary designs before construction funds are released by RCO. Typical elements for a preliminary design are defined in Manual 18 Appendix D-2.

Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity

- [14-1255](#) Barnaby Reach Restoration Design

Condition:

- Funding under agreement 14-1255 will be released pending review panel evaluation of the final products of agreement 09-1440.
- In developing the preliminary design and design report under agreement 14-1255, sponsor shall:
 - Identify specific priority habitat objectives in terms of the targeted salmonid species, life stage, and timing (i.e., rather than identifying geomorphic objectives with general benefits to fish and wildlife habitat). For the preferred alternative, extend the design analysis area upstream to include the Illabot delta area. The purpose of this is to investigate additional existing flow paths that might provide conveyance from the mainstem to the Barnaby complex. Use of an existing flow path has the potential to serve as a more cost-effective solution to generating the desired habitat outcomes.
 - Describe the range of design criteria evaluated to meet this objective (e.g., what ranges of velocities and depths are required to achieve the specified habitat outcomes? Can the desired objective be met by a design flow of less than 30 percent of the mainstem flow? A channel of less than 270 feet in width?).
 - Across the range of design variations considered for the preferred alternative, document comparisons of cost, feasibility of permitting, and the risks to public safety (e.g. recreational river usage) and downstream infrastructure. Expand the risk assessment for the preferred alternative to carefully evaluate channel migration and channel avulsion into the sloughs and the potential risk to infrastructure and property. Specifically, the additional connection proposed between Barnaby, Harrison, and Lucas may increase the potential for effects to property should an avulsion occur.
- [14-1246](#) Illabot Creek Alluvial Fan Restoration – Phase 2a

Condition: Once sponsor provides the information requested under the Comments section, the following conditions are expected to be added to the project agreement.

- The design portion of the scope can proceed as proposed.
- The funding requested for construction materials under this proposal is contingent upon the sponsor securing the additional funding to complete the entire construction budget (as outlined in phase 2b, project 14-2170), either through the companion large cap proposal (14-2170), or another funding source.

- [14-1257](#) Kukutali Preserve Tombolo Restoration

Condition: The alternatives analysis report shall be submitted to the SRFB Review Panel before initiation of the next phase of work. Authorization to proceed with the 60 percent design portion of the work will be determined based on the information provided regarding the benefit to salmon from the selected alternative.

Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity

- [14-1893](#) NF Touchet Channel Realignment & Habitat

Condition: The panel appreciates the discussion at the regional area meeting with the sponsor and design engineer. The review panel is very supportive of the efforts to improve habitat conditions in this reach, especially to add channel length through restored meander patterns in order to decrease slope and velocities, and to create off-channel habitats such as the backwater area, and improve instream complexity through the addition of woody structures that provide interstices for juvenile fish refuge and pool scour and cover.

The current log weir design does not address one of the root problems in this reach (straightened steep alignment and log weirs that were placed to backwater the diversion which now forms an impassable drop for the upstream passage of small juvenile fish). If the diversion could be moved to a more natural pool location (perhaps near the new bridge), the log weirs could be removed.

The panel has continued concerns about the numerous log weir structures proposed downstream of the existing log weir. These types of drop structures used to address long term fish passage require more maintenance and have proven to fail over time.

We recommend further negotiations with the landowner to achieve a more process based approach to the design such as restoring the left bank relic floodplain channel. If this approach is just not acceptable to the landowner, we suggest a design modification using a steepened roughened channel to provide passage over the lower log weir and then place additional wood in the area downstream of the roughened channel. The roughened channel design should optimize juvenile fish passage. This is the upstream end of steelhead spawning, and rearing fish need to be able to move upstream to utilize the upper watershed.

The project may proceed to funding subject to the following conditions that will increase the benefits to fish and certainty of success:

- The sponsor will work with the landowner to document the current condition of the diversion, including current fish screening criteria. If needed, the sponsor and landowner would develop a conceptual plan to make the diversion compliant in the future and include discussion of grant funding opportunities for the diversion work. An option to relocate the diversion and remove the log weirs followed up with a restoration plan needs to be discussed.

- If the current alignment must be maintained the sponsor needs to modify the fish passage design using a roughened channel approach with woody habitat structures added to the downstream channel in place of the log weirs.
- [14-1895](#) McCaw Reach Fish Restoration (Design) Phase B

Condition: The review panel must review and approve the preliminary design before construction funds are released by RCO.

WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity

- [14-1651](#) MF Porter Creek Reach Phase 1

Condition: Before submitting the project designs to the permitting agencies, the sponsor will provide the SRFB Review Panel to review the designs and the basis of design report for consistency with SRFB’s project evaluation criteria. In particular, the review panel will check to ensure that 1) the design report identifies specific, measurable objectives for restoring Chinook habitat and habitat forming processes, including but not necessarily limited to those stated in the project proposal, and 2) that the project design will accomplish these objectives.

- [14-1656](#) NF (Xwqelem) Farmhouse Phase 3 Preliminary Design

Condition:

The existing preliminary design for Phase 3 must be re-evaluated to address the following issues.

- The design process will include hydrologic and hydraulic modeling of water depth/elevation, velocity and sediment transport conditions at channel forming (e.g. 2- to 10-year) flow events, focusing primarily on the quantity and quality of habitat that will be provided/enhanced at these lower flows, and only secondarily on the conditions generated during 100-year flow events, as was the basis for the existing preliminary design.
- The design will evaluate using wider spacing between individual engineered logjams and compare them to the narrower spacings that are the basis of the existing feasibility study/preliminary design. If similar habitat benefit is demonstrated with wider spacing/fewer engineered logjams, then the final design preference will favor fewer structures in order to increase the cost-effectiveness of the project.
- The design process will include a rigorous evaluation of the design for the previous NSEA engineered logjam project at Wick’s Slough, and determine why the structures at the inlet of the slough led to increased

sediment deposition in that area. Lessons learned from this evaluation will be incorporated into the Phase 3 design. If the cause of the sediment aggradation turns out to be natural geomorphic variability rather than a clear design flaw, then the NSEA structures shall be left in place.

- Observations and insights on the effectiveness of the as-built Phase 1 project will also be incorporated into the design process.
- The re-design process will include preparation of the “preliminary design” documentation required by Manual 18. This documentation will be reviewed and approved by the review panel prior to releasing funding for final design of Phase.
- [14-1665](#) MF Porter Creek Reach Instream Restoration

Condition: Before submitting the project designs to the permitting agencies, the sponsor will provide the SRFB Review Panel to review the designs and the basis of design report for consistency with SRFB’s project evaluation criteria. In particular, the review panel will check to ensure that 1) the design report identifies specific, measurable objectives for restoring Chinook habitat and habitat forming processes, including but not necessarily limited to those stated in the project proposal, and 2) that the project design will accomplish these objectives.

- [14-1666](#) NF Nooksack (Xwqelem) Farmhouse Reach Restoration

Condition: The existing preliminary design for Phases 3- 6 must be re-evaluated to address the following issues.

- The design process will include hydrologic and hydraulic modeling of water depth/elevation, velocity and sediment transport conditions at channel forming (e.g. 2-to 10-year) flow events, focusing primarily on the quantity and quality of habitat that will be provided/enhanced at these lower flows, and only secondarily on the conditions generated during 100-year flow events, as was the basis for the existing preliminary design.
- The design will evaluate using wider spacing between individual engineered logjams in each of the “large island” clusters, and compare them to the narrower spacings that are the basis of the existing design. If similar habitat benefit is demonstrated with wider spacing/fewer engineered logjams, then the final design preference will favor fewer structures in order to increase the cost-effectiveness of the project.
- Observations and insights on the effectiveness of the as-built Phase 1 project will be incorporated into the design process.

The re-design process will include preparation of the “preliminary design” documentation required by Manual 18. This documentation will be reviewed and approved by the review panel before releasing funding for final design and construction of Phases 3-6. The 6-month final design requirement for PSAR large capital projects will be waived in this case to allow for a robust re-evaluation of the project design.

Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board Lead Entity

- [14-1217](#) Naches River Side Channel Preliminary Design

Condition: Sponsor shall sequence the work such that the preliminary design task is not initiated until the technical advisory group has reviewed the initial hydraulic assessment and determined that hydrology is sufficient to support a successful channel.

Project of Concern: Hood Canal Coordinating Council: 14-1334 S. Fork Skokomish Canyon Fish Passage Assessment

Lead Entity:	HCCC
Project Number:	14-1334
Project Name:	S. Fork Skokomish Canyon Fish Passage Assessment
Project Sponsor:	Mason CD
Grant Manager:	Mike Ramsey

Date		Status
Draft Application Review/Site Visit	5/5/2014	Reviewed
Post Application	9/29/14	POC
Final	10/30/14	POC
Early Application Status Option		
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.	
Post-Application & Final Status Options		
NMI	Need More Information	
POC	Project of Concern	
CONDITIONE D	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions	
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process	

Project Summary

This project proposes to assess fish passage conditions for re-introduced spring Chinook, bull trout and steelhead under low flow conditions through a series of natural rapids in the canyon of the SF Skokomish River. Anecdotal information suggests that the rapids may be barriers for Chinook. Depending on the study results, the resulting data may be used to develop conceptual designs for improving fish passage through the rapids, if warranted.

Draft Application Review and Site Visit – REVIEW PANEL comments

Date: 5/21/2014

Panel Member(s) Name: Tyler and Slocum

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

1. Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria.

Further justification of the need for enhanced passage would strengthen the proposal. The premise for the proposal is based on a 1957 Washington Department of Fisheries report suggesting that reduced snowmelt had led to impassible fish passage conditions through the rapids. No PI number or other documentation is provided with which to evaluate the potential quality of habitat upstream of the canyon. No documentation is provided in the proposal related to actual utilization of the South Fork Skokomish River above the canyon by the target species either in the decades preceding or subsequent to the 1950s, although reportedly bull trout and steelhead currently do swim through the rapids. WDFW data show documented presence of winter steelhead, fall Chinook, and bull trout above the canyon.

The SRFB criteria emphasize restoration of natural processes. Given that these cascades are natural barriers and not of a clear anthropogenic origin, the project would not be restoring natural processes. The Review Panel notes the sponsor’s discussion of the influence of global warming on flows and associated changes in the passability of the cascades, based on the 1957 WDF study. Knowledge of climate change impacts has evolved substantially in the last 40 years; the referenced document is not compelling in convincing the Review Panel that the cascades are a barrier of anthropogenic origin.

Due to the lack of basic information, it is impossible for the review panel to evaluate the need for or the potential benefit resulting from the proposed assessment, nor whether any subsequent conceptual design efforts will be warranted. Because of these uncertainties over the need for and benefit of improving fish passage through the canyon, this assessment appears to most closely fit the “filling a data gap” project category identified in Section 2 of Manual 18. The review panel recommends that the proposal be reformulated to address the mandatory content for data gap-filling assessments, which are identified in Manual 18. In particular, the sponsors must closely coordinate with the relevant federal and state resource agencies, and with the lead entity organization, to assure that criteria in Manual 18 are met and that all agree on the technical approach.

2. Missing Pre-application information.

3. Comments/Questions:

The sponsor may find it helpful to consult with the Upper Columbia Fisheries Recovery Board to get insights from its current project to assess fish passage objectives and design criteria through a partially natural/partially human-caused boulder field on Icicle Creek (SRFB Project No. 13-1342).

4. Staff Comments:

EARLY APPLICATION Review and Site VISIT – lead entity and project sponsor responses

Directions: By the final application due date, applicants must revise their project proposals using “track changes” and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the section at the end of the project proposal, which asks how you responded to the review panel’s comments.



Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD “track changes” and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

Post Application – REVIEW PANEL comments

Date: September 25, 2014

Review Panel Member(s) Name: Full panel

Application Project Status: POC

1. If the project is a POC, identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:

- #1 - It is unclear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing.
- #3 - The project is dependent on other key conditions or processes being addressed first.
- #5 - The project does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed.
- #15 - The methodology does not appear to be appropriate to meet the goals and objectives of the project.

The proposal is premised on two key assumptions from the 2010 *Recovery Plan for Skokomish River Chinook Salmon*, which the review panel believes should be more rigorously tested before committing to a program of creating artificially-enhanced fish passage conditions through the South Fork canyon rapids. The first assumption is that the overall, long-term hydrology patterns of the South Fork watershed have changed significantly enough since the 1920s to now prevent upstream migration of early-timed Chinook spawning. The proposal links receding glaciers and permanent snow fields in Olympic National Park to reduction in spring-time flows in the South Fork, but the 2010 Recovery Plan characterizes the South Fork as naturally having a “weak snowmelt signature due to lower elevation headwaters.” The small shift in timing of the spring peak runoff hydrograph that is shown Figure 4.6 might affect Chinook utilization of the upper watershed, but at present, not enough information is

presented in the proposal or the Recovery Plan to conclusively determine this. The more comprehensive questions to be answered are: what flow levels are needed to maintain all of the relevant life history stages of Spring Chinook in the upper watershed; what is the natural, long-term variability in hydrology; and how have man-made factors (climatic, logging intensity, etc.) skewed the long-term hydrology patterns? Steelhead and bull trout reportedly still utilize the upper watershed: are there other hydrologic factors besides migration through the canyon that allow them to persist, while Spring Chinook have not?

The second assumption from the Recovery Plan that deserves more rigorous testing is the 1957 Wash. Dept. of Fisheries recommendation that corrective actions are needed to facilitate adult Chinook migration through the canyon. It is important to put the 1957 recommendations into their context. In the late 1950's WDF pursued an aggressive program of clearing log jams from, building fish ladders around, and/or dynamiting cascades and other natural fish passage barriers around the state. This program was a desperate response to the catastrophic loss of habitat caused by two decades of dam construction. At best, these attempts to facilitate fish passage past natural barriers ignored the natural process restoration approach that is the basis of the current SRFB funding approach; at worst they caused unintended negative environmental impacts such as introducing non-native species. The review panel believes that habitat restoration practice has improved greatly since 1957, and it would not necessarily support proposals for implementing artificial “corrective actions” that may result from the proposed study.

2. If the project is a POC, what changes would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria?

As described in the initial review comments, the review panel recommends that this proposal be reformulated to address the mandatory content for data gap-filling assessments, which are identified on page 19 of Manual 18. In particular, the sponsors must closely coordinate with the relevant federal and state resource agencies, and with the lead entity organization, to assure that criteria in Manual 18 are met and that all agree on the technical approach. We recommend that the sponsor convene a team of advisors with relevant technical backgrounds including hydrology, engineering and salmon biology/ecology from NOAA/NMFS the U.S. Forest Service, WDFW, WDNR, Skokomish Tribe, and other organizations, as appropriate, to provide technical input and inter-agency coordination for the project work.

The scope of the study must take a more comprehensive view of the hydrology of the upper South Fork and how it affects all relevant life history stages of Spring Chinook and other fish species, not just the flows that may impede adult passage through the canyon's rapids. This scope may include identifying and evaluating the feasibility of conceptual designs for improving adult fish passage, but the review panel wants to make clear that at this point we do not necessarily support committing SRFB funds to any subsequent detailed design proposal for a particular action.

3. If the project is Conditioned, the following language will be added to the project agreement:

4. How could this project be further improved?

5. Other comments:

Post application – lead entity and project sponsor responses

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 22-25 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2014. **By October 15**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals. Please “accept” all current track changes in the project proposal so you are starting with a clean proposal. Then please turn track changes back on when you make new changes. This step will save time and focus the reviewers on the changes.

In addition, please fill out the section at the end of the project proposal, which asks how you responded to the review panel’s comments.

FINAL REVIEW PANEL Comments

Date: 10/30/14

Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

Final Project Status: POC

1. If the project is a POC, please identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:

#1 - It is unclear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing.

#3 - The project is dependent on other key conditions or processes being addressed first.

#7 - The project does not work towards restoring natural watershed processes.

#15 - The methodology does not appear to be appropriate to meet the goals and objectives of the project.

Discussion of these criteria is provided in the September 25, 2014 post-application comments, above.

The Review Panel recognizes the prominent role that improving fish passage through the South Fork Skokomish Canyon plays in the Skokomish River Chinook Recovery Plan, and that the Board may choose to fund this project despite the noted inconsistencies with the SRFB evaluation criteria. In this case, the review panel recommends that the following conditions be required to improve the potential benefits and certainty of the project (below).

2. If the project is Conditioned, the following language will be added to the project agreement:

1. The sponsor shall convene a diverse team of advisors with relevant technical backgrounds including hydrology, engineering and salmon biology/ecology from NOAA/NMFS, the U.S. Forest Service, WDFW, WDNR, Skokomish Tribe, and other organizations, as appropriate, to provide technical input and inter-agency coordination for the project work. The advisory effort shall also include representation by a whitewater recreation advocate.
2. The scope of the study must take a more comprehensive view of the hydrology and hydraulic characteristics of the upper South Fork and how they affect all relevant life history stages of Spring Chinook and the other listed fish species that are present in the river, not just the flows that may impede adult passage through the canyon’s four rapids. The hydrology assessment will address both water flow and sediment transport considerations that are relevant to forming habitat for the species of concern. The sponsor will present its detailed plan for the hydrology and hydraulic assessment, including the proposed suite of conceptual designs that will be modeled, for the review panel’s approval before commencing the modeling work. After completion, the sponsor will include a detailed write-up of the assessment in its project report deliverable.

3. Other comments:

Project of Concern: Hood Canal Coordinating Council: 14-1405 Pioneer Park Restoration

Lead Entity:	WRIA 13 – Thurston County
Project Number:	14-1405
Project Name:	Pioneer Park Restoration
Project Sponsor:	SPSSEG
Grant Manager:	Adam Cole

Date		Status
Draft Application Review/Site Visit	5/14/14	Reviewed
Post Application	9/23/14	POC
Final	10/29/14	POC
Early Application Status Option		
REVIEWED	SRFB Review Panel has reviewed and provided comments.	
Post-Application & Final Status Options		
NMI	Need More Information	
POC	Project of Concern	
CONDITIONED	SRFB Review Panel has applied conditions	
CLEAR	Project has been reviewed by SRFB Review Panel and is okay to continue in funding process	

Project Summary

This project site was identified through the WRIA 13 three-year implementation priority list. This project is located on the Deschutes River in Pioneer Park which is a popular recreational area owned by the City of Tumwater. This project seeks to restore aquatic habitat in the reach by increasing the amount of large woody debris, re-establishing native riparian forest, and creating in-stream complexity. The completed conceptual design proposes to install a flow deflecting log jam(s) that will help redirect flows into the historic main channel, while providing much needed off channel habitat along an eroded clay river bank. An aggressive riparian plan will also be implemented along the Pioneer Park section of river frontage.

Draft Application Review and Site Visit – REVIEW

PANEL comments

Date: 5/23/14

Panel Member(s) Name: Steve Toth and Paul Schlenger

Early Project Status: ☒ Reviewed

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

5. Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria.

The current proposal focuses on one small area to protect eroding banks and improve habitat complexity - the application would be improved by 1) identifying why this particular area is a priority for habitat improvement, 2) describing upstream habitat conditions (e.g., water temperatures, riparian condition, armoring), and 3) explaining how the project ties into larger reach-scale restoration efforts in this portion of the Deschutes River.

Given the lack of technical plans or reports for the site, this design-build project will likely be conditioned for design review by the SRFB Review Panel before proceeding to construction.

6. Missing Pre-application information.

7. Comments/Questions:

The project proposes to install several ELJs to provide roughness, habitat complexity, and address bank erosion in this public park. The design will have to carefully consider public safety due to high recreational use and may limit the complexity of wood structures. The Review Panel has generally not been supportive of dolotimber structures for stream restoration. The plan includes revegetation of riparian areas with a minimum 100-foot buffer - the plantings should focus on establishing a forest with conifers and cottonwoods in the riparian area.

8. Staff Comments:

Given the high recreational use of this area, fencing or signage could be included in the grant proposal to manage human use of the area.

EARLY APPLICATION Review and Site VISIT – lead entity and project sponsor responses

Directions: By the final application due date, applicants must revise their project proposals using “track changes” and update their PRISM applications and attachments, as needed, to respond to the review panel comments. In addition, please fill out the section at the end of the project proposal, which asks how you responded to the review panel’s comments.



Special Note: To help speed the local and SRFB Review Panel evaluation process, if for any reason throughout the application review process you update your project proposal based on SRFB Review Panel comments please update your project proposal using WORD “track changes” and re-attach your proposal in PRISM. This step will save time and focus the reviewer on the changes.

Post Application – REVIEW PANEL comments

Date: 9/23/14

Review Panel Member(s) Name: Review Panel

Application Project Status: POC

6. If the project is a POC, identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:

- 4. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits and the project sponsor has failed to justify the costs to the satisfaction of the Review Panel.
- 11. The project is sited improperly.

7. If the project is a POC, what changes would make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria?

The Review Panel has concerns about constructing engineered log-jams in an area of such high public use. We believe this type of project needs to be located in an area with less public safety concerns. The Panel would be supportive of riparian restoration efforts, if areas can be fenced off from the public to allow new vegetation to mature.

8. If the project is Conditioned, the following language will be added to the project agreement:

9. How could this project be further improved?

10. Other comments:

Post application – lead entity and project sponsor responses

Directions: All projects will be reviewed at the September 22-25 review panel meeting. A status will be assigned to each project by October 4, 2014. **By October 15**, applicants of projects assigned a status of Project of Concern, Conditioned, or Need More Information, must update their project proposals. Please “accept” all current track changes in the project proposal so you are starting with a clean proposal. Then please turn track changes back on when you make new changes. This step will save time and focus the reviewers on the changes.

In addition, please fill out the section at the end of the project proposal, which asks how you responded to the review panel’s comments.

FINAL REVIEW PANEL Comments

Date: 10/29/14

Panel Member(s) Name: Full Review Panel

Final Project Status: POC

4. If the project is a POC, please identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:

11. The project is sited improperly.

5. If the project is Conditioned, the following language will be added to the project agreement:

6. Other comments:

The Review Panel recognizes that the habitat in this reach of the Deschutes River would benefit from the addition of large wood to create pools and increase habitat diversity. The recent formation of a natural woody debris jam at the western park boundary shows the potential for substantial improvements in aquatic habitat. The Review Panel also understands the importance of the Deschutes River for salmon recovery in Thurston County, despite the lack of ESA-listed populations.

Unfortunately, the proposal to construct engineered log jams (ELJ’s) in a highly used public park would unacceptably increase the risk to public safety. Young children commonly recreate in the river and would likely be attracted to climbing on ELJ structures. While most of the recreational use is during the summer when flows are lower, sunny days can attract river users even when flows are higher and water temperatures are colder. Many of the users float with inflated inner tubes and have limited ability to steer around and avoid potential hazards. Signage is unlikely to prevent recreational users from using the river, even during potentially hazardous conditions. The conceptual design report did not consider design alternatives nor address potential public safety issues for the project proposal. While natural hazards are also present in this reach of the

Deschutes River, engineered structures would increase the potential hazard and increase the liability risk for any accidents that may occur on the river within the park boundaries.

The potential fish benefits that could be realized from the proposed project habitat enhancements are limited due to the project’s location being very low in the Deschutes River system. This limits any benefits of fine sediment reduction to salmon because it is downstream of the main spawning areas and would only affect water quality for juvenile salmon in the lowermost mile of the river during their outmigration from the river.

To address bank erosion along the meander bend in the project area, the Review Panel would recommend seeking alternative funding sources to implement a lighter approach that would involve laying back the bank and using bioengineered techniques, such as willow fascines or coir rolls, to reduce shear stress along the bank. The riparian area could then be planted with willows along the bank, as well as additional trees, such as conifers and cottonwood, in the riparian area.

Attachment 8 – Funding Table By Region

Hood Canal Coordinating Council

	SRFB	PSAR
Regional Allocations:	\$1,195,165	\$1,864,626
Total Funding to be Awarded, December	\$1,195,165	\$0
Allocation Remaining After Funding Decision	\$0	\$0

Lead Entity: Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large CAP 2015-17 Request
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	
1	14-1321	Lower Big Quilcene River Riparian Protection	Jefferson Land Trust			\$161,160	\$161,160	
2	14-1369	Skokomish Estuary Restoration Phase 3C	Mason Conservation Dist			\$463,600	\$463,600	
3	14-1322	Duckabush Riparian Habitat Acquisition	Jefferson Land Trust			\$746,000	\$746,000	
4	14-1326	Beards Cove Restoration	Great Peninsula Conservancy	\$297,132	\$297,132	\$302,868	\$302,868	
5	14-1300	Dosewallips Estuary Barge Removal	Hood Canal SEG			\$190,998	\$190,998	
6	14-1328	Skokomish River General Investigation 2014	Mason Conservation Dist	\$360,500	\$360,500			
8	14-1332	South Fork Skokomish LWD Enhancement Phase 3	Mason Conservation Dist	\$875,774	\$537,533	P		
9	14-1329	Mainstem Skokomish LWD Design – HWY 101	Mason Conservation Dist	\$210,658	Alternate			

Attachment 8 – Funding Table By Region

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large CAP 2015-17 Request
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	
10	14-1315	Hood Canal S Chum Nearshore Habitat Use Assessment	Wild Fish Conservancy	\$242,114	Alternate			
11	14-1320	Dosewallips Forest Service Road Decommissioning	Hood Canal SEG	\$660,963	Alternate			
12	14-1318	Lower Union R. Habitat Assessment and Feasibility	Hood Canal SEG	\$89,708	Alternate			
13	14-1334	S. Fork Skokomish Canyon Fish Passage Assessment	Mason Conservation Dist	\$175,437	Alternate			
lg cap	14-1366	Kilisut Harbor Restoration - Construction Phase	North Olympic Salmon Coalition					\$8,986,384
lg cap	14-1376	Skokomish River Natural Process Rehabilitation	Mason Conservation Dist					\$1,835,607
Total Funded:				\$1,195,165		\$1,864,626		\$10,821,991

Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board

Lead Entity: Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity

Lead Entity Allocation: \$2,700,000

Rank	Project Number	Type	Name	Sponsor	Grant Request	Funding Approved
1	14-1338	R	SF Toutle Riparian Restoration	Lower Columbia River FEG	\$180,290	\$180,290
3	14-1335	R	SFK Toutle@ Johnson Creek Restoration	Lower Columbia River FEG	\$378,500	\$378,500
4	14-1292	R	Grays River Satterlund Site	Wahkiakum Conservation Dist	\$69,850	\$69,850
5	14-1339	R	Haapa Habitat Restoration Phase I project	Lower Columbia River FEG	\$292,460	\$292,460
6	14-1336	R	Upper Washougal River- Chaffee Property	Lower Columbia River FEG	\$307,747	\$307,747
7	14-1380	R	Columbia- Pacific Passage Habitat Restoration	CREST	\$325,000	\$325,000
8	14-1392	P	Wind River Community Based Strategy Development	Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd	\$135,000	\$135,000
10	14-1337	R	Toutle River Confluence Restoration- Phase I	Lower Columbia River FEG	\$388,500	\$388,500
11	14-1360	R	Dougan Creek Confluence Restoration	Lower Columbia River FEG	\$281,960	\$281,960
12	14-1308	R	Clear Creek Fish Passage	Wahkiakum Co. Public Works	\$340,693	\$340,693
13	14-1391	P	Lwr Elochoman Community Based Strategy Development	Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd	\$133,000	Alternate
15	14-1344	R	NF Lewis 13.5 Enhancement - Phase II	Lower Columbia River FEG	\$295,200	Alternate
16	14-1176	R	Upper Hamilton Creek Restoration Project	Lower Columbia Estuary Partner	\$378,349	Alternate
17	14-1342	R	Lower Kalama Restoration Phase 1	Lower Columbia River FEG	\$324,300	Alternate
19	14-1309	P	Muddy-Clear Restoration Design	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	\$110,000	Alternate

Attachment 8 – Funding Table By Region

20	14-1340	P	Washougal Racetrack Restoration Design	Lower Columbia River FEG	\$75,000	Alternate
21	14-1177	R	Greenleaf Creek Restoration Project	Lower Columbia Estuary Partner	\$386,721	Alternate
					Total Funded:	\$2,700,000

Northeast Washington

Lead Entity:		Kalispel Tribe-Pend Oreille Lead Entity			Lead Entity Allocation:		\$360,000
Rank	Project Number	Type	Name	Sponsor	Grant Request	Funding Approved	
1	14-1871	R	Indian Creek Fish Passage Implementation	Pend Oreille Co Public Works	\$250,000	\$250,000	
2	14-1975	R	Smalle Creek Westside Calispel Rd Fish Passage Imp	Pend Oreille Co Public Works	\$110,000	\$110,000	
					Total Funded:	\$360,000	

Puget Sound Partnership

	SRFB	PSAR
Regional Allocations:	\$6,795,035	\$8,151,016
Total Funding Requested, December	\$6,795,027	\$0
Allocation Remaining After Funding Decision	\$0	\$0

Lead Entity: Green, Duwamish, and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9) Lead Entity

SRFB Allocation:	\$327,353
PSAR Allocation:	\$357,221
PSAR Allocation Remaining for December:	\$0

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large Cap 2015-17 PSAR
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	Request
1	14-1001	Mill Creek Side Channel (Leber 2014)	Kent City of	\$327,353	\$327,353	\$357,221	\$357,221	
LG	14-1389	Downey Farmstead Restoration Project	Kent City of					\$4,890,965
LG	14-1327	Porter Levee Setback, Floodplain Reconnection	King County DNR & Parks					\$4,675,000
Total Funded:					\$327,353		\$357,221	

Lead Entity: Island County Lead Entity

SRFB Allocation:	\$240,780
-------------------------	-----------

PSAR Allocation:	\$196,991
-------------------------	-----------

PSAR Allocation for December:	\$0
--------------------------------------	-----

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large Cap 2015-17 PSAR
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	Request
1	14-1108	Ala Spit Restoration, Phase 4	Island County Health Dept	\$75,809	\$75,809	\$186,991	\$186,991	
2	14-1114	Waterman Nearshore Aquisition	Whidbey Camano Land Trust	\$164,971	\$164,971	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$845,029
3	14-1074	Kristoferson Creek Fish Passage Barrier Correction	Snohomish Conservation Dist	\$25,800	\$0 P	\$100,000	Alternate	
4	14-1152	Camano Isl State Park Lagoon Reconnection	Skagit River Sys Cooperative	\$85,096	Alternate	\$100,000	Alternate	
5	14-1076	Iverson Preserve Stakeholder Integration Project	Island County Health Dept	\$54,805	Alternate	\$50,000	Alternate	
6	14-1075	Feeder Bluff Assessment & Armor Removal ID	NW Straits Marine Cons Found	\$24,051	Alternate	\$50,000	Alternate	
Total Funded:				\$240,784		\$196,991		\$845,029

Lead Entity: Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8) Lead Entity

SRFB Allocation:	\$433,356
-------------------------	-----------

PSAR Allocation:	\$350,000
-------------------------	-----------

PSAR Allocation Remaining for December:	\$0
--	-----

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large Cap 2015-17 PSAR
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	Request
1	14-1193	Cedar River Stewardship in Action	Seattle Public Utilities	\$206,025	\$206,025	\$95,000	\$95,000	
2	14-1330	Riverbend Levee Setback & Removal Prelim Design	King Co Water & Land Res			\$255,000	\$255,000	
3	14-1299	Willow Creek Daylighting Preliminary Design	Edmonds City of	\$157,331	\$157,331			
4	14-1333	Squire's Landing Park Riparian Restoration	Sno-King Watershed Council	\$70,000	\$70,000			
5	14-1194	Evans Creek Relocation	Redmond City of					\$2,500,000
Total Funded:					\$433,356		\$350,000	\$2,500,000

Lead Entity: Nisqually River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity

SRFB Allocation:	\$416,803
PSAR Allocation:	\$0
PSAR Allocation Remaining for December:	\$0

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large Cap 2015-17 PSAR
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	Request
1	14-1929	Middle Ohop Protection Phase 1	Nisqually Land Trust	\$80,000	\$80,000			
2	14-1791	Upper Ohop Valley Protection	Nisqually Land Trust	\$90,000	\$90,000			
3	14-1935	Wilcox Farm Floodplain Restoration Design	Nisqually Indian Tribe	\$135,000	\$135,000			
4	14-1919	Nisqually River Knotweed #5	Pierce Co Conservation Dist	\$130,000	\$111,803	P		
Lg CA P	14-1688	Busy Wild Creek Protection	Nisqually Land Trust		Alternate			\$5,889,000
Total Funded:					\$416,803		\$0	\$5,889,000

Lead Entity: North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon

SRFB Allocation: \$715,907

PSAR Allocation: \$655,397

PSAR Allocation for December: \$0

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large Cap 2015-17 PSAR
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	Request
1	14-1373	Elwha Floodplain Restoration Planning Project	Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe	\$185,000	\$185,000			
2	14-1382	Lower Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration	Clallam Co Community Dev					\$11,867,000
3	14-1374	Little River LWD Planning Project	Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe	\$200,000	\$200,000			
4	14-1371	Pysht Estuary Saltmarsh Restoration	Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe					\$4,291,267
5	14-1385	Dungeness Landscape Protection- RM1.5 to RM 6.5	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe					\$8,009,650
6	14-1384	Dungeness Habitat Protection- RM 6.5 to 7.5 Phase	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe	\$24,775	\$24,775	\$655,397	\$655,397	
7	14-1379	Hoko 9000 Road Abandonment	Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe	\$306,132	\$306,132			
Total Funded:					\$715,907		\$655,397	\$24,167,917

Attachment 8 – Funding Table By Region

Lead Entity: Pierce County Lead Entity

SRFB Allocation: \$562,016

PSAR Allocation: \$975,256

PSAR Allocation for December: \$0

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large Cap 2015-17 PSAR
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	Request
1	14-1504	South Prairie Creek (RM4.0-4.6) Floodplain Phase 0	South Puget Sound SEG	\$0	\$0	\$193,000	\$193,000	
2	14-1180	South Fork Floodplain Restoration PH 2B Const	Pierce Co Water Programs Div	\$225,628	\$225,628	\$782,256	\$782,256	
3	14-1377	Middle Boise Creek - Vanwieringen	King Co Water & Land Res	\$200,000	\$200,000			
4	14-1188	Puyallup River RM27.2-28.6 LB Acquisition	Pierce Co Water Programs Div	\$425,000	\$136,388	P		
5	14-1239	Calistoga Setback Levee Construction 2014 Request	Orting City of	\$564,000	Alternate			
6	14-1184	Neadham Road Acquisition and Levee Removal	Pierce Co Water Programs Div					\$6,887,266
7	14-1189	South Prairie Creek (RM 4.0-4.6) Phase 1 and 2	South Puget Sound SEG					\$3,330,487
8	14-1187	Alward Road Acquisition Phase 2	Pierce Co Water Programs Div					\$4,514,100
Total Funded:				\$562,016		\$975,256		\$14,731,853

Lead Entity: San Juan County Community Development Lead Entity

SRFB Allocation: \$307,270

PSAR Allocation: \$705,131

PSAR Allocation for December: \$0

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large Cap 2015-17 PSAR
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	Request
1	14-1888	Huntley Conservation Easement	San Juan County Land Bank			\$286,400	\$286,400	
2	14-1933	Fishery Pt Neighborhood Shoreline CE Acquisition	San Juan Preservation Trust			\$371,000	\$371,000	
3	14-1913	West Sound Pocket Beach Restoration	Friends of the San Juans	\$43,654	\$43,654	\$47,731	\$47,731	
4	14-1931	West Beach Road Barrier Correction	Skagit Fish Enhancement Group	\$263,616	\$263,616			
LG	14-1887	Kellet Bluff Hart Property - Henry Island	San Juan County Land Bank					\$825,000
Total Funded:					\$307,270		\$705,131	\$825,000

Lead Entity: Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity

SRFB Allocation:	\$1,239,822
PSAR Allocation:	\$0
PSAR Allocation Remaining for December:	\$0

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large Cap 2015-17 PSAR
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	Request
1	14-1255	Barnaby Reach Restoration Design	Skagit River Sys Cooperative	\$395,250	\$395,250			
2	14-1260	Illabot Creek Protection and Riparian Restoration	Skagit Land Trust			\$275,290	\$275,290	
3	14-1261	SRFB Conservation Property Stewardship	Skagit Fish Enhancement Group			\$100,000	\$100,000	
4	14-1242	Skagit Basin Ongoing Project Maintenance	Skagit River Sys Cooperative			\$97,750	\$97,750	
5	14-1263	Martin Slough Riparian Restoration	Skagit County Public Works			\$155,550	\$155,550	
6	14-1258	Skagit Delta Hydrodynamic Model	The Nature Conservancy	\$330,000	\$330,000			
7	14-1264	Martin Slough Fish Passage	Skagit County Public Works	\$85,000	\$85,000			
8	14-1262	Skagit Riparian Habitat Strategy	Skagit Watershed Council			\$145,146	\$145,146	
9	14-1246	Illabot Creek Alluvial Fan Restoration – Phase 2a	Skagit River Sys Cooperative			\$1,096,675	\$1,096,675	
9	14-2170	Illabot Creek Alluvial Fan Restoration – Phase 2b	Skagit River Sys Cooperative					\$2,994,205
10	14-1248	Hansen Creek Restoration Acquisition	Skagit River Sys Cooperative	\$366,213	\$366,213	\$20,787	\$20,787	
11	14-1257	Kukutali Tombolo Restoration Feasibility & Design	Swinomish Tribe	\$63,359	\$63,359	\$111,641	Alternate	
Total Funded:				\$1,239,822		\$1,891,198		\$2,994,205

Lead Entity: Snohomish County Lead Entity

SRFB Allocation:	\$565,767
PSAR Allocation:	\$0
PSAR Allocation Remaining for December:	\$0

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large Cap 2015-17 PSAR
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	Request
1	14-1226	Cherry Creek Restoration-Ph I	Sound Salmon Solutions	\$326,360	\$326,360			
2	14-1404	Moga Back-Channel Design	Snohomish Conservation Dist	\$100,000	\$100,000			
3	14-1416	Two Mountains Farm Riparian Restoration-Section 3	King Conservation District	\$139,400	\$139,400			
4	14-1426	WRIA 07 Fish Passage Data Gap King - Snohomish	Wild Fish Conservancy	\$155,760	Alternate			
Total Funded:				\$565,760		\$0		\$0

Lead Entity: Stillaguamish River Salmon Recovery Co-Lead Entity

SRFB Allocation:	\$552,129
PSAR Allocation:	\$1,091,431
PSAR Allocation Remaining for December:	\$0

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large Cap 2015-17 PSAR
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	Request
1	14-1356	Stillaguamish Floodplain Protection & Restoration	Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians	\$402,129	\$402,129	\$934,181	\$934,181	
2	14-1289	North Meander Reconnection - Wood Placement	Snohomish County Public Works			\$157,250	\$157,250	
3	14-1306	North Meander Reconnection, Ph III Design	Snohomish County Public Works	\$150,000	\$150,000			
Total Funded:				\$552,129		\$1,091,431		\$0

Lead Entity: West Sound Watersheds Council Lead Entity

SRFB Allocation:	\$294,655
PSAR Allocation:	\$63,765
PSAR Allocation Remaining for December:	\$0

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large Cap 2015-17 PSAR
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	Request
1	14-1375	West Sound Nearshore Integration & Synthesis	Kitsap County Comm Development	\$20,346	Alternate	\$63,765	\$63,765	
2	14-1946	Filucy Bay Estuary Shoreline Protection	Great Peninsula Conservancy	\$150,000	\$150,000			
3	14-1632	Curley Creek Acquisition Feasibility	Great Peninsula Conservancy	\$33,000	\$33,000			
4	14-1957	E. Kitsap Steelhead Habitat Evaluation	Kitsap County Comm Development	\$75,572	\$50,030 P			
5	14-1517	Springbrook Creek Evaluation and Feasibility	Bainbridge Island Land Trust	\$61,625	\$61,625			
6	14-2176	Lower Purdy Creek Restoration Feasibility	Pierce Co Public Works	\$105,000	Alternate			
7	14-1949	Evergreen Park Nearshore Restoration Design	Bremerton Public Works	\$200,000	Alternate			
Total Funded:				\$294,655		\$63,765		\$0

Lead Entity: WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity

SRFB Allocation:	\$711,475
PSAR Allocation:	\$0
PSAR Allocation Remaining for December:	\$0

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large Cap 2015-17 PSAR
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	Request
1	14-1658	SF (Nuxw7iyem) Nessel Phase 2-3 Design	Nooksack Indian Tribe	\$108,100	\$108,100			
2	14-1659	SF (Nuxw7iyem) DS Hutchinson Phase 2a Restoration	Nooksack Indian Tribe	\$320,264	\$320,264			
3	14-1655	NF (Xwqélém) Farmhouse Ph 2a Restoration	Nooksack Indian Tribe	\$339,645	\$283,111 P			
4	14-1868	South Fork Nooksack: Camp 18 Design	Lummi Nation	\$102,238	Alternate			
5	14-1657	SF (Nuxw7iyem) Nessel Ph 1 Restoration	Nooksack Indian Tribe	\$1,000,127	Alternate			
6	14-1654	Upper Cavanaugh-Fobes Phase 2 Design	Lummi Nation	\$102,184	Alternate			
7	14-1656	NF (Xwqélém) Farmhouse Phase 3 Design	Nooksack Indian Tribe	\$86,837	Alternate			
8	14-1651	MF Porter Creek Reach Phase 1	Lummi Nation	\$664,442	Alternate			
9	14-1881	NF (Xwqélém) Farmhouse Phase 2b Restoration	Nooksack Indian Tribe	\$1,228,414	Alternate			
LG	14-1667	SF Nooksack (Nuxw7iyem) Nessel Reach Restoration	Nooksack Indian Tribe					\$3,247,295
LG	14-1666	NF Nooksack (Xwqélém) Farmhouse (Ph 1b, 2b-6)	Nooksack Indian Tribe					\$5,796,581
LG	14-1665	MF Porter Creek Reach Instream Restoration	Lummi Nation					\$3,088,656
Total Funded:				\$711,475		\$0		\$12,132,532

Lead Entity: WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee Lead Entity

SRFB Allocation:	\$194,755
PSAR Allocation:	\$0
PSAR Allocation Remaining for December:	\$0

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large Cap 2015-17 PSAR
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	Request
2	14-1430	Allison Springs Estuary - Riparian Stewardship	Capitol Land Trust	\$11,000	\$11,000			
3	14-1406	Lower McLane LWD	South Puget Sound SEG	\$95,440	\$95,440			
4	14-1429	Harmony Farms Restoration Design	Capitol Land Trust	\$30,000	\$30,000			
5	14-1405	Pioneer Park Restoration Preliminary Designs	South Puget Sound SEG	\$83,500	\$58,315	P		
LG	14-1407	The Big Three Culvert Replacement Package	South Puget Sound SEG					\$3,644,273
Total Funded:				\$194,755		\$0		\$3,644,273

Lead Entity: WRIA 14 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee Lead Entity

SRFB Allocation:	\$232,942
PSAR Allocation:	\$0
PSAR Allocation Remaining for Dec:	\$0

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB		PSAR Funded Sept. 2014		Large Cap 2015-17 PSAR
				Request	Funding	Request	Funding	Request
1	14-1433	Goldsborough Habitat Acquisition Phase 3	Capitol Land Trust	\$110,925	\$110,925			
2	14-1412	Shelton Harbor Restoration Phase 1	South Puget Sound SEG	\$209,950	Alternate			
3	14-1410	Likes Creek Fish Passage II, Supplemental	South Puget Sound SEG	\$84,900	\$84,900			
4	14-1432	Oakland Bay Restoration - Riparian Stewardship	Capitol Land Trust	\$23,500	\$23,500			
5	14-1586	Allyn Shoreline Enhancement Project	Mason Conservation Dist	\$40,086	\$13,617	P		
LG	14-1403	West Oakland Bay Restoration and Conservation	Squaxin Island Tribe	\$0	Alternate			\$1,906,499
LG	14-1397	Little Skookum Inlet Shoreline Habitat Protection	Forterra	\$0	Alternate			\$596,010
Total Funded:				\$232,942		\$0		\$2,502,509

Snake River Salmon Recovery Board

Lead Entity:		Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity			Lead Entity Allocation:	
Rank	Project Number	Type	Name	Sponsor	Grant Request	Funding Approved
1	14-1898	R	Restore Alpowa Creek Fish Passage	Nez Perce Tribe	\$40,000	\$40,000
3	14-1894	R	Mill Cr Passage 9th Ave Construction 2	Tri-State Steelheaders Inc	\$465,973	\$465,973
4	14-1892	R	Titus Creek Diversion Fish Passage and Screening	Walla Walla Co Cons Dist	\$130,380	\$130,380
5	14-1899	R	Tucannon LW Restoration Project Area 11	Fish & Wildlife Dept of	\$200,000	\$200,000
6	14-1903	R	Restoring Pataha Creek with Simulated Beaver Dams	Pomeroy Conservation Dist	\$77,250	\$77,250
7	14-1900	R	PA 24 Floodplain and Channel Complexity	Columbia Conservation Dist	\$231,255	\$231,255
8	14-1914	P	Steptoe Creek Perched Culvert Design & Assessment	Palouse Conservation District	\$12,650	\$12,650
9	14-1902	P	Bridge to Bridge Final Restoration Design	Tri-State Steelheaders Inc	\$112,000	\$112,000
10	14-1897	P	Snedecker Conservation Easement Assessment	Blue Mountain Land Trust	\$16,300	\$16,300
11	14-1893	R	N Touchet Levee Setback and Habitat Improvement	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	\$234,792	\$234,792
12	14-1895	P	McCaw Reach Fish Restoration (Design) Phase B	Walla Walla Co Cons Dist	\$62,400	\$62,400
13	14-1896	P	Tucannon River MM4 - Frame Cons. Easement Asst.	Blue Mountain Land Trust	\$15,400	\$15,400
					Total Funded:	\$1,598,400

Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board

Lead Entities:

Okanogan County
and Chelan County

Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity

Lead Entity Allocation: **\$1,953,000**

Rank	Project Number	Type	Name	Sponsor	Grant Request	Funding Approved
1	14-1764	R	Methow Watershed Beaver Reintroduction	Methow Salmon Recovery Found	\$182,500	\$182,500
2	14-1738	P	Nason Creek Kahler Design	Chelan Co Natural Resource	\$126,480	\$126,480
3	14-1735	R	Silver Side Channel Revival - Implementation	Cascade Col Reg Fish Enhance	\$525,287	\$525,287
4	14-1736	P	Restore Lower Peshastin Creek - Design	Cascade Col Reg Fish Enhance	\$138,440	\$138,440
5	14-1737	R	Barkley Irrigation Company: Under Pressure	Trout Unlimited Inc.	\$723,732	\$723,732
6	14-1739	P	Upper Peshastin Migration Barrier Design	Chelan Co Natural Resource	\$62,500	\$62,500
7	14-1761	R	Methow Watershed Riparian Stewardship Program	Methow Salmon Recovery Found	\$91,561	\$91,561
8	14-1753	R	Goat Creek Complexity for Confluentus	National Forest Foundation	\$102,500	\$102,500
9	14-1710	A	Twisp River--Poorman Creek Protection, Phase II	Methow Conservancy	\$294,390	Alternate
10	14-1732	P	Skinney Creek Floodplain Restoration Design	Chelan Co Natural Resource	\$107,000	Alternate
					Total Funded:	\$1,953,000

Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership

Lead Entity:		Grays Harbor County Lead Entity			Lead Entity Allocation:	
Rank	Project Number	Type	Name	Sponsor	Grant Request	Funding Approved
1	14-1268	A	Black River Conservation - Ramos Acquisition	Capitol Land Trust	\$90,000	\$90,000
2	14-1168	R	Stevens Creek Fish Barrier Culvert Correction	Chehalis Basin FTF	\$155,226	\$155,226
3	14-1159	R	Delezenne Creek Fish Passage Restoration Project	Grays Harbor Conservation Dist	\$200,000	\$200,000
4	14-1390	A	Schweikert Farm Acquisition	Heernett Environmental Found	\$234,000	\$234,000
5	14-1165	R	Weyerhaeuser-Middle Fork Satsop Culvert Correction	Grays Harbor Conservation Dist	\$97,248	Alternate
6	14-1591	C	Wishkah Gardens	Forterra	\$85,850	Alternate
7	14-1164	R	Rayonier-Middle Fork Hoquiam Culvert Corrections	Chehalis Basin FTF	\$76,167	Alternate
8	14-1267	R	Scammon Creek (RM 1.15) Barrier Removal	Lewis County Public Works	\$187,780	Alternate
					Total Funded:	\$679,226

Lead Entity:		North Pacific Coast Lead Entity			Lead Entity Allocation:	
Rank	Project Number	Type	Name	Sponsor	Grant Request	Funding Approved
1	14-1661	R	Squaw Creek Culvert Replacement	Pacific Coast Salmon Coalition	\$162,500	\$162,500
2	14-1660	R	Haehule Culvert Replacement	Pacific Coast Salmon Coalition	\$117,000	\$117,000
					Total Funded:	\$279,500

Attachment 8 – Funding Table By Region

Lead Entity:		Pacific County Lead Entity				Lead Entity Allocation:	\$373,524
Rank	Project Number	Type	Name	Sponsor	Grant Request	Funding Approved	
1	14-1158	R	Greenhead Slough Barrier Removal	Friends of Willapa Refuge	\$373,524	\$373,524	
2	14-1673	R	Stringer Creek Barrier Removal and Replacement	Pacific County Anglers	\$383,770	Alternate	
3	14-1676	R	C-400 - Church Road Project	Grays Harbor Conservation Dist	\$85,098	Alternate	
Total Funded:						\$373,524	
Lead Entity:		Quinalt Indian Nation Lead Entity				Lead Entity Allocation:	\$287,750
Rank	Project Number	Type	Name	Sponsor	Grant Request	Funding Approved	
1	14-1506	R	Miller Creek Culvert Replacement	Pacific Coast Salmon Coalition	\$152,750	\$152,750	
2	14-1601	R	Lower Quinalt Floodplain Phase 2 Invasive Control	Quinalt Indian Nation	\$135,000	\$135,000	
Total Funded:						\$287,750	

Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board**Regional Allocation: \$1,776,600****Lead Entity: Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board Lead Entity****Lead Entity Allocation: \$1,237,524**

Rank	Project Number	Type	Name	Sponsor	Grant Request	Funding Approved
1	14-1215	R	Naneum-Coleman Fish Passage Projects	Kittitas Co Conservation Dist	\$140,120	\$140,120
2	14-1203	R	Yakima Basin Riparian & Instream Stewardship	Mid-Columbia RFEG	\$183,810	\$183,810
3	14-1196	C	Manastash Creek Acquisition & Restoration	Kittitas County Public Works	\$235,286	\$235,286
4	14-1214	P	Upper Yakima River Restoration Design	Kittitas Conservation Trust	\$133,260	\$133,260
5	14-1238	C	South Fork Oak Creek Habitat Enhancement	Mid-Columbia RFEG	\$133,090	\$133,090
6	14-1222	P	Ahtanum Creek Restoration Survey and DESIGN 2014	North Yakima Conserv Dist	\$130,000	\$130,000
8	14-1217	P	Naches River Side Channel Preliminary Design	North Yakima Conserv Dist	\$76,392	\$76,392
9	14-1204	R	Reducing road density in the Naches watershed	Mid-Columbia RFEG	\$71,800	\$71,800
10	14-1348	R	Badger Mtn ID Riverstation screens	Badger Mtn Irrigation District	\$186,000	\$133,766 P

Total Funded: \$1,237,524**Lead Entity: Klickitat County****Lead Entity Allocation: \$539,076**

Rank	Project Number	Type	Name	Sponsor	Grant Request	Funding Approved
1	14-1857	A	Rock Creek Riparian Easement	Eastern Klickitat CD	\$539,076	\$539,076
2	14-1860	R	Klickitat River Floodplain Restoration Phase 6	Columbia Land Trust	\$516,162	Alternate

Total Funded: \$539,076