



2015 Salmon Recovery Grant Funding Report

December 2015

Table of Contents

Part 1 – Introduction	1
2015 Grant Round	1
Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Funds	2
Elements of the 2015 Grant Round	5
Habitat Work Schedule	6
PRISM Innovations	7
Part 2 – SRFB Review Panel Comments	9
Project Review Process	9
“Projects of Concern”	10
“Conditioned” Projects	13
Adjustments to Project Lists	14
General Grant Round Process and Observations	14
2015 Recommendations	21
Part 3 – Region Summaries	23
Introduction	23
How is the Regional Review Process Implemented?	23
Attachment 1 – 2015 Grant Schedule	25
Attachment 2 – SRFB Review Panel Biographies	27
Attachment 3 – SRFB Review Panel Evaluation Criteria	30
Attachment 4 – 2015-2017 PSAR Large Capital Project List	33
Attachment 5 – Projects Funded in May and October 2015	34
Attachment 6 – Regional Monitoring Project List Submitted August 2015	35
Attachment 7 – Intensively Monitored Watershed Project List Submitted August 2015	36
Attachment 8 – “Projects of Concern” and Project “Conditioned” Summary	37
Attachment 9 – “Projects of Concern” Review Panel Comment Form	46
Attachment 10 – Funding Table by Region	50
Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Region	50
Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region	52
Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region	54
Northeast Washington Salmon Recovery Region	55
Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region	56
Snake River Salmon Recovery Region	67
Upper Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region	68
Washington Coast Salmon Recovery Region	69

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 and the eight salmon recovery regions to identify and approve projects for funding. The Recreation and Conservation Office has administered more than \$805 million of state and federal funds to help finance nearly 3,000 salmon recovery projects and activities statewide. This report presents information on the process used to review the 2015 applications, the SRFB Review Panel project evaluations, and staff analysis for the SRFB to consider at its December 9 and 10, 2015 meeting in Olympia.

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

Regional Salmon Recovery Organization	Regional Allocation Percent of Total	2015 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 Salmon and steelhead, but is a separate salmon recovery region for summer Chum Salmon. The Hood Canal Coordinating Council receives 10 percent (\$772,165) of the Puget Sound Partnership's regional SRFB allocation for Chinook Salmon and steelhead. The council also receives a regional allocation of \$423,000 from the SRFB for Hood Canal summer Chum Salmon.

**There are four projects submitted by the Klickitat County Lead Entity. Klickitat is receiving \$270,000 from the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board regional allocation and \$458,267 from the Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Board's regional allocation.

2015 Grant Round

The Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund grant award from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), combined with returned funds and other available state

¹Lead 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.

capital funds, make an \$18 million grant cycle possible. RCO also set aside \$500,000 for 2016 for unanticipated cost increases. The Legislature funded the Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Account (PSAR) at \$37 million to implement projects in the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region. The proposed regional allocations in the funding tables in Attachment 9 reflect the \$18 million grant round funding target and the PSAR allocations set by the Puget Sound Partnership, the salmon recovery regional organization for Puget Sound. 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 and approval process. Project alternates within a lead entity list may receive funds within 1 year from the original board funding decision.

In the spring of 2015, sponsors submitted 224 salmon project applications in PRISM, RCO’s project database, for the 2015 grant cycle. Between April and June 2015, the lead entities coordinated project site visits with the SRFB Review Panel and RCO staff. The site visits were an opportunity to see the project sites, learn about the projects specifics, and provide feedback to sponsors in a project comment form. The deadline for salmon grant applications was August 14, 2015; lead entities were required to submit their ranked project lists by this time. A total of 180 projects were submitted by the deadline and reviewed by RCO staff and the SRFB Review Panel.

Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Funds

The state 2015-2017 Capital Budget included \$37 million to accelerate implementation of the *Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Plan*. The budget includes two components with two processes for allocating funds, similar to the past two biennia: \$30 is allocated to watersheds to advance projects and ensure significant progress in every watershed in Puget Sound, and \$7 million is allocated to a large capital project that the board approved in December 2014 as part of the 2015 Regional Large Capital List prioritized by the Puget Sound Partnership. The SRFB distributes the funds in coordination with the Puget Sound Partnership.

The \$30 million PSAR fund is allocated to lead entities and watershed planning areas, using the distribution formula recommended by the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council and approved by the Puget Sound Partnership’s Leadership Council. The guiding principles for the distribution formula are as follows:

- Distribute funds in a manner that keeps everyone at the table (no watershed left behind).
- Distribute funds in a manner that leads to salmon recovery and de-listing as quickly as possible.
- Think regionally when discussing funding allocation.

Table 2. Allocation of the \$30 Million portion of PSAR Funding

Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA)	Recovery Units	Estimated Amount ²
1	Nooksack	\$2,392,809
2	San Juan Islands	\$1,033,535
3 and 4	Skagit	\$4,221,709
5	Stillaguamish	\$1,856,954
6	Island	\$809,953
7	Snohomish	\$1,902,818
8	Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish	\$1,475,542
9	Green ³	\$1,101,070
10 and 12	Puyallup/White and Chambers/Clover	\$1,890,205
11	Nisqually	\$1,401,875
13	Thurston	\$655,163
14	Mason	\$783,581
15	East Kitsap ⁴	\$991,112
15, 16, and 17	Hood Canal ⁵	\$2,596,901
17, 18, and 19	Elwha-Dungeness-Strait ⁶	\$2,407,714
Hood Canal summer chum ⁷		\$1,410,202

The remaining \$7 million PSAR funds are allocated to the Number 1 ranked large capital project that is high priority and significantly large in scope (i.e., scale, complexity, and cost). The Salmon Recovery Council and the SRFB approved the 2015-17 ranked large capital projects list at the December 2015 meeting. Large capital projects cost more than is typically available within the standard PSAR allocations. Each watershed proposed these projects and the Puget Sound Recovery Council ranked and prioritized the projects. Large capital projects receive final approval after completing the regular SRFB project grant process. The SRFB Review Panel technically reviews the locally vetted projects. 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 shown in Attachment 4.

Criteria for prioritizing include:

- Results in an improvement in abundance, productivity, diversity, and/or spatial distribution for one or more populations of listed Evolutionary Significant Units.

²The total project funding amounts are less administrative costs.

³WRIA 9 includes 52 shoreline miles from Vashon Island from WRIA 15 (Vashon Island).

⁴WRIA 15 excludes shoreline miles from Vashon Island (52) and areas in Hood Canal south of Foulweather Bluff (100).

⁵Shoreline miles in Hood Canal are east and south of the Clallam County line and Foulweather bluff.

⁶Shoreline miles in the Strait of Juan de Fuca are west of the Clallam County line to Cape Flattery.

⁷Hood Canal Summer Chum Evolutionary Significant Unit receives 5 percent of the total PSAR capital funds.

- 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.).

PSAR Early Action Option

PSAR projects that were ranked and ready to advance ahead of the December 2015 board meeting were able to use an early action funding option for receiving approval and funding ahead of the normal SRFB and PSAR schedule. The projects had to be ready and show a need to progress immediately. RCO could issue agreements once the lead entity submitted the projects, the SRFB Review Panel cleared the project, the board approved them, and the PSAR account received funding.

In May 2015, the board approved eight projects to use PSAR funding. Approval was pending completion of the submittal and review process. The projects must be cleared by the SRFB Review Panel to receive funding. These approved projects could go under agreement before the December board meeting. Of these projects, five were cleared and funded. The board approved seven projects in May pending review and one project in October 2015. See Attachment 5 for list of early-approved PSAR projects.

2015 Grant Round Components

The 2015 grant cycle included several components approved by the board.

- The SRFB will distribute a combination of federal NOAA's Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund, state salmon funds, and PSAR funds in this grant round, found in Attachment 7 and 10.
- PSAR early action projects: Eight early PSAR projects were approved by the by the board pending full submittal and review noted on Attachment 5. Note that not all approved projects were submitted for funding by the lead entity or cleared by the review panel. Those projects will not receive funding.
- Regional Monitoring projects: In February 2015, the SRFB approved a regional salmon recovery organization, at its discretion, to use up to 10 percent of its annual SRFB project allocation for monitoring activities subject to certain conditions. An addendum to Manual 18 provides guidance and an approval process. Submitted project lists contain

six monitoring projects for a total request of \$441,628 statewide. See Attachment 4 for a table of monitoring projects. The projects were to be ranked and included in the lead entity project lists. Attachment 10 includes these projects submitted on lead entity and the region project lists.

- **Intensively Monitored Watershed projects:** In March 2014, the SRFB approved up to \$2 million a year, for three grant rounds, for design and restoration projects in Intensively Monitored Watershed complexes. For the 2015 grant round, \$1.83 million is available for these projects. This is the second grant round this funding is available. Six projects were submitted and one was withdrawn. There are five projects requesting \$1,663,753 as shown in Attachment 7. The SRFB Review Panel evaluated all projects submitted by the lead entity, including Intensively Monitored Watershed projects. Because there was enough funding for all projects, the Intensively Monitored Watershed technical oversight committee did not prioritize the projects this year. Lead entities rank the Intensively Monitored Watershed projects on their lists only if they want to use their own allocation for the projects.

At the December 2015 meeting, RCO staff will ask the board to approve Intensively Monitored Watershed projects and lead entity ranked lists that include PSAR projects, SRFB (state and federal funding) projects, including regional monitoring projects.

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. 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.

Elements of the 2015 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:

- Allocate salmon recovery funds 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 NOAA’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 will be used efficiently to address both listed and non-listed species.

In February 2015, 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 do not 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 third 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 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 a series of improvements, making the PRISM database more user friendly. RCO accepted the last paper invoices in March 2015, and in April 2015, accepted electronic invoices through PRISM E-billing.

The newest feature of PRISM used in this grant round is the development of the lead entity Ranked List module. This feature enables lead entities and regions to submit their ranked lists directly from PRISM. This feature is more efficient, reduces errors, and saves time for lead entity coordinators and RCO staff. After entering the allocations directly into PRISM, the list automatically populates with this year's projects in application status. Other projects can be added to a list. Staff can review the lists and accept them or return them. Finally, regions can use the reporting feature to display projects by funding meeting or year.

Next features to be implemented in the 2015-17 Biennium include moving the sponsor Progress and Final Reports to the Web interface and building a project evaluation module.

Part 2 – SRFB Review Panel Comments

The SRFB Review Panel is comprised of eight members who have a broad range of knowledge and experience in salmon habitat restoration and protection approaches, watershed processes, ecosystem approaches to habitat restoration and protection, project development, and project management. Members' expertise covers the gamut of issues faced by lead entities and sponsors of SRFB projects.

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 labeled "Projects of Concern" do not meet the SRFB's review criteria and will move 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 started in the spring reviewing projects both before and after the application deadline. This review intends to help lead entities and sponsors improve or clarify each project's benefits to fish and certainty of successful implementation. 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 as 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.
- Sponsor submitted project application materials.
- Discussions with lead entities, project sponsors, and regional organizations during the regional area project meetings, October 26-27, 2015.

As with past rounds, the 2015 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, 2015, 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 early action PSAR project applications and to review and discuss

any projects that the panel had identified concerns with from the early review site visits and draft applications.

After the early project reviews, 180 final applications were submitted by August 14, 2015 for funding consideration. The review panel reviewed all final applications and responses to early comments. The panel then met from September 21-23, 2015 to discuss final project proposals and responses to applications. Project comment forms were updated with post-application comments by October 2, 2015. Projects at that time received a status of either: Clear, Conditioned, Need More Information, or Project of Concern.

Projects with complete applications that met all review criteria and were recommended for funding received a status of "Clear". Some applications still lacked sufficient information to complete the technical review and receive 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 13, 2015. The panel reviewed additional information, responses to comments, and cleared projects if possible by October 21, 2015. The review panel invited projects with a remaining issue or "Project of Concern" status to the regional area project meetings to discuss the project in detail. The purpose of the regional area project meetings was 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 remaining 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 the SRFB criteria remained "Projects of Concern". Lead entities and regional organizations received the panel determinations by November 6, 2015. Attachment 8 lists "Projects of Concern", and Attachment 10 lists a table of all projects submitted for funding, grouped by lead entity.

"Projects of Concern"

After the regional area meetings, only one project remained a "Project of Concern". The board will review and decide on the one remaining "Project of Concern". The review panel labeled 21 projects as "Conditioned" because it felt the projects needed to meet specific conditions for approval. Attachment 3 contains SRFB evaluation criteria for projects; Attachment 9 contains a summary of the review panel comment forms for the "Projects of Concern".

Table 2. Number of Projects and Projects Status in 2015

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 Lead Entity	12	7	7	3	1	0
Green, Duwamish, and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9) Lead Entity	5	5	0	0	0	0
Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity	17	16	1	2	4	0
Island County Lead Entity	6	6	1	1	1	0
Kalispel Tribe-Pend Oreille Lead Entity	1	1	0	0	1	0
Klickitat County Lead Entity	5	4	1	1	1	0
Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8) Lead Entity	7	7	1	1	1	1
Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity	30	24	6	1	1	0
Nisqually River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity	1	7	0	0	1	0
North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon	10	5	5	1	0	0
North Pacific Coast Lead Entity	4	3	1	0	3	0
Pacific County Lead Entity	2	2	0	0	0	0
Pierce County Lead Entity	5	4	1	0	0	0
Quinault Indian Nation Lead Entity	5	4	1	0	1	0
San Juan County Community Development Lead Entity	5	5	1	2	0	0
Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity	12	9	3	1	2	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"
Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity	15	13	2	0	6	0
Snohomish Basin Lead Entity	7	6	1	1	1	0
Stillaguamish River Salmon Recovery Co-Lead Entity	4	2	2	0	1	0
Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity	16	9	7	0	1	0
West Sound Watersheds Council Lead Entity	10	8	2	1	0	0
WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity	10	6	4	0	1	0
WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee	7	7	0	0	1	0
WRIA 14 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee	7	6	1	0	1	0
Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board Lead Entity	15	14	2	1	2	0
Total	218	180	50	16	31	1

The number of projects submitted in 2015 was in 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 intends 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”					
		Draft, Flagged “Need More Information” or “Project of Concern”		October		Final Report Nov. 18, 2015	
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	0.56%
2012	175	17		35	20%	1	0.57%
2013	192	32		15	8%	0	0
2014	185	33		10	5%	2	1%
2015	181	17		16	8%	1	.55%

The 2015 SRFB policies governing a “Project of Concern” are the same as in previous grant rounds. Lead entities and regional organizations must notify RCO of their final lists by November 10, 2015. 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 for the lead entity. If lead entities withdraw a “Project of Concern” before the funding meeting, RCO will consider alternates 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.

“Conditioned” Projects

The review panel labeled 21 projects as “Conditioned” because it felt the projects needed to meet specific conditions in order to satisfy the board’s benefit, certainty, and cost-effectiveness criteria. Attachment 8 contains a summary of the “Conditioned” projects and their review panel condition. The condition usually becomes part of the project agreement.

The review panel continues to use conditioning of projects as a tool for strengthening project design and ensuring that proposals that may contain elements of uncertainty but otherwise

meet the SRFB evaluation criteria can proceed to funding approval and an RCO project agreement. A typical project condition consists of assigning an intermediate review step between the selection of a preferred project alternative and the preliminary design phases. Another common condition might be to direct the elimination of a particular component of a project design because it is inconsistent with the SRFB's theme of restoration of natural processes or provides no added benefit to salmon.

In 2015, the review panel also worked with RCO grants managers to develop and launch a condition-tracking tool in SharePoint. This tracking tool helps review panel members keep track of the status of project conditions over the life of a particular project, particularly when individual members were not directly involved in the review of the sponsor's responses to the condition. The new tool makes it easier to track the status of each condition and provides RCO with documentation that the projects meet the conditions.

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 withdraw because of a "Project of Concern" designation or because it received funding from 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 10.

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 modification, 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

As in past years, the review panel supported the board by reviewing all proposals for SRFB funding to ensure that they met the SRFB's minimum criteria for benefit to salmon recovery, certainty of successful implementation, and cost-effectiveness. During 2015, the panel reviewed

225 proposals at the “pre-application” stage, traveling to each region and/or lead entity area in teams of two to visit project sites, read applicant’s draft application materials, and discuss the proposals. Typically these project tours included not only the particular project sponsor and review panel team, but also the RCO grants manager, members of the regional or lead entity technical and citizens advisory committees, and other sponsors who were working in that lead entity.

The office presentations and field visits generated lively and engaged discussions, which identified strengths and weaknesses of each proposal and discussed suggested improvements. Usually, lead entity personnel and sponsors found the review panel input to be valuable both from the perspective of offering experience from other projects and approaches that have been tried in other lead entities and regions, as well as being at greater liberty to voice candid criticism than local stakeholders may have felt comfortable doing. We find that local technical advisory committees and lead entity personnel frequently use our reviews not only to improve their project portfolios, but also to help weed out weaker proposals from the application process. Scheduling all the pre-application field visits during the 10-week period of April through mid-June can be hectic, but review panel members and project sponsors believe that it is a pivotal part of the application process because the on-site dialogue allows for key exchanges of ideas that substantially improve many projects.

Throughout the application cycle, panel members noted several themes and issues that continually arise. Many have been described in previous year’s funding reports, some get resolved more or less over time, and some seem inherent within the context of the SRFB funding process. The following discussion raises a few of these issues that took higher profile during the 2015 funding cycle.

Large-scale and Noteworthy Projects

As in previous years, a small percentage of 2015’s proposals have the potential to result in large-scale actions that fully restore natural habitat forming processes. This year’s “noteworthy” proposals include:

Table 4. Noteworthy Projects

Project Number and Name	Sponsor Lead Entity Region	Goal	Phase/Funding
15-1163 Snoqualmie at Fall City Raging River Acquisition	King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks	Acquire floodplain to set stage for removal of levees and restoration of river and floodplain process at confluence of the Snoqualmie and Raging Rivers.	Initial acquisition that leverages larger expenditure of county funding.

Project Number and Name	Sponsor Lead Entity Region	Goal	Phase/Funding
15-1150 East Fork Hoquiam River Surge Plain Acquisition	Chehalis River Basin Land Trust	Purchase of 82 acres of wetland, slough, creek, and riverbank in a tidal reach of the East Fork Hoquiam to supplement 660 acres of contiguous protected land.	Purchase, following two previous SRFB-funded acquisitions.
15-1107 West Oakland Bay Restoration and Conservation	Squaxin Island Tribe	Large-scale estuary restoration in four components: 1) Restoration of 23.5 acres by importing material to provide intertidal elevations to support natural salt marsh vegetation, 2) acquisition of 14 acres of high functioning habitat, 3) placement of large wood to improve creek mouth, and 4) design for future removal of shoreline armoring.	
15-1136 Cispus Yellow Jacket Restoration Phase 1	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Large, multi-phased cooperative effort between U.S. Forest Service and Cowlitz Indian Tribe to treat a reach of the Cispus River with logjams at a scale approximating historic wood loadings.	Phase 1 implementation, but supplements similar treatments completed about 10 years ago.

Each of these projects takes a large-scale and long-term vision to create enough area where natural habitat forming processes can function. By contrast, many of this year's other proposed restoration, assessment, and protection projects continued to "work the edges" by protecting smaller blocks of habitat or attempting smaller-scale restoration actions within the constraints of existing adjacent land uses. In many cases, sponsors worked hard to find compromises that accommodate interests of protecting local infrastructure and the perceptions of adjacent private landowners on the impact of the project on their property values (whether realistic or not). Unfortunately, for salmon recovery, the compromises tend to favor the competing land use interests, and as a result, frequently not meet the full potential of salmon recovery efforts.

The review panel finds that a key to implementing large-scale, highly effective protection and restoration actions is the ability of a committed government agency, tribe, or non-governmental organization to buy a large enough area so that the need to compromise with local infrastructure and "Not In My Backyard" perceptions of neighboring landowners can be minimized. In our experience, purchase of permanent conservation easements often does not resolve this compromised situation, but allows the underlying title owner – and in many cases their neighbors – to dictate stewardship and habitat restoration opportunities on a property.

A recent example, in which a sponsor declined to enforce its prescriptive right to restore tidal processes on its SRFB-purchased conservation easement on Whidbey Island when faced with

opposition from owners of a few adjacent vacation homes, illustrates the importance of fee simple property acquisition as a foundation for successful implementation of large-scale habitat restoration projects. In this context, the review panel believes that preventing use of PSAR funding for land acquisition, which the state Legislature debated this year, would severely limit the effectiveness of this funding source.

Application of the “Certainty of Success” and “Cost-effectiveness” Criteria

A perennial source of deliberation during review panel project review discussions is our application of the SRFB’s “Certainty of Success” and “Cost-effectiveness” criterion. Lacking definitive guidance on how to apply these criteria, the panel recognizes that the specific circumstances and context of each individual project defies a one-size-fits-all approach. Panel members largely rely on our experience with reviewing several hundred projects over 15 years to have a sense for when the costs of a particular proposal are distinctly disproportionate to its anticipated benefit to salmon recovery, or when it faces such obvious constraints that successful implementation is unlikely.

In the same vein as recognizing the importance of fee simple ownership to ensure control of a project’s fate, the review panel recently is taking a stricter interpretation of the “certainty of success” evaluation criterion when evaluating large-scale feasibility assessments. Experience has shown that if the project sponsor or partner organizations do not control the land or cannot ensure necessary modifications to surrounding infrastructure then there is little assurance of accomplishing the restoration activities identified in the assessment. The review panel recognizes the “Catch 22” dilemma of not adequately identifying restoration options of a site until some level of feasibility assessment is done, but some site constraints are so obvious that we can predict accurately in advance that high benefit restoration actions will be unfeasible to implement. For this reason, the review panel believes that an early “Project of Concern” status was appropriate for two of this year’s speculative feasibility study proposals, Project 15-1290 *Neck Point Lagoon and Beach Restoration* (withdrawn) and Project 15-1190 *Duckabush Estuary Restoration Planning* (now Clear status).

The panel’s application of the “Cost-effectiveness” evaluation criterion also can require careful deliberation. Occasionally, this is an easy call, as in the example this year of a new and inexperienced sponsor that proposed a budget for a straightforward fish passage project in the Snake River region that was obviously more expensive than was necessary. In this case, we worked with the sponsor to investigate tried and true design approaches used in the Family Forest Fish Passage Program, and the sponsor gratefully used this information to reduce its proposed budget by about half.

Most other cases are not this easy. Often a wide discrepancy of project costs relates to the sponsor's institutional background. For example, fish passage barrier removal projects sponsored by county public works departments typically cost about twice as much as an equivalent project sponsored by a tribe or a regional fisheries enhancement group. The reason appears to be public works departments' institutional expectations for design, preparation of specifications and contract documents, and construction inspection. The panel tries to be consistent in keeping the likely overall cost of a completed project in mind, even when only one phase of the project, such as an initial feasibility study, may be proposed.

The upper Columbia region is the only regional organization that uses an explicit cost-to-benefit evaluation formula in its project scoring and ranking process. While there are shortcomings inherent in any scheme that attempts to quantify and compare environmental benefits and project costs, the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board's approach does provide a useful tool for considering benefits versus costs applied in a uniform and objective way. The review panel currently has no standardized direction for applying cost-to-benefit evaluation on a uniform, statewide basis, and instead relies on the collective professional judgment of the members. We think that it would be productive for the SRFB to consider the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board's approach and evaluate whether it makes sense to apply something like it statewide.

Another emerging "cost-benefit" issue is the increasing tendency of engineering consultants designing large-scale Puget Sound near-shore projects to incorporate expensive upgrades of drainage and flood protection infrastructure into the project scope. While the review panel agrees that it is essential to replace the existing level of drainage and flood protection on projects that involve setting back dikes and reintroducing tidal flow, we feel that it is misguided to spend salmon recovery funding to upgrade these facilities over and above their existing level of protection in isolation from the surrounding infrastructure.

In high profile projects like the Fir Island Farms and Smith Island near-shore restoration projects, well over half of the projects budgets are dedicated to building new pump stations where none existed previously and building large, new dikes that are out of scale with the surrounding local dike system. In our opinion, the justification that the upgraded infrastructure is necessary to protect against predicted sea level rise fails to consider that most of the surrounding dike and drainage infrastructure is not designed for future sea level rise. Moreover, the local dike and drainage districts themselves have no funding program or comprehensive plans to respond to anticipated sea level rise. Spending scarce salmon recovery dollars on building uncoordinated and out-of-sequence upgrades to dike and drainage infrastructure deprives funding from other projects that also could provide substantial salmon recovery benefit.

Introducing “Value Engineering” analysis and publishing typical ranges of costs for various types of restoration projects were recommended in the funding reports from previous years,⁸ and the review panel continues to encourage adoption of these recommendations.

S.M.A.R.T. Objectives

In an effort to improve the quality of proposals, the revised 2015 application form requires applicants to identify S.M.A.R.T. (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time bound) objectives for their projects. The review panel spent considerable effort this year working with sponsors to inculcate this more disciplined approach to their projects. Efforts included a presentation at the May salmon recovery conference to explain the logical framework project design process (including S.M.A.R.T. objectives)⁹ and providing extensive comments on the pre-application proposal review forms to coach individual sponsors in articulating clear goals and S.M.A.R.T. objectives.

As in past years, sponsors demonstrated a wide range of sophistication and competence in the design of their projects. Many sponsors can articulate clearly and follow through on S.M.A.R.T. objectives. However, other sponsors resist the whole notion of defining measurable objectives and accountability for their projects achieving those objectives. Panel members consistently find that projects that fail to identify clear objectives most commonly result in unsatisfactory outcomes for supporting local salmon recovery efforts.

The panel recognizes that including a wide range of local project sponsor capabilities is a key part of “The Washington Way” of accomplishing salmon recovery, and so we continue to work with sponsors to try to improve the quality of vague project designs. Besides the one-on-one coaching during the pre-application review phase, the panel has relied increasingly on labeling projects as “Conditioned” to define and meet clear objectives. We rely on RCO’s grants managers to monitor the progress and final deliverables of projects to ensure meeting the stated objectives, or if they are not, what steps need to be taken to accomplish them.

In the panel’s view, the accountability for achieving the stated objectives of a salmon recovery project should be no less than, for example, the accountability of a public works agency for achieving the objectives of a highway improvement project. Presently, a lack of options exists to redress sponsors who fail to achieve their project objectives. The review panel would be interested in the SRFB’s view on whether measures such as temporary suspension of a sponsor’s eligibility to propose new projects may be warranted to redress repeated failures to achieve project results.

⁸Refer to the 2014 Funding Report for a detailed discussion of these two recommendations.

⁹www.rco.wa.gov/documents/SalmonConference/presentations/ProjectMgmtPlanning-MeasureTwice-PDFs/1%20Slocum_Effective%20Goals%20and%20Objectives.pdf

Monitoring and Adaptive Management

This year, the review panel saw some encouraging examples of sponsors using results of effectiveness monitoring and fish utilization monitoring studies to inform adaptive management decisions related to project design and siting. As a general rule, sponsors still lack access and motivation to optimally use data from the Intensively Monitored Watersheds and SRFB programmatic monitoring programs in project planning, but two 2015 proposals from the Snake River region illustrate the potential for these valuable tools.

Project 15-1322 *Tucannon Salmonid Survival and Habitat Utilization* focuses on expanding the geographic priority area for protection and restoration of the Tucannon River, based on results of monitoring data showing that important winter rearing habitat extends for several miles downstream of the reaches that were initially identified as priorities. Project 15-1321 *Asotin Intensively Monitored Watershed Restoration* expands the geographic area of treatment reaches within the Asotin Intensively Monitored Watershed based on positive results from effectiveness monitoring of treatments in the original treatment reaches. The review panel feels that each recovery region should emphasize the practice of using relevant monitoring data to inform and adaptively manage subsequent project designs.

New Sponsors

The review panel was pleased to work with three new sponsors this year: Whitman Conservation District, Palouse Conservation District, and the City of Bremerton. Ecologic Research, Inc. a consulting firm affiliated with Utah State University that is very active in designing stream restoration projects in the Snake River region took the initiative to collaborate with Palouse and Columbia Conservation Districts to propose pilot-scale restoration projects on creeks that until now have not received attention under Snake River Salmon Recovery Board's strategic plan.

Invasive Weed Eradication Projects

In 2015, as in previous years, the review panel continued to see proposals for eradicating knotweed and other non-native invasive plants along shorelines. Despite recent amendments in Manual 18 to better define the eligibility of these projects and provide guidance on meeting the SRFB's minimum evaluation criteria, the panel finds that these proposals continue to straddle the limit of eligibility.

We felt that that some of this year's proposals more accurately represented ongoing, open-ended invasive weed control programs that better fit the duties of county weed control boards than SRFB funding. The panel recognizes that some lead entities, particularly in the Pacific Coast and Puget Sound regions, consider invasive weed eradication as a strategic priority, so we worked with the sponsors to help them define S.M.A.R.T. objectives that we hope will help guide these projects to clear benefits to salmon.

Resources for Project Design

Review panel members have had the benefit of reviewing hundreds of projects statewide during several funding rounds and can bring this unique experience to assist project sponsors. We feel that our experience is valuable to practitioners in the restoration and protection fields, but the large body of restoration work undertaken in Washington in the past 15 years could be even more valuable to guide practitioners if it were easily assessable to them.

RCO's biannual salmon recovery conference is an excellent venue for sharing information on projects. RCO's recent creation of a "best practices" tab on its Web site, which provides examples of top quality design deliverables from selected SRFB restoration projects, is another valuable resource. Thirdly, PRISM's vast database of consultant design studies and project engineering plans is a hugely valuable resource for those that are familiar enough to run queries in it. The review panel urges the SRFB and RCO to be mindful of the value of the PRISM database and to continue to make it as assessable to the public. There may be opportunities to improve the use of query functions to search for engineering data such as cost reporting and design information on various restoration treatments (e.g. engineered logjams). Furthermore, as the Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program and Floodplains by Design programs begin to accumulate portfolios of successfully implemented projects, it would benefit practitioners if the technical reports and designs from these projects were included in PRISM.

Role of Regional Technical Teams

The review panel continues to notice differing roles of regional technical teams in guiding project development to support the achievement of their regions' salmon recovery goals. The upper Columbia and Yakima regional technical teams especially are proactive in identifying project needs and opportunities and advising their local sponsors in developing effective projects to address those needs. The annual regional meetings, which RCO hosts near the end of each year's project application cycle, are a good venue for learning about the progress of each region during that year. The review panel feels that all regions would benefit by sending their directors and technical review team chairs to each of the regional presentations to learn what their counterparts are doing around the state.

2015 Recommendations

Summary of Recommendations for Improving Project Implementation

The following is a summary of key recommendations based on the general observations for the 2015 grant round (as described above) and from previous years' funding reports.

- Work with the state Legislature to ensure that acquisition funding remains a critical tool for salmon recovery. In general, it is preferable to lay the foundation for successful large-

scale, natural process restoration projects by securing fee simple title to the project site. Permanent conservation easements can protect land from future development successfully, but tend not to be reliable as a foundation for restoration projects unless explicitly written into the easement.

- Follow up on recommendations from previous funding rounds on implementing value-engineering analysis and compiling typical ranges of projects costs from invoices of actual projects. We recommend that RCO staff develop a process for project sponsors to complete a standard as-built closeout cost summary in a format that other sponsors and designers can readily use. A consultant could compile this information and make it available in a searchable format on RCO's Web site.
- RCO and the SRFB Monitoring Panel should continue to look for opportunities for project sponsors to use monitoring data for project development and adaptive management.
- RCO and the SRFB should reevaluate whether invasive weed eradication projects should be eligible for SRFB funding.
- To promote overall project effectiveness, consider measures such as requiring more robust end-of-project implementation monitoring, or withholding final grant payments until sponsors certify the accomplishment of all project objectives.
- Direct RCO to continue to improve the availability and usability of existing information in PRISM for sponsors and project designers. During PRISM upgrades, RCO should develop a format for uploading and querying relevant design and cost information from SRFB-funded projects, as well as from projects funded by the Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program, Family Forest Fish Passage Program, and Floodplains by Design programs as they become available.

Manual 18 Updates

The review panel does not have any recommendations for Manual 18 policy revisions this year. As described above, the panel is working with RCO staff to clarify expectations for "Conditioned" projects and to guide sponsors on developing S.M.A.R.T. project objectives. We also have worked with staff to clarify the "Project Eligibility" text (Section 2) to discourage the use of artificial, permanent structures such as concrete "dolos" and steel anchors in the context of restoring natural fluvial processes in river restoration projects.

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 about 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. The staff and SRFB use them as a reference.

How is the Regional Review Process Implemented?

RCO 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.¹⁰ This is based on information from the regional responses (provided at the links below), application materials, and presentations to the review panel at the regional area

¹⁰Revised Code of Washington 77.85

meetings in October in Olympia. Staff notes that the pre-proposal meetings and site visits, coupled with the early and continual feedback from the review panel, helped improve projects.

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 Overviews

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

Attachment 1 – 2015 Grant Schedule

Date	Action	Description
February 13	DUE DATE: Requests for review panel site visits	Lead entities submit their requests for site visits to RCO staff by this date.
February-June 9	Project draft application materials due at least three weeks before site visit (required)	At least three weeks before the site visit , applicants enter application materials through PRISM Online (See Draft Application Checklist). The lead entity will provide applicants with a project number from the Habitat Work Schedule before work can begin in PRISM Online.
February-June 30	Pre-application review and site visits (required)	RCO grants managers and review panel members review draft application materials, go on lead entity-organized site visits, and provide technical feedback based on materials and visits. Complete site visits before June 30, 2015 .
February-May	Application workshops (on request)	RCO staff holds an online application workshop. Additional in-person trainings can be provided to lead entities upon request.
May 27-29	Salmon Recovery Conference	Bi-annual salmon recovery conference will be held in Vancouver, WA. Read more .
February-July 15	SRFB review panel completes initial project comment forms	About two weeks after the site visits, RCO grants managers provide review panel comment forms to lead entities and applicants. Applicants must address review panel comments through revisions to their Appendix C project proposals (using Microsoft Word track changes).
August 14	Due Date: Applications due Lead entity submittals due	Applicants submit final application materials, including attachments, via PRISM Online. See Final Application checklist . New this year, lead entities submit draft ranked lists via PRISM.
August 17-28	RCO grants manager review	Screen all applications for completeness and eligibility.
August 28	Review panel post-application review	RCO grants managers forward project application materials to review panel members for evaluation.
September 4	Due Date: Regional submittal	Regional organizations submit their recommendations for funding, including alternate projects (only those they want the SRFB to consider funding), and their Regional Area Summary and Project Matrix.
September 19-21	SRFB Review Panel meeting	The review panel meets to discuss projects, prepare comment forms, and determine the status of each project.
October 2	Project comment forms available for sponsors	RCO grants managers provide the review panel comment forms to lead entities and applicants. Projects

Date	Action	Description
		will be identified with a status of "Clear," "Conditioned," "Need More Information" (NMI), or "Project of Concern" (POC).
October 13	Due Date: Response to project comment forms	Applicants with projects labeled Conditioned, NMI, or POC provide responses to review panel comments through revisions to the project proposal attached in PRISM. If the applicant does not respond to comments by this date, RCO will assume the project has been withdrawn from funding consideration.
October 21	Review panel list of projects for regional area meeting	The review panel reviews the responses to comments and identifies which projects to clear. They recommend a list of POCs to present at the regional area project meeting.
October 24-26	Regional area project meetings	Regional organizations, lead entities, and applicants present regional updates and discuss POCs with the review panel.
November 2	Review panel finalizes project comment forms	The review panel finalizes comment forms by considering application materials, site visits, applicants' responses to comments, and presentations during the regional area project meeting.
November 10	Due Date: Lead entity submits final ranked list	Lead entities submit ranked project lists in PRISM. RCO will not accept changes to the lists after this date. Updates submitted after this date will not appear in the grant funding report.
November 18	Final 2015 grant report available for public review	The final funding recommendation report is available online for SRFB and public review.
December 9-10	Board funding meeting	Board awards grants. Public comment period available.

Attachment 2 – 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 became a licensed professional engineer in Washington State.

Kelley Jorgensen, consultant, Longview

Kelley Jorgensen is a watershed ecologist with 25 years of applied science experience, including spending the past 20 years in the lower Columbia River region from the tributary headwaters to the estuary. She has worked in the private and public sectors, and currently manages a 1,000-acre conservation program for a private landowner, Plas Newydd Farm (pronounced *plass now-with*, meaning “new place” in Welsh) in Ridgefield, WA. She has been on the SRFB Review Panel since 2007 and a member of the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Technical Advisory Committee off and on since 2000. She was an officer and member of the River Restoration Northwest Board of Directors from 2007-2015.

Jennifer O’Neal, consultant, Mount Vernon

Ms. O’Neal is a senior fisheries biologist and project manager at Natural Systems Design 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 the 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. The American Fisheries Society certified him as a fisheries professional. He has worked extensively throughout Puget Sound estuarine and near-shore 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 25 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 chairs 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 – SRFB Review Panel Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria are 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. RCO expects 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. Before the regional area meetings, the regional recovery organization that represents the area in which the project is located¹¹ 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.

¹¹For Puget Sound, this will be the Puget Sound Regional Implementation Technical Team chair.

- A. Incomplete application or proposal.
 - 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 addressing other key conditions or processes 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 focus is on supplying a secondary need, such as education, stream bank 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 improve 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 – 2015-2017 PSAR Large Capital Project List

Lead Entity	Project Number	Project Name	Amount ¹²
Nisqually River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity	14-1688	Busy Wild Creek Protection	\$5,889,000
North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon	14-1382	Lower Dungeness River	\$11,867,000
WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity	14-1665	MF Porter Creek Reach	\$3,088,656
Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity	14-1366	Kilisut Harbor Restoration	\$8,986,384
WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity	14-1666	NF Nooksack (Xwqelem) Farmhouse	\$5,796,581
Island County Lead Entity	14-1114	Waterman Nearshore Acquisition	\$845,029
WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity	14-1667	SF Nooksack (Nuxw7iyem) Nessel Reach	\$3,247,295
Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity	14-2170	Illabot Creek Alluvial Fan Restoration	\$2,994,205
Pierce County Lead Entity	14-1184	Neadham Road Acquisition and Levee	\$6,887,266
Green, Duwamish, and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9) Lead Entity	14-1389	Downey Farmstead Restoration	\$4,890,965
Pierce County Lead Entity	14-1189	South Prairie Creek	\$3,330,487
Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity	14-1376	Skokomish River Natural Rehabilitation	\$1,835,607
Green, Duwamish, and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9) Lead Entity	14-1327	Porter Levee Setback, Floodplain	\$4,675,000
North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon	14-1385	Dungeness Landscape Protect	\$8,009,650
North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon	14-1371	Pysht Estuary Saltmarsh	\$4,291,267
Pierce County Lead Entity	14-1187	Alward Road Acquisition	\$4,514,100
San Juan County Community Development Lead Entity	14-1887	Kellet Bluff/Hart Property	\$825,000
WRIA 14 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee	14-1403	West Oakland Bay Restoration	\$1,906,499
Lake Washington/Cedar/ Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8) Lead Entity	14-1194	Evans Creek Relocation	\$2,500,000
WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee	14-1407	The Big Three Culvert Package	\$3,644,273
WRIA 14 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee	14-1397	Little Skookum Inlet Shoreline	\$596,010
Total			\$90,620,274

¹²The total reflects only project cost and not program management costs. Final costs may vary as other funding

Attachment 5 – Projects Funded in May and October 2015

Puget Sound Partnership

PSAR Project List Approved in May 2015

Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	Request	PSAR Funding
	15-1165	Pressentin Park Restoration Phase 2 and 3	Skagit Fish Enhancement Group	\$2,208,841	\$2,208,842
	15-1166	Skagit Floodplain Side Channel Connectivity Design	Skagit Fish Enhancement Group	\$166,228	\$166,228
	14-1001	Mill Creek Side Channel (Leber 2014)	City of Kent	\$250,000	\$250,000
	09-1277	Qwuloot Estuary Restoration – Construction	Tulalip Tribes	\$500,000	\$500,000
	15-1174	Goodell Creek Restoration Preliminary Design	Upper Skagit Indian Tribe	\$368,750	Project of Concern
	15-1173	Skiyou Island Rock Removal and Riparian Restoration	Skagit County Public Works	\$251,145	Withdrawn
Total Funded:					\$3,125,070

PSAR Project List Approved in October 2015

Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	Request	PSAR Funding
	15-1055	Dungeness R. Floodplain Restoration Robinson Phase	Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe	\$1,157,700	\$1,157,700
Total Funded:					\$1,157,700

Attachment 6 – Regional Monitoring Project List Submitted August 2015

				SRFB	
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	Request	Funding
Island County Lead Entity				Total Funded:	\$39,355
6	15-1485	Whidbey Basin Pocket Estuary Census	Skagit River System Cooperative	\$39,355	\$39,355
Klickitat County Lead Entity				Total Funded:	\$66,500
1	15-1296	Assess Salmonid Recolonization – White Salmon River	Mid-Columbia Regional Fisheries Enhancement Group	\$66,500	\$66,500
Nisqually River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity				Total Funded:	\$41,500
1	15-1261	Nisqually Chinook Recovery Monitoring	Nisqually River Foundation	\$41,500	\$41,500
Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity				Total Funded	\$97,350
	15-1449	Skagit Habitat Status and Trends Monitoring Implementation	Skagit River System Cooperative	\$97,350	\$97,350
Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity				Total Funded	\$158,419
9	15-1315	Asotin Intensively Monitored Watershed Monitoring	Department. of Fish and Wildlife	\$158,419	\$158,419
Stillaguamish River Salmon Recovery Co-Lead Entity				Total Funded:	\$55,125
1	15-1333	Stillaguamish Side-Channel Monitoring	Snohomish County Public Works	\$55,125	\$55,125

Attachment 7 – Intensively Monitored Watershed Project List

Submitted August 2015

Total Available \$1,830,000

Total Request \$1,663,753

				SRFB	
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	Request	Funding
Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity				Total Funded:	\$527,220
14	15-1203	Lower Big Beef Creek Restoration Phase 2	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group	\$440,970	\$440,970
	15-1194	Seabeck Creek Restoration	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group	\$86,250	\$86,250
Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity				Total Funded:	\$810,907
13	15-1127	Abernathy Headwaters Implementation	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	\$810,907	\$810,907
Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity				Total Funded:	\$200,000
1	15-1167	Milltown Island Phase 2 – Preliminary Design	Department Fish and Wildlife	\$200,000	\$200,000
Snake River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity				Total Funded:	\$125,626
1	15-1321	Asotin Intensively Monitored Watershed Restoration	Department Fish and Wildlife	\$125,626	\$125,626

Attachment 8 – “Projects of Concern” and Project “Conditioned” Summary

“Projects of Concern” = 1

“Conditioned” Projects = 21

Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity

[15-1192](#) **Salmon Creek Bridge Construction, West Uncas Road**

Condition: The project proponent will redesign the natural channel bed between armored abutments to a 24 foot bankfull width for permit submission and implementation.

[15-1197](#) **Weaver Creek Reconnection**

Condition: Submit the preliminary design deliverables as required in Appendix D-2 of Manual 18 to the review panel for review and approval prior to releasing funds for construction. The review panel requires 30 days review and comment period, and this timeframe needs to be built into the project schedule.

[15-1204](#) **Lower Big Quilcene River Design Phase 2**

Condition: The project is conditioned to not proceed until enough additional funds are secured to allow the design work to reach the preliminary design milestone. As currently proposed, the project would make some progress on important topics to inform the design, but the project wouldn’t complete any planning or design stage.

The project is a large-scale restoration project and the review panel commends the sponsor for their work trying to cobble together funding. However, it is important that the proposed project is part of an overall effort that will reach the next design milestone, in this case preliminary design.

Klickitat County Lead Entity

[15-1258](#) **Mill Creek Fish Passage Construction**

Condition: The project is funded subject to two conditions:

- A. The sponsor obtains a signed landowner agreement that verifies that only eligible project elements (as defined in Manual 18, Section 2) will be funded and

- B. The large wood debris structure that is proposed near the culvert outlet will be omitted from the project design, as its function and effectiveness for supporting the salmon recovery objectives are unclear. The project budget will be adjusted accordingly to deduct the cost of this proposed element.

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

[15-1071](#) **Evans Creek Relocation Project**

Condition: The review panel will review and approve a draft final design of the Evans Creek Relocation project to evaluate wood placement and floodplain connectivity for juvenile salmonid habitat. The project sponsor has done a good job of responding to previous Review Panel comments, but several design elements of the proposed project appear to be uncertain at this time and may be modified for the final design.

Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity

[15-1070](#) **Elochoman Stream Restoration Elkinton**

Condition: Restoration actions as shown on the preliminary design plans are cleared for the SRFB funding decision in December 2015 EXCEPT for the design and construction actions along the face of and adjacent to the upstream and downstream concrete wall.

[15-1087](#) **Lacamas Creek Side Channel Reconnection**

Condition: The project is conditioned for Review Panel review of draft design deliverables including feasibility assessment, conceptual designs, and alternatives analysis prior to the final selection of a preferred alternative. The intent is for the Review Panel to see a clear rationale for the selection of the chosen alternative prior to that alternative proceeding further in the design process to insure benefits to fish, certainty of success and reasonable costs relative to the benefits can be achieved and is optimized in the project design.

The review panel requires a 30 day review and comment period, and this timeframe needs to be built into the project schedule.

Early application review panel comments have been addressed.

Nisqually River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity

[15-1231](#) Mashel Eatonville Restoration Phase 3

Condition: Submit the preliminary design deliverables as required in Appendix D-2 of Manual 18 to the review panel for review and approval prior to releasing funds for construction. The review panel requires 30 days review and comment period, and this timeframe needs to be built into the project schedule. The designs will allow for natural rates of channel migration.

North Pacific Coast Lead Entity

[15-1250](#) Colby Creek Culvert Replacement

Condition: The project sponsor and landowner will provide an updated, prioritized list of remaining RMAP-related fish passage barriers in the Dickey River basin area (RMAP # 2610100 Quilleute Lowlands) before implementing the Colby Creek culvert replacement project. For each site on the fish passage barrier list, additional information shall be provided about the location (section, township, range), road number, road management block, culvert size(s), reason for barrier, fish species, approximate upstream habitat length, year of scheduled correction, and any other site constraints or passage concerns.

San Juan County Community Development Lead Entity

[15-1239](#) Ecology of Resident Chinook in San Juan Island

Condition: The revised final proposal (dated 10/23/15 in the project’s PRISM file) provides further information about how the proposed study will meet the “data gap filling” eligibility requirements for SRFB-funded assessments (Manual 18, page 18). In particular, the response to Item No. 10.A.4 provides a plan and schedule for incorporating the results into WRIA 2 recovery planning through updating the San Juan Chapter of the *Puget Sound Chinook Recovery Plan*. In order to assure the lead entity’s commitment to fully utilizing the study’s results for this purpose, the award of project funding is conditioned as follows.

Prior to signing the grant agreement, the sponsor will provide the RCO grant manager with a letter from the WRIA 2 Lead Entity and the Puget Sound Partnership that 1) explicitly acknowledges the sponsor’s description and schedule for how the results of the study will be integrated with PIAT and incorporated into the local project selection process (as described in Item 10.A.4) and 2) states their

commitment to actually carry out the scheduled tasks as described. These letters will be included in the project’s PRISM file.

Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity

[15-1165](#)

Pressentin Park Restoration Phases 2 and 3

Condition: The sponsor will provide a copy of the preliminary/60% design deliverables to the review panel for its review and approval before proceeding to the construction phase of the project. Please allow 30 days for review and feedback.

Pressentin Park was original acquired with WWRP-Local Parks funds by Skagit County (PRISM #92-110). Another parcel, between the park and the Skagit River, known as “Sakshaug” was purchased by The Nature Conservancy (TNC) with a SRFB grant (PRISM #07-1783). The proposed restoration project needs to be compatible with the recreation long-term obligations per the WWRP – LP funding program.

[15-1174](#)

Goodell Creek Restoration Feasibility

Condition: The Panel recognizes the efforts of the project sponsor to be responsive to the information requests, as well as to gather supporting evidence with respect to multiple partner support for the project concept. The project is conditioned with the following requirements:

- A. The feasibility study will include specific details on the results of the investigation into the potential for Federal Highway grant funding.
- B. The feasibility study will include collection of current information about fish use/presence/distribution in Goodell Creek to further inform the potential fish benefit of this project. This information will include data on juvenile and adult life stages.
- C. The feasibility study will include specific information on the full costs of project approaches through implementation so that cost/benefit evaluations can be made.

Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity

[15-1320](#)

Buford Creek Barrier Fish Passage Design (HWY 129)

Condition: The review panel shall review the alternatives analysis before funds are released for preliminary design development. The alternatives analysis must be summarized in a report, which includes the process for evaluating the alternatives, selecting the preferred alternative, and the justification for the final alternative selected.

The review panel will review the preliminary design before funds are released for further design refinement.

[15-1306](#)

North Touchet River Baileysburg Restoration

Condition: The review panel shall approve the preliminary design before funds are released for final design. Final designs shall be approved by the review panel before construction funds are released. Design elements that should be included in each design phase are articulated in Manual 18 Appendix D. The panel requires 30 days for each review period. In developing the preliminary and final designs, the panel encourages the sponsor to place large wood strategically to meet project objectives rather than primarily for bank protection purposes.

The review panel is very pleased with the current direction of the project and appreciates the efforts of the sponsor, lead entity, and region to reshape this project. The panel encourages the lead entity and region to remain in contact with the county to stay informed on possible replacement of the Baileysburg Bridge. If the county prepares to move ahead with bridge replacement, it would offer an excellent opportunity to incorporate design elements, which would be favorable for channel process restoration and salmonid habitat.

[15-1308](#)

Asotin County Geomorphic-Watershed Assessment

Condition: The review panel shall review the revised project scope of work before funds are disbursed for other tasks identified within the proposal.

Snohomish Basin Lead Entity

[15-1199](#)

Middle Pilchuck Large Woody Debris Design

Condition: The sponsor accepted the condition and increased the budget slightly to allow for additional deliverables.

The review panel remains concerned about a proposal in this dynamic and evolving reach of the Pilchuck River where several SRFB projects have already been funded and have failed. The review panel recognizes the importance of the reach for providing habitat for adult and juvenile Chinook salmon. As such, the project is Conditioned as follows:

The scope of work shall be amended to include the completion of a draft Restoration Feasibility Assessment report as part of initial conceptual design and hydraulic modeling tasks. This report shall be submitted to the review panel for approval prior to spending any project funding on the preliminary design tasks. The deliverables of both the Feasibility Assessment and Preliminary Design tasks shall meet the requirements in Manual 18 Appendix D-1 and D-2, respectively.

The scope of the Feasibility Assessment report shall include, but is not limited to:

- Description of reach scale geomorphic processes including rate of lateral channel migration and expected channel trajectory. The study reach shall extend sufficiently upstream and downstream of the proposed project site to provide an accurate understanding of the geomorphic context affecting the project.
- Description of site-specific known habitat use by adults for spawning, and holding, and juveniles for rearing and refuge.
- Candid evaluation of land use and infrastructure constraints to process-based restoration.
- A list of clearly articulated goals and quantifiable S.M.A.R.T objectives.
- A range of potential restoration alternatives that would meet the stated objectives. These alternatives should expand upon the proposal’s state objective of installing 5 to 8 ELJs to include other methods of restoring habitat forming natural processes (including allowing for natural channel migration) in the project reach. The report must document the input that

the consulted agencies (WDNR, WDFW and others as appropriate in) provide in the evaluation of these alternatives.

- The selection of a preferred alternative, based on the objective evaluation of relevant criteria for ensuring benefit to salmon and certainty of successful implementation. The criteria must include, among others, minimization of adverse impacts to the existing salmonid utilization of the project reach.

The review panel requires 30 days to review and provide comments on deliverables, and this timeframe should be taken into account during project schedule development.

Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity

[15-1208](#)

Monitor Side Channel Restoration

Condition: Before proceeding with the final design tasks, the sponsor will provide a copy of the preliminary design deliverables for review and approval by the review panel. The purpose of the review will be to verify that the preliminary design addresses the issues raised in the pre-application comments and, more generally, the project evaluation criteria in Manual 18, Appendix H. Please allow up to 30 days for review.

[15-1209](#)

Nason Creek Sediment Reduction

Condition: The project sponsor shall provide a final deliverable product that includes a list of stream crossing sites and proposed treatments at each site to reduce sediment delivery from the road network.

[15-1101](#)

Bunker Road Barrier Removals

Condition: The preliminary and final designs will be submitted to the Review Panel for review and approval prior to the release of funds for construction. The review panel requires a 30-day review and comment period, and this timeframe needs to be built into the project schedule.

- A. As part of preliminary design development, a wetland hydrologist should evaluate the site and conceptual design to assess potential impacts to wetlands and aid in developing the preliminary design. Rerouting the stream may effectively drain the wetland if there are no other hydrologic inputs to the wetland.

- B. Sponsor should contact the US Army Corps of Engineers to determine if a Section 404 permit will be required. Sponsor should anticipate costs for preparing this permit application and for completing a wetland delineation and report, which would accompany the application.

The sponsor’s engineer has concerns with the design of the stream channel between the two new bridges and has recommended creating a new channel on the north side of the road thus obviating the need for the two bridges. The sponsor has been working closely with Weyerhaeuser and WDFW’s Area Habitat Biologist, is making progress towards a new design, and is confident the project will be ready for construction in 2016. A revised cost estimate and complete application (e.g. updated project description of the new alternative, etc.) needs to be submitted and posted on Prism by October 13, 2015.

[15-1096](#)

Wisner Creek Channel Reconnection

Condition: Given the lack of current conceptual design information, the following conditions shall be applied:

- A. After the new engineer is on the project and has collected necessary data and developed a conceptual design, the design should be posted on PRISM and a site visit scheduled with a review panel member and RCO grant manager for additional input on developing the preliminary design.
- B. Based on the comments received at the post-concept site visit, sponsor shall develop a preliminary design and post on PRISM. The preliminary design should, at a minimum, include a reference reach study of the existing creek and floodplain, location of the proposed channel, stream profile of the proposed channel, floodplain and channel cross sections, and data from the topographic survey.
- C. The review panel shall approve the preliminary design before construction funds are released. Plan on three weeks for the panel to review the conceptual design and two weeks for review of the preliminary design.

West Sound Watersheds Council Lead Entity

[15-1074](#) Cowling Creek Culverts Replacement Feasibility

Condition: The intent of this condition is to address the POC (number 16 below) through a more formal involvement with the County.

The sponsor will add a task to the scope of work which includes time and budget for Kitsap County Engineers and Planners to participate in the selection of a consultant, review and provide comment on the consultant work plan to meet County standards, provide written documentation of the review of project design options and a letter of understanding and technical support for the selected alternative (costs and design). This information could be included in an Appendix within the final report.

Thank you for responding to the POC comments, especially about the status of the Nearshore Prioritization Process relative to the importance of Cowling Creek.

Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board Lead Entity

[15-1141](#) Ahtanum Creek Riparian Enhancement 2015

Condition: To increase the certainty of success of the riparian plantings, the review panel would like to propose a condition to review and provide comment on the instream restoration design plans at a preliminary level relative to the proposed planting plan. The sequencing of these two efforts are described in the project proposal.

The project sponsor will provide the preliminary design for the instream restoration work for the review panel to review and provide comment on the riparian planting designs. The review panel requires 30-days for design review.

Attachment 9 – “Projects of Concern” Review Panel Comment Form

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

15-1056 Meadowdale Beach Park Barrier Removal

Lead Entity:	WRIA 8
Project Number:	15-1056
Project Name:	Meadowdale Beach Park
Project Sponsor:	Snohomish County Parks
Grant Manager:	Elizabeth Butler

	Date	Status¹³
Post-Application	10/1/15	NMI
Final	10/27/15	POC

Project Summary (for Review Panel reference only)

This project will producing a preliminary design as part of a larger \$1,555,000 design project for replacing a culvert under Burlington Northern tracks with a multi-span bridge and restoring the channel habitat for juvenile Chinook, coho, and chum salmon, as well as cutthroat trout and other fish species. A feasibility study is currently underway to define the preferred alternative. Another project feature is to enhance ADA and provide longer seasonal access to the park with interpretive signage offering educational benefits. From the site visit it appears the culvert is located near MHHW. The main fish benefit is the removal of the culvert and restoring nearshore habitat function. Counts of adult coho, chum and cutthroat trout indicate the culvert is not an upstream passage barrier. The culvert restricts the natural transport of sediment downstream.

FINAL REVIEW PANEL Comments

Date: 10/28/15

Final Project Status: POC

Review Panel Member(s): Review Panel

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

The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits and the project sponsor failed to justify the costs to the satisfaction of the review panel.

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

- 3. Other comments:**

Not only are the design costs very high for the proposed project, but implementing the design will ultimately cost between \$10 to \$15 million to improve passage and habitat conditions for fish in a 1-acre pocket estuary area. The \$10 to \$15 million cost per acre is

¹³CLEAR: Cleared to proceed; CONDITIONED: Cleared to proceed with a condition; NMI: Needs More Information; POC: Project of Concern; NOTEWORTHY: Exemplary Project

significantly higher than other estuary and shoreline restoration projects submitted for SRFB funding in the past. For example, one of the highest cost SRFB-funded nearshore projects presented to date is the Fir Island Farm restoration project (SRFB #12-1205), which is projected to cost about \$17 million but restores approximately 130 acres of nearshore/estuary habitat for a cost of about \$130,000 per acre. The total costs for a similar type of project to replace an active railroad culvert with a bridge and improve public park amenities (Titlow Estuary Restoration) is estimated to be about \$1.2 million per acre. The Review Panel recognizes that only a portion of the project is focused on salmon benefits and that the sponsor, therefore, has asked for only a portion of the design costs; however, the review panel believes that the project’s relative benefit to recovery of Puget Sound Chinook Salmon is still not commensurate with the project costs, particularly in the context of implementing the entire project.

Post-Application REVIEW PANEL comments

Date: 10/1/15

Project Status: NMI

Review Panel Member(s): Full Panel

- 1. If the project is a POC, Form identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:**
- 2. If the project is a POC, identify the changes that would make this a technically sound project:**
- 3. If the project is Conditioned, the following language will be added to the project agreement:**
- 4. General comments:**

The review panel still has concerns about the project budget and feels the Sponsor needs to further justify the costs. The design costs seem to be high by a magnitude of 10 when compared to other large construction projects. For projects of this nature (high construction costs), justification of design costs using a percentage of the construction costs may not be appropriate. Please note that cost was a concern when the project design was proposed as final at a cost of \$1,125,000 and now a Preliminary Design is proposed at a cost of \$1,550,000.



Sponsor Response Instructions:

If your project is not cleared (i.e. has a status of NMI, Conditioned, or POC) you must update your proposal, PRISM questions, or attachments as necessary to address the review panel’s comments. Use track changes when updating your proposal. Fill out the section at the end of your project proposal to document how you responded to comments.

Draft Application / Site Visit

REVIEW PANEL comments

Date: 4/29/15

Project Site Visit? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Review Panel Member(s): Powers, Toth

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

A letter from BNSF noting their commitment to proceed with the project. The design costs seem very high. The main fish benefit is from the bridge placement that allows for expansion of the estuary area and formation of a more natural nearshore area. This bridge placement appears to be contingent on a formal commitment with BNSF. What role will BNSF play in the development and review of preliminary and final designs? Please justify the \$660,000 item for bridge design. What are the tasks, which result in this cost? Also, for the \$75,000 for the survey? What new information is needed in addition to the feasibility study?

One of the fish benefits listed is for coho. What are the summer rearing conditions in terms of flow and water temperature in Lund’s Gulch Creek? Please provide more information on the potential relocation or remeandering of the lower 300 feet of Lund's Gulch Creek. Will the width of the riparian area and the type of forest along the creek be sufficient to provide for a long-term source of large wood, or will wood have to be periodically added to promote better habitat conditions?

Urban streams generally have flashier runoff with greater flow and sediment transport than natural streams due to the increased amount of impervious area in the basin. Are there actions that can be taken in the upper basin area or in the stream corridor to reduce the impacts of the increased runoff and sediment inputs? What are the water quality conditions in Lund's Gulch Creek?

2. Missing Pre-application information.

For a final design proposal there should be conceptual level plans available to review. Specifically, a bridge opening identified that supports restoration of habitat-forming processes.

3. General Comments:

The overall restoration plan seems to have good benefits for fish, but the costs for construction and design are very high (about \$10 million in total). It is unclear whether the costs are too high relative to the benefits provided by the project.

The project sponsor is encouraged to contact Chelan County Natural Resources Department to learn from their experiences working with BNSF in the replacement of culverts with bridges in Nason Creek (Nason Creek Lower White Pine Floodplain Reconnection Assessment – Project No. 09-1472).

4. Staff Comments:

Please be sure to address all comments I provided when I reviewed the application in May (if you haven’t already done so), along with completing all other final application requirements listed in Section 3 of RCO Manual 18 www.rco.wa.gov/documents/manuals&forms/Manual_18.pdf. All changes to your proposal should be made using “Track Changes” in Word.



Sponsor Response Instructions:

Revise your project proposals using “track changes” and update any relevant PRISM questions and attachments. Fill out the section at the end of your project proposal to document how you responded to comments.

Attachment 10 – Funding Table by Region

Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Region

Hood Canal Coordinating Council

Regional Allocations	SRFB	PSAR
	\$1,195,165	\$3,399,638
Allocation Remaining after Funding Decision	\$0	\$328,176

Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity

Lead Entity Allocation: \$1,195,165
 PSAR Allocation: \$3,399,638¹⁴
 PSAR Remaining Allocation: \$328,176

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding	Alternate or Partial
1	15-1206	South Fork Skokomish Large Woody Material Enhancement Phase 3	Mason Conservation District	\$224,692	\$224,692	\$0	\$0	
2	15-1051	Sequim Bay Shoreline Restoration – Dawley Phase	North Olympic Salmon Coalition	\$400,221	\$400,221	\$0	\$0	
3	15-1196	Upper South Fork Skokomish Channel Floodplain Assessment	Mason Conservation District	\$0	\$0	\$305,213	\$305,213	
4	15-1192	Salmon Creek Bridge Construction West Uncas Road	Jefferson County	\$0	\$0	\$751,800	\$751,800	Note ¹⁵
5	15-1205	Lower Mainstem Skokomish Large Woody Material Design Highway 101	Mason Conservation District	\$0	\$0	\$265,302	\$265,302	
6	15-1195	Skokomish Valley Road Realignment Conceptual Design	Mason Conservation District	\$0	\$0	\$362,990	\$362,990	

¹⁴Hood Canal's PSAR allocation is \$4,007,103. This round, the lead entity is loaning \$607,465 to the North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity, reflected in the allocation.

¹⁵Total project request of \$788,800 will be fully funded with \$37,000 from 2013-2015 PSAR return funds.

Attachment 10 – Funding Table By Region

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding	Alternate or Partial
7	15-1200	Snow Creek Uncas Preserve Phase 2	Jefferson Land Trust	\$0	\$0	\$150,979	\$150,979	
8	15-1189	Big Quilcene River Floodplain Key Pieces	Jefferson County	\$0	\$0	\$587,319	\$587,319	
9	15-1197	Weaver Creek Reconnection	Mason Conservation District	\$0	\$0	\$199,574	\$199,574	
10	15-1191	Hood Canal Bridge Impact Assessment	Long Live the Kings	\$173,852	\$173,852	\$81,718	\$81,718	Note ¹⁶
11	15-1202	Hood Canal Summer Chum Nearshore Habitat Use Assessment	Wild Fish Conservancy	\$396,400	\$396,400	\$0	\$0	
12	15-1204	Lower Big Quilcene River Design Phase 2	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$300,000	
13	15-1190	Duckabush River Estuary Restoration Planning	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group	\$0	\$0	\$66,567	\$66,567	
14	15-1203	Intensively Monitored Watershed – Lower Big Beef Creek Restoration Phase 2	Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group	\$440,970	\$0	\$0	\$0	Alternate ¹⁷
Total Funded:					\$1,195,165		\$3,071,462	

¹⁶Total project request of \$687,766 will be fully funded with \$432,196 from 2013-2015 PSAR return funds.

¹⁷Project is funded with 2015 Intensively Monitored Watersheds funding.

Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region

Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board

Regional Allocations **SRFB**
\$2,700,000¹⁸

Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity

Lead Entity Allocation: \$2,700,000

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	Alternate or Partial
1	15-1040	Germany Creek Restoration Andrews Site	Cowlitz Conservation District	\$185,300	\$185,300	
2	15-1039	Germany Creek Restoration Smith Site	Cowlitz Conservation District	\$260,625	\$260,625	
3	15-1093	Nutrient Enhancement Phase 2 WRIAs 27-28	Lower Columbia Fish Enhancement Group	\$51,703	\$51,703	
4	15-1087	Lacamas Creek Side Channel Reconnection	Lewis County Public Works	\$125,735	\$125,735	
5	15-1114	Upper Hamilton Creek Restoration	Lower Columbia Estuary Partner	\$295,250	\$295,250	
6	15-1111	Columbia Estuary Chinook Conservation Project	Columbia Land Trust	\$450,500	\$450,500	
7	15-1119	McCormick Creek Restoration	Clark Public Utilities	\$325,000	\$325,000	
8	15-1135	East Fork Grays River Large Wood Retention	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	\$124,300	\$124,300	
9	15-1134	Grays River Reaches 3 and 4 Mass Wasting Project	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	\$55,997	\$55,997	
10	15-1090	Silver-Bluebird Creek Restoration	Lower Columbia Fish Enhancement Group	\$301,000	\$301,000	
11	15-1113	East Fork Lewis Side Channel 5A-5B Restoration	Lower Columbia Estuary Partner	\$331,287	\$254,590	Note ¹⁹
12	15-1042	Skamokawa Creek Restoration Baldwin Site Phase 2	Wahkiakum Conservation District	\$83,200	\$0	Alternate
14	15-1136	Cispus Yellowjacket Restoration Phase 1	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	\$469,700	\$0	Alternate
15	15-1041	Elochoman Stream Restoration Elkinton	Wahkiakum Conservation District	\$383,731	\$0	Alternate
16	15-1117	Upper Elochoman Reach 9 Phase 2	Columbia Land Trust	\$217,905	\$0	Alternate

¹⁸The remaining \$270,000 of the regional allocation is given to the Klickitat County Lead Entity.

¹⁹This project will receive partial funding. Sponsor has committed to seek additional funds needed to complete the project.

Attachment 10 – Funding Table By Region

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	Alternate or Partial
17	15-1094	North Fork Lewis 13.5 Phase 2	Lower Columbia Fish Enhancement Group	\$303,880	\$0	Alternate
18	15-1070	Lower Elochoman Restoration Strategy Development	Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board	\$114,400	\$0	Alternate
19	15-1118	East Fork Lewis River Knotweed Control Project	Clark Public Utilities	\$264,500	\$0	Alternate
20	15-1133	Grays River Pond Reconnection Design	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	\$80,010	\$0	Alternate
21	15-1091	Washougal Bedrock Channel Restoration Design	Lower Columbia Fish Enhancement Group	\$88,070	\$0	Alternate
22	15-1130	IgiXatk?oa' mam iq?oane'X South Fork Grays Phase 1	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	\$500,000	\$0	Alternate
23	15-1043	Wilson Cr Restoration Goldinov Site	Wahkiakum Conservation District	\$324,438	\$0	Alternate
24	15-1128	Muddy-Clear Design	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	\$100,000	\$0	Alternate
Total Funded:				\$2,430,000		

Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region

Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board

Regional Allocation **SRFB**
\$1,776,600²⁰

Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board Lead Entity

Lead Entity Allocation: \$1,318,333

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	Alternate or Partial
1	15-1144	South Fork Cowlitz Floodplain Restoration	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	\$84,314	\$84,314	
2	15-1153	Gold Creek Instream Habitat Design	Kittitas Conservation Trust	\$185,705	\$185,705	
3	13-1315	Naneum, Wilson, and Cherry Creek Assessment	Kittitas County Public Works	\$100,000	\$100,000	
4	15-1350	Yakima River Mile 153 Side Channel Connection Design	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	\$116,000	\$116,000	
5	14-1215	Naneum-Coleman Fish Passage Projects	Kittitas County Conservation District	\$185,312	\$185,312	
6	15-1147	Yakima River Floodplain Assessment and Final Design	Trout Unlimited Inc.	\$123,701	\$123,701	
7	15-1247	Williams Creek Aquatic Habitat Restoration	Kittitas Conservation Trust	\$214,920	\$214,920	
8	15-1141	Ahtanum Creek Riparian Enhancement	North Yakima Conservation District	\$200,668	\$200,668	
9	15-1151	Parke Creek Caribou Creek Fish Passage	Kittitas County Conservation District	\$280,339	\$107,713	Partial
10	15-1143	Swauk River Mile 17.3-18.8 Floodplain Reconnection	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	\$385,000	\$0	Alternate
11	15-1483	North Fork Manastash Floodplain Restoration	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	\$143,516	\$0	Alternate
12	15-1148	Teaaway Riparian and Floodplain Protection	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$350,000	\$0	Alternate

²⁰The remaining \$458,267 of the regional allocation is given to the Klickitat County Lead Entity.

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	Alternate or Partial
13	15-1146	Ensign Ranch Big Creek Flow Enhancement Project	Washington Water Trust	\$146,500	\$0	Alternate
Total Funded:				\$1,318,333		

Klickitat County Lead Entity**Lead Entity Allocation: \$728,267**

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding
1	15-1296	Assess Salmonid Recolonization of the White Salmon River	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	\$66,500	\$66,500
2	15-1258	Mill Creek Fish Passage Construction	Underwood Conservation District	\$425,153	\$425,153
3	15-1298	Rattlesnake Creek Riparian Vegetation Enhancement	Underwood Conservation District	\$61,670	\$61,670
4	15-1297	Upper Rattlesnake Creek Hydrologic Project	Underwood Conservation District	\$174,944	\$174,944
Total Funded:				\$728,267	

Northeast Washington Salmon Recovery Region

Kalispel Tribe-Pend Oreille Lead Entity

Regional Allocation	SRFB
	\$360,000
Allocation Remaining after Funding Decision	\$8

Kalispel Tribe-Pend Oreille Lead Entity**Lead Entity Allocation: \$360,000**

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding
1	15-1106	LeClerc Creek Restoration Phase 3	Kalispel Tribe	\$359,992	\$359,992
Total Funded:				\$359,992	

Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region

Puget Sound Partnership

Regional Allocations:	SRFB	PSAR
	\$6,795,035	\$23,461,349
Allocation Remaining After Funding Decision:	\$335,262	\$3,745,029

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

Lead Entity SRFB Allocation: \$327,353
PSAR Allocation: \$1,101,070

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding	Alternate or Partial
1	15-1240	Downey Farmstead – Frager Road Relocation	City of Kent	\$327,353	\$327,353	\$372,647	\$372,647	
2	15-1291	Lones-Turley Levee Conceptual Design	King County Water and Land Resources Division	\$0	\$0	\$200,000	\$200,000	
3	15-1221	Maury Island Aquatic Reserve Protection	King County Water and Land Resources Division	\$0	\$0	\$200,000	\$200,000	
4	13-1099	Duwamish Gardens Restoration ²¹	City of Tukwila	\$0	\$0	\$36,423	\$36,423	
5	14-1001	Mill Creek Side Channel (Leber 2014)	City of Kent	\$764,238	\$0	\$292,000	\$292,000	Partial ²²
Total Funded:					\$327,353		\$1,101,070	

²¹This 2013 project is receiving additional funding for cultural resources costs.

²²This project received funding in 2014 and will receive additional PSAR funding in 2015.

Island County Lead Entity**Lead Entity SRFB Allocation: \$240,784****PSAR Allocation: \$809,953****Remaining PSAR Allocation: \$385,331**

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding
1	15-1050	Kristoferson Creek Fish Passage Improvements	Snohomish Conservation District	\$168,379	\$168,379	\$51,621	\$51,621
2	15-1049	Iverson Preserve Stakeholder Integration	Island County Department of Natural Resources	\$0	\$0	\$104,805	\$104,805
3	15-1048	Camano Island State Park Tidal Marsh Feasibility	Skagit River System Cooperative	\$33,050	\$33,050	\$152,046	\$152,046
4	15-1072	Greenbank Marsh Restoration Issues Assessment	Whidbey Island Conservation District	\$0	\$0	\$116,150	\$116,150
5	15-1485	Whidbey Basin Pocket Estuary Census	Skagit River System Cooperative	\$39,355	\$39,355	\$0	\$0
Total Funded				\$240,784		\$424,622	

Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8) Lead Entity**Lead Entity SRFB Allocation: \$433,356****PSAR Allocation: \$1,457,542****Remaining PSAR Allocation: \$75,400**

Rank	Project Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding
1	15-1054	Sammamish River Side Channel Restoration Phase 3	City of Bothell	\$433,356	\$433,356	\$168,968	\$168,968
2	15-1058	Lower Bear Creek Natural Area Additions	King Count Water and Land Resources Division	\$0	\$0	\$375,000	\$375,000
3	15-1059	Bear Creek Reach 6 Restoration Phase 2 Design	Adopt A Stream Foundation	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000
4	15-1056	Meadowdale Beach Park and Estuary Restoration Design	Snohomish County Department of Parks and Recreation	\$0	\$0	\$250,000	\$250,000
5	15-1067	Willowmoor Preliminary Design	King Count Water and Land Resources Division	\$0	\$0	\$200,000	\$200,000
6	15-1071	Evans Creek Relocation Project	City of Redmond	\$0	\$0	\$338,174	\$338,174
Total Funded:				\$433,356		\$1,382,142	

Nisqually River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity²³

Lead Entity SRFB Allocation: \$416,803

PSAR Allocation: \$1,401,875

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding	Alternate or Partial
1	15-1261	Nisqually Chinook Recovery Monitoring	Nisqually River Foundation	\$41,500	\$41,500	\$0	\$0	
2	15-1233	Mashel Shoreline Protection Phase 4	Nisqually Land Trust	\$0	\$0	\$704,165	\$704,165	Note ²⁴
3	15-1231	Mashel Eatonville Restoration Phase 3	South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group	\$375,303	\$375,303	\$578,340	\$578,340	Note ²⁵
4	15-1238	Whitewater Reach Protection Project	Nisqually Land Trust	\$300,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	Alternate ²⁶
5	15-1232	Mashel Eatonville Phase 3 Conservation Easement	Nisqually Land Trust	\$129,370	\$0	\$119,370	\$119,370	Note ²⁷
6	15-1236	Middle Ohop Protection Phase 2	Nisqually Land Trust	\$195,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	Alternate
7	15-1246	McKenna Area Small Lot Acquisitions	Nisqually Land Trust	\$600,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	Alternate
	15-1107	West Oakland Bay Restoration and Conservation	Squaxin Island Tribe	\$1,620,499	\$0	\$0	\$0	Alternate ²⁸
Total Funded:					\$416,803		\$1,401,875	

²³The Nisqually lead entity will use \$800,000 of 2013-15 PSAR returned funds from the Lower Ohop Restoration Phase 3 project for other projects as noted.

²⁴To be partially funded with \$20,000 PSAR 2013-15 returned funds.

²⁵To be partially funded with \$236,357 PSAR 2013-15 returned funds.

²⁶To be fully funded with \$300,000 PSAR 2013-15 returned funds.

²⁷To be partially funded with \$10,000 PSAR 2013-15 returned funds.

²⁸Regionally significant project in the WRIA 14 watershed. To be partially funded with \$233,643 PSAR 2013-15 returned funds.

North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon

Lead Entity SRFB Allocation: \$715,907

PSAR Allocation: \$3,015,179²⁹

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding	Alternate or Partial
1	15-1055	Dungeness River Floodplain Restoration-Robinson Phase	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe	\$0	\$0	\$1,157,700	\$1,157,700	
2	15-1051	Sequim Bay Shoreline Restoration Dawley Phase	North Olympic Salmon Coalition	\$400,221	\$0	\$0	\$0	Alternate ³⁰
3	15-1053	Dungeness River Railroad Reach Floodplain Restoration ³¹	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe	\$0	\$0	\$1,452,697	\$1,452,697	
4	15-1045	Beach Lake Acquisition and Restoration	Coastal Watershed Institute	\$79,968	\$79,968	\$404,782	\$404,782	
5	15-1061	Pysht River Floodplain Restoration: Phase 3	Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe	\$635,939	\$635,939	\$0	\$0	
Total Funded:					\$715,907		\$3,015,179	

²⁹This amount reflects an additional \$607,465 from Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity.

³⁰Project is fully funded by the Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity on its list. The council is the regional recovery organization for recovery of Eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca and Hood Canal summer Chum Salmon.

³¹SRFB approved project as a PSAR early action project in May. An additional \$46,247.69 from 2013-15 PSAR returned funds and \$31,056 returned funds from the Puget Sound Partnership's Project Implementation and Development Awards program will be included in the project agreement.

Pierce County Lead Entity**Lead Entity SRFB Allocation: \$562,016****PSAR Allocation: \$1,890,205**

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding	Alternate or Partial
1	15-1224	South Prairie Creek (River Mile 4-4.6) Phase 1	South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group	\$562,016	\$562,016	\$801,422	\$801,422	
2	15-1159	Chambers Creek Dam Acquisition Feasibility and Planning	Forterra	\$0	\$0	\$165,727	\$163,152	
3	15-1157	Neadham Road Acquisition and Design	Pierce County Water Programs Division	\$0	\$0	\$912,453	\$875,631	
4	15-1107	West Oakland Bay Restoration and Conservation	Squaxin Island Tribe	\$0	\$0	\$1,620,499	\$50,000	Note ³²
Total Funded:					\$562,016		\$1,890,205	

San Juan County Community Development Lead Entity**Lead Entity SRFB Allocation: \$307,270****PSAR Allocation: \$1,033,535****Remaining PSAR Allocation: \$388,486**

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding
1	15-1239	Ecology of Resident Chinook in San Juan Islands	Long Live the Kings	\$106,383	\$106,383	\$90,000	\$90,000
2	15-1300	Cascade Creek Acquisition	San Juan County Land Bank	\$0	\$0	\$492,500	\$492,500
3	15-1288	Mud Bay Sucia Island Salt Marsh Restoration	Friends of the San Juans	\$28,711	\$28,711	\$62,549	\$62,549
4	15-1289	Forage Fish Spawn Habitat Rehabilitation	Friends of the San Juans	\$172,176	\$172,176	\$0	\$0
Total Funded:					\$307,270		\$645,049

³²Regionally significant project in the WRIA 14 watershed. Pierce Citizens Advisory Committee agreed to provide \$50,000 towards this project in a different watershed.

Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity

Lead Entity SRFB Allocation: \$1,239,822

PSAR Allocation: \$4,169,553

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding
1	15-1165	Pressentin Park Restoration Phases 2 and 3 ³³	Skagit Fisheries Enhancement Group	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$1,575,570	\$1,575,570
2	15-1168	Skagit Basin Riparian Restoration Phase 2	Skagit River System Cooperative	\$328,000	\$328,000	\$0	\$0
3	15-1164	Hamilton-Carey's Slough Preliminary Design Phase 1	Skagit Fisheries Enhancement Group	\$199,426	\$199,426	\$0	\$0
4	15-1166	Skagit Side Channel Barrier Final Designs	Skagit Fisheries Enhancement Group	\$0	\$0	\$77,688	\$77,688
5	15-1169	Illabot Creek Alluvial Fan Restoration Phase 2b	Skagit River System Cooperative	\$415,046	\$415,046	\$2,187,454	\$2,123,290
6	15-1172	Lake Creek Wetland Complex Protection	Skagit Land Trust	\$0	\$0	\$164,755	\$164,755
7	15-1174	Goodell Creek Restoration Feasibility	Upper Skagit Indian Tribe	\$0	\$0	\$228,250	\$228,250
	15-1449	Skagit Habitat Status and Trends Monitoring Implementation ³⁴	Skagit River System Cooperative	\$97,350	\$97,350	\$0	\$0
Total Funded:					\$1,239,822		\$4,169,553

³³Project receiving \$64,164 in 2013-15 PSAR returned funds.³⁴This monitoring project isn't ranked, but has been authorized to be submitted by the Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity.

Snohomish Basin Lead Entity**Lead Entity SRFB Allocation: \$565,767****PSAR Allocation: \$1,902,818****Remaining PSAR Allocation: \$434,464**

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding
1	09-1277	Qwuloolt Estuary Restoration and Construction	Tulalip Tribes	\$0	\$0	\$500,000	\$500,000 ³⁵
3	15-1163	Snoqualmie at Fall City Raging River Acquisition	King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks	\$0	\$0	\$800,000	\$800,000
4	15-1198	Moga Back Channel Construction	Snohomish Conservation District	\$314,777	\$314,777	\$93,668	\$93,668
5	15-1131	Woods Creek In-stream Restoration Partnership	Adopt A Stream Foundation	\$150,429	\$150,429	\$44,763	\$44,763
6	15-1199	Middle Pilchuck Large Woody Materials Design	Wild Fish Conservancy	\$100,561	\$100,561	\$29,923	\$29,923
Total Funded:					\$565,767		\$1,468,354

Stillaguamish River Salmon Recovery Co-Lead Entity³⁶**Lead Entity SRFB Allocation: \$216,875****Remaining SRFB Allocation: \$335,254****Remaining PSAR Allocation: \$1,856,954**

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding
1	15-1333	Stillaguamish Side-Channel Monitoring	Snohomish County Department of Public Works	\$55,125	\$55,125	\$0	\$0
2	15-1110	Knotweed Control in North and South Forks Stilly	Snohomish County Department of Public Works	\$161,750	\$161,750	\$0	\$0 ³⁷
Total Funded:					\$216,875		\$0

³⁵SRFB approved as an early action project in May 2015.³⁶Stillaguamish River Salmon Recovery Co-Lead Entity received approval from RCO to hold its allocation for the 2016 grant round.³⁷Project also receiving \$40,000 2013-15 PSAR returned funds.

West Sound Watersheds Council Lead Entity

Lead Entity SRFB Allocation: \$294,655

PSAR Allocation: \$991,112

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding	Alternate or Partial
1	15-1079	Crescent Creek Culvert Feasibility Study	South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group	\$0	\$0	\$56,500	\$56,500	
2	15-1080	Grovers Creek Protection Phase 2	Great Peninsula Conservancy	\$194,655	\$194,655	\$105,345	\$105,345	
3	15-1075	Harper Estuary Restoration Final Design	Kitsap County	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$290,000	\$290,000	
4	15-1076	Port Orchard Pass Phase 1 Preliminary Design	Bainbridge Island Land Trust	\$0	\$0	\$90,500	\$90,500	
5	14-2176	Lower Purdy Creek Restoration Feasibility	Pierce County Public Works and Utilities	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$55,000	\$55,000	
6	15-1074	Cowling Creek Culverts Replacement Feasibility	Mid Sound Fisheries Enhancement Group	\$0	\$0	\$68,000	\$68,000	
7	14-1949	Evergreen Park Near-shore Restoration Design	Bremerton Public Works Department	\$0	\$0	\$200,000	\$125,767	Partial
	15-1107	West Oakland Bay Restoration and Conservation	Squaxin Island Tribe	\$0	\$0	\$1,620,499	\$200,000	Note ³⁸
Total Funded:					\$294,655		\$991,112	

³⁸Regionally significant project in the WRIA 14 watershed. The West Sound Watersheds Council elected to provide \$200,000 to this project. It was not ranked in this lead entity.

WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity

Lead Entity SRFB Allocation: \$711,475

PSAR Allocation: \$2,392,809

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding	Alternate or Partial
1	15-1283	Nuxw7iyem South Fork Nesset Phase 1 Restoration	Nooksack Indian Tribe	\$0	\$0	\$1,009,330	\$1,009,330	
2	15-1286	Middle Fork Porter Creek Reach Phase 1	Lummi Nation	\$0	\$0	\$867,114	\$867,114	
3	15-1271	South Fork Acme Reach Acquisition	Whatcom Land Trust	\$357,000	\$357,000	\$0	\$0	
4	15-1278	South Fork Skookum Edfro Phase 1 Restoration	Lummi Nation	\$285,159	\$285,159	\$0	\$0	
5	15-1287	(Xwqélém) North Fork Farmhouse Phase 2b	Nooksack Indian Tribe	\$69,316	\$69,316	\$516,366	\$516,365	
6	15-1284	Cavanaugh-Fobes Phase 2 Design	Lummi Nation	\$98,848	\$0	\$0	\$0	Alternate
Total Funded:					\$711,475		\$2,392,809	

WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee Lead Entity³⁹

Lead Entity SRFB Allocation: \$194,755

PSAR Allocation: \$655,163

Remaining PSAR Allocation: \$276,218

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding	Alternate or Partial
1	15-1107	West Oakland Bay Restoration and Conservation	Squaxin Island Tribe	\$0	\$0	\$1,620,499	\$254,136	Partial ⁴⁰
2	15-1226	Deschutes River Mile 33 Large Woody Materials Preliminary Design	South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group	\$72,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	Note ⁴¹
3	15-1176	WRIA 13 Water Type Assessment Phase 4	Wild Fish Conservancy	\$110,500	\$80,500	\$0	\$0	Partial ⁴²
4	15-1228	Deschutes River Mile 21 Large Woody Materials and Riparian Design	South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group	\$92,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	Note ⁴³
5	15-1227	Lake Lawrence Outlet Channel Restoration	South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group	\$114,255	\$114,255	\$124,809	\$124,809	
6	15-1152	Shermer-Deschutes Floodplain Acquisition	Capitol Land Trust	\$208,250	\$0	\$0	\$0	Note ⁴⁴
7	15-1154	Deschutes River Bridge Design	Capitol Land Trust	\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	Note ⁴⁵
Total Funded:				\$194,755		\$378,945		

³⁹The WRIA 13 lead entity will have \$473,114 returned 2013-15 PSAR funds from the Little Fishtrap project and will allocate it to projects on its list as noted.

⁴⁰This project will receive \$45,864 of 2013-15 PSAR returned funds.

⁴¹This project will receive \$72,000 of 2013-15 PSAR returned funds.

⁴²This project will receive \$30,000 of 2013-15 PSAR returned funds.

⁴³This project will receive \$92,000 of 2013-15 PSAR returned funds.

⁴⁴This project will receive \$208,250 of 2013-15 PSAR returned funds.

⁴⁵This project will receive \$25,000 from 2013-15 PSAR returned funds.

WRIA 14 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee Lead Entity

Lead Entity SRFB Allocation: \$232,942

PSAR Allocation: \$783,581

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	PSAR Request	PSAR Funding	Alternate or Partial
1	15-1107	West Oakland Bay Restoration and Conservation	Squaxin Island Tribe	\$0	\$0	\$1,620,499	\$781,473	Partial
2	15-1177	WRIA 14 Water Type Assessment Phase 3	Wild Fish Conservancy	\$110,500	\$110,500	\$0	\$0	
3	15-1182	Anderson Creek Enhancement Project Phase 2	South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group	\$122,442	\$122,442	\$2,108	\$2,108	
4	15-1201	Lower Goldsborough Riparian Acquisition	Capitol Land Trust	\$130,050	\$0	\$0	\$0	Alternate
5	15-1229	Upper Likes Creek Road Abandonment	Mason Conservation District	\$41,663	\$0	\$0	\$0	Alternate
6	15-1108	Little Skookum Inlet Shoreline Protection	Forterra	\$199,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	Alternate
Total Funded:				\$232,942		\$783,581		

Snake River Salmon Recovery Region

Snake River Salmon Recovery Board

Regional Allocation	SRFB
	\$1,598,400
Allocation Remaining after Funding Decision	\$0

Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity Lead Entity Allocation: \$1,598,400

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	Alternate or Partial
1	15-1321	Asotin Intensively Monitored Watershed Restoration	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$0	\$0	Alternate ⁴⁶
2	15-1323	Tucannon Large Wood and Floodplain Restoration PA6-9	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$400,000	\$165,000	Partial ⁴⁷
3	15-1307	Collins Bridge Fish Barrier Removal	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$91,158	\$91,158	
4	15-1318	Snedeker Conservation Easement	Blue Mountain Land Trust	\$45,050	\$45,050	
5	15-1306	North Touchet River Baileysburg Restoration	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	\$460,131	\$460,131	
6	15-1309	Steptoe Creek perched culvert replacement	Palouse Conservation District	\$189,738	\$189,738	
7	15-1317	Little Tucannon Post Assisted Log Structures	Columbia Conservation District	\$38,151	\$38,151	
8	15-1316	Penawawa Creek Instream Habitat Rehabilitation	Whitman Conservation District	\$38,832	\$38,832	
9	15-1315	Asotin Intensively Monitored Watershed Monitoring	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$158,419	\$158,419	
10	15-1324	Mill Creek Passage Design - Upper Flume	Tri-State Steelheaders Inc.	\$155,371	\$155,371	
11	15-1320	Buford Creek Barrier Fish Passage Design (Highway 129)	Nez Perce Tribe	\$97,550	\$97,550	

⁴⁶This project will be funded with Intensively Monitored Watersheds funding.

⁴⁷The project request is \$400,000. The Snake River Salmon Recovery Board approved the project to receive \$165,000 with the remaining to be funded as money becomes available.

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	Alternate or Partial
12	15-1308	Asotin County Geomorphic-Watershed Assessment	Asotin County Conservation District	\$150,000	\$100,000	Partial
13	15-1322	Tucannon Salmonid Survival and Habitat Utilization	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	\$113,242	\$59,000	Partial
Total Funded:					\$1,598,400	

Upper Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region

Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board

Regional Allocation	SRFB
	\$1,953,000
Allocation Remaining after Funding Decision	\$0

Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity Lead Entity Allocation: \$1,953,000

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	Alternate or Partial
1	15-1217	M2 Right Sugar Acquisition	Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation	\$104,465	\$104,465	
2	15-1210	Upper White Pine Floodplain Reconnection	Chelan County Natural Resources Department	\$750,000	\$750,000	
3	15-1251	Twisp River-Poorman Creek Protection Phase 2	Methow Conservancy	\$294,350	\$294,350	
4	15-1220	Lower Wenatchee Flow Enhance Phase 2	Trout Unlimited Inc.	\$270,000	\$270,000	
5	15-1219	Icicle Creek-Boulder Field-Wild Fish to Wilderness	Trout Unlimited Inc.	\$500,000	\$500,000	
6	15-1209	Nason Creek Sediment Reduction Roads Inventory	Chelan County Natural Resources Department	\$39,686	\$34,185	Partial
7	15-1215	Wenatchee Basin Barrier and Diversion Assessment	Cascade Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	\$289,939	\$0	Alternate

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	Alternate or Partial
8	15-1208	Monitor Side Channel Final Design and Permitting	Chelan County Natural Resources Department	\$138,242	\$0	Alternate
9	15-1212	Lower Nason Creek Protection	Chelan-Douglas Land Trust	\$167,875	\$0	Alternate
Total Funded:					\$1,953,000	

Washington Coast Salmon Recovery Region

Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership

SRFB

Regional Allocation **\$1,620,000**

Allocation Remaining after Funding Decision **\$0**

Chehalis Basin Lead Entity

Lead Entity Allocation: \$595,132

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding
1	15-1038	Boyer Road Fish Barrier Culvert Correction	Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force	\$153,558	\$153,558
2	15-1150	East Fork Hoquiam River Surge Plain Acquisition	Chehalis River Basin Land Trust	\$85,000	\$85,000
3	15-1101	Bunker Road Barrier Removals	Lewis County Conservation District	\$198,933	\$198,933
4	15-1096	Wisner Creek Channel Reconnection	Lewis County Conservation District	\$55,896	\$55,896
5	15-1109	Wishkah Gardens Acquisition	Forterra	\$101,745	\$101,745
Total Funded:					\$595,132

Lead Entity North Pacific Coast**Lead Entity Allocation: \$332,852**

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	Alternate or Partial
1	15-1250	Colby Creek Culvert Replacement	Pacific Coast Salmon Coalition	\$209,950	\$209,950	
2	15-1257	Big River and Umbrella Creek Riparian Restoration	Makah Tribe	\$122,902	\$122,902	
3	15-1254	Hoh River Riparian Restoration	10 000 Years Institute	\$266,240	\$0	Alternate
Total Funded:					\$332,852	

Pacific County Lead Entity**Lead Entity Allocation: \$382,354**

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	Alternate or Partial
1	15-1047	Stringer Creek Barrier Correction	Pacific County Anglers	\$385,602	\$382,354	Partial
2	15-1260	C-400 Line Fish Barrier - Church Road Project	Grays Harbor Conservation District	\$85,098	\$0	Alternate
Total Funded:					\$382,354	

Quinault Indian Nation Lead Entity**Lead Entity Allocation: \$309,662**

Rank	Project Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	SRFB Request	SRFB Funding	
1	15-1103	Lower Quinault River Invasive Plant Control Phase 4	Quinault Indian Nation	\$141,671	\$141,671	
2	15-1102	F-5 Road Fish Barrier Removal Project	Quinault Indian Nation	\$43,992	\$43,992	
3	15-1104	Prairie Creek Rehabilitation – Instream Large Woody Materials Design	Quinault Indian Nation	\$72,999	\$72,999	
4	15-1097	Shale Creek Preliminary Design	The Nature Conservancy	\$51,000	\$51,000	
Total Funded:					\$309,662	