



# **2016 Salmon Recovery Grant Funding Report**

---

December 2016

## Table of Contents

<b>Part 1 – Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Introduction .....	1
Overview of Funding .....	1
SRFB Decisions for December.....	5
Elements of the 2016 Grant Round .....	5
<b>Part 2 – SRFB Review Panel Comments .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Project Review Process .....	7
Adjustments to Project Lists .....	12
Observations from the SRFB Review Panel.....	12
2016 Recommendations .....	17
<b>Part 3 – Region Summaries .....</b>	<b>19</b>
Introduction .....	19
How is the Regional Review Process Implemented?.....	19
<b>Attachment 1 – 2016 Grant Schedule.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Attachment 2 – 2016 SRFB Review Panel Biographies.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Attachment 3 – 2016 SRFB Review Panel Evaluation Criteria .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Attachment 4 –Intensively Monitored Watershed Treatment Project List .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Attachment 5 – Regional Monitoring Project List .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Attachment 6 – Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Large Capital Projects List.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Attachment 7 – Conditioned Project Summary .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Attachment 8 – Project of Concern Summary.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Attachment 9 – Ranked Salmon Project Lists.....</b>	<b>44</b>
Hood Canal Salmon Recovery Region.....	44
Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region.....	45
Middle Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region.....	55
Northeast Washington Salmon Recovery Region.....	45
Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region.....	47
Snake River Salmon Recovery Region .....	53
Upper Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region .....	54
Washington Coast Salmon Recovery Region.....	54

*Cover photograph by Marc Duboiski, Recreation and Conservation Office*

## **Part 1 – Introduction**

### **Introduction**

Since 1999, the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) has been distributing state and federal money to protect and restore salmon habitat. Honoring the “Washington Way” of ground-up salmon recovery decision-making, the SRFB works closely with local watershed groups known as lead entities<sup>1</sup> to identify projects for funding, and regional organizations to prioritize funding. This partnership has resulted in the SRFB distributing nearly \$836 million for nearly 3,000 projects and activities statewide, all aimed at bringing salmon back from the brink of extinction.

This report presents information on the process used to review the 2016 applications and develop funding recommendations for the SRFB to consider at its December 8, 2016 meeting in Olympia.

### **Overview of Funding**

Funding for salmon grants comes from two main sources:

- \$14.6 million from state capital bond funds and the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF), a federal award to the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). \$13.1 million is available for the grant round and \$1.53 million is available for Intensively Monitored Watershed treatment projects.
- Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) fund, a state capital bond-funded program focused on Puget Sound and Hood Canal, jointly administered by the Recreation and Conservation Office and the Puget Sound Partnership. In 2013-2015 this account was funded at \$37 million. The amount available for the next biennium will be set by the Legislature in 2017.

In addition to the \$13.1 million, RCO sets aside up to \$500,000 for unanticipated cost increases in 2017.

---

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

Allocation Formula. The SRFB has adopted the following allocation formula for awarding grants.

**Table 1. SRFB Regional Funding Allocation Formula**

Regional Salmon Recovery Organization	Regional Allocation Percent of Total	2016 Allocation Based on \$13.1 Million
Hood Canal Coordinating Council*	2.35%	\$869,350
Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board**	15%	\$1,963,950
Northeast Washington	2%	\$261,860
Puget Sound Partnership	42.04%	\$4,942,633
Snake River Salmon Recovery Board	8.88%	\$1,162,658
Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board	10.85%	\$1,420,591
Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership	9%	\$1,178,370
Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board**	9.87%	\$1,292,279
<p>*Hood Canal is in the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Region for Chinook and steelhead, but is a separate salmon recovery region for summer chum. The Hood Canal Coordinating Council receives 10 percent of the Puget Sound Partnership's regional SRFB allocation for Chinook and steelhead.</p> <p>**There are four projects submitted by the Klickitat County Lead Entity. Klickitat is receiving \$98,197 from Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board's regional allocation and \$382,000 from the Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board's regional allocation.</p> <p>**Puget Sound (North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity) is giving Hood Canal \$520,743 in SRFB funds this round that it used on its 2015 ranked list. The allocations on the ranked lists in Attachment 9 reflect this.</p>		

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

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

The SRFB also committed to continuing the following key principles:

- Salmon recovery funds will be allocated regionally.
- The SRFB Review Panel will not evaluate the quality of lead entity strategies that are part of recovery plans already submitted to the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office and NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service. Regional organizations ensure the submitted lists of projects are consistent with the regional recovery plans.

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

## PSAR Funds

This year will see a different approach to the way PSAR grants are awarded, which will streamline the process. Traditionally, PSAR grants were awarded by the SRFB with salmon grants in December after the account was funded by the Legislature. This grant round, the PSAR regular and large capital lists are being submitted in advance of the legislative session.

Lead entities are including PSAR projects on their ranked project lists and asking the SRFB to approve those projects at the December SRFB meeting. This will enable approved PSAR projects to go immediately under contract once the PSAR account is funded by the Legislature in 2017, getting the money on the ground quickly, potentially up to 6 months earlier than previous years. The streamlined process also improves efficiency because all of the PSAR funds can be approved in one meeting.

If the PSAR account is funded in the 2017-19 Biennium, the first \$30 million of PSAR funds are to be 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 allocations.

**Table 2. Projected Allocation of \$30 Million in PSAR Funding**

WRIA	Recovery Units	Estimated Amount <sup>2</sup>
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 <sup>3</sup>	\$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 <sup>4</sup>	\$991,112
15, 16, and 17	Hood Canal <sup>5</sup>	\$2,596,901
17, 18, and 19	Elwha-Dungeness-Strait <sup>6</sup>	\$2,407,714
Hood Canal summer chum <sup>7</sup>		\$1,410,202

Any remaining PSAR funds over \$30 million are allocated to a ranked large capital project list. This list contains projects that are high priority and significantly large in scope (i.e. scale, complexity, and cost). Each watershed proposes these projects to the region, the SRFB Review Panel reviews them, and the Puget Sound Partnership ranks and prioritizes them before they come to the SRFB for approval. This year, 18 applications were received, requesting \$74 million (Attachment 6).

The Puget Sound Partnership's criteria for prioritizing include the following:

- Results in an improvement in abundance, productivity, diversity, and/or spatial distribution for one or more populations of listed Evolutionary Significant Units.
- Benefits multiple listed salmon and steelhead populations.
- Level of design work completed for project (for restoration projects).
- Stage of project development (for acquisition projects).
- Match funding provided by project sponsor.

<sup>2</sup>The total project funding amounts are less administrative costs.

<sup>3</sup>WRIA 9 includes 52 shoreline miles from Vashon Island from WRIA 15 (Vashon Island).

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

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

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

<sup>7</sup>Hood Canal Summer Chum Evolutionary Significant Unit receives 5 percent of the total Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration capital funds.



- Makes progress toward a Puget Sound Action Agenda target for protection or restoration of habitat (e.g. shoreline armoring, eelgrass, estuaries, etc.).

## **SRFB Decisions for December**

**Salmon Projects:** The board will be asked to approve up to \$13.1 million for projects using salmon state and federal funding (Attachment 9) and the ranked PSAR lists for Legislative funding (Attachment 6).

**PSAR Projects:** The board will be asked to approve project lists for PSAR funding. RCO will enter into contracts for the approved projects when the PSAR account is funded in July 2017, applying the approved Puget Sound Partnership allocation formula shown in Table 2. These projects are displayed in Attachment 9 under the Puget Sound Region.

**PSAR Large Capital Projects:** The board will be asked to approve a PSAR large capital project list. RCO will enter into contracts for the approved projects when the PSAR account is funded in July 2017 above the \$30 million level. These projects are displayed in Attachment 6.

**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 the certain conditions. An addendum to Manual 18 provides guidance and an approval process. Submitted 2016 project lists contain six monitoring projects. See Attachment 5 for a table of regional monitoring projects. These projects also are submitted and included on lead entity and region project lists for board approval in Attachment 9 and included in the \$13.1 million allocation of salmon state and federal funding

**Intensively Monitored Watershed Projects:** In March 2014, the SRFB approved up to \$2 million a year, for three grant rounds, for restoration treatment projects in Intensively Monitored Watershed complexes. In 2015, \$1.83 million was available for these projects. This year, the third and final year, \$1.87 million was available. Some of the \$2 million was used to fund the actual monitoring. Three projects were submitted requesting \$1.53 million, shown in Attachment 4. The SRFB Review Panel evaluated all projects submitted by the lead entity. Because there is enough funding for all projects, the Intensively Monitored Watershed technical oversight committee will not need to prioritize the projects. Lead entities rank the projects on their lists only if they want to use their own allocation for the 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 2016 Grant Round**

In spring 2016, sponsors submitted 224 applications in PRISM, RCO's project database, for the 2016 grant cycle. Between April and June 2016, 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 project specifics, and provide feedback to the sponsor in a project comment form in order to improve the projects. The deadline for salmon grant applications was August 14, 2016. In total, 181 projects were submitted by the deadline and reviewed by RCO staff and the review panel.

Each regional area and corresponding lead entities prepared their respective ranked lists of salmon projects in consideration of the available funding.

Several lead entities also identified “alternate” projects on their lists. These projects must go through the entire lead entity, region, and board review process. Project alternates within a lead entity list may receive funds within 1 year from the original board funding decision, and only if another project on the funded portion of the list cannot be completed or is funded by another entity other than RCO.

## Guidance Manual

In February 2016, 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.

## PRISM Innovations

RCO’s moving outside users from PRISM 2007 to PRISM Online (a Web-based interface) continues and we are finalizing the move of two final pieces – Progress and Final Reports. Once those two features are implemented in January 2017, all of the required functions that are needed by sponsors will be available in PRISM Online. Sponsors will be able to enter and submit new applications, search for other projects, submit electronic billings, and complete required progress and final reporting requirements. RCO has received positive feedback on our efforts to improve PRISM for sponsors. Since electronic billings were implemented in March 2015, sponsors have submitted more than 4,700 bills and RCO has paid every bill in less than 30 days.

Another new feature that we recently developed is Salmon Project Ranked Lists. This feature was designed and built to support lead entities and regions submitting and ranking projects for SRFB approval. This new tool automated a complex workflow using Excel spreadsheets that were prone to errors.

During the next 6 months, RCO has plans to enhance the PRISM tool for completing interim, final, and compliance inspections (Compliance Workbench) of the properties and sites acquired and restored. RCO staff have been using the compliance workbench for several years and have ideas for enhancing the tool to make it more useful to staff in the field.



## **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. Review panel biographies are in Attachment 2.

The SRFB Review Panel helps the board meet the requirements of the PCSRF 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 meeting these criteria and will be forwarded to the SRFB for funding consideration unless the lead entity withdraws the application. The review panel does not otherwise rate, score, or rank projects. Members of the panel also are available to review project designs to satisfy project conditions or at staff request.

### **Project Review Process**

The review panel worked throughout the year reviewing projects both before and after the application deadline. This review helps lead entities and sponsors improve 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 K, and is Attachment 3 in this report. The panel based its evaluations and comments on the following:

- Early project site visits and consultations.
- Attendance at some local technical and citizens committee project evaluation and ranking processes used by lead entities and regional organizations.
- Application materials submitted by lead entities and regional organizations.
- Discussions with lead entities, project sponsors, and regional organizations during the regional area project meetings October 24-25, 2016.

As with past rounds, the 2016 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, 2016, 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 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, 181 final applications were submitted by August 12, 2016 for funding consideration. The review panel reviewed all final applications and responses to early comments. The panel then met from September 19-21 to discuss final project proposals and responses to applications. Review panel updated project comment forms with post-application

comments by September 30. 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 forwarded as recommended for funding received a status of "Clear." Some applications still lacked sufficient information to complete the technical review and received 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, 2016. The panel reviewed additional information, responses to comments, and cleared projects if possible by October 19, 2016. Projects with a remaining "Project of Concern" status were invited to the regional area project meetings to discuss the project issues in detail with the panel. The purpose of the regional area project meetings is to have regions present an overview of their recovery programs' goals and objectives, how the project lists achieve these goals, and their processes for project selection. It is also the opportunity for the lead entities and project sponsors to discuss any project issues identified with the review panel.

After the regional area project meetings, the review panel evaluated all projects by the review criteria to determine if any had low benefit to salmon, low certainty of being successful, or were not cost-effective. Projects that did not clearly meet one or more of these SRFB criteria were identified as "Projects of Concern." Lead entities and regional organizations received the panel determinations by November 4, 2016. The table of all projects grouped by lead entity is found in Attachment 9.

## Projects of Concern

After the regional area meetings, the review panel labeled 7 projects as "Projects of Concern." Only two projects of concern were submitted on ranked lists. Three were withdrawn, one was Conditioned, and one was re-scoped to a design project. The board will review and decide on the two remaining "Projects of Concern". Comment forms for "Projects of Concern" can be found in Attachment 8.

**Table 3. Project Status**

Lead Entity	Projects Reviewed Early Site Visits	Projects Submitted by Due Date	Projects Withdrawn After Review	"Projects of Concern" September	"Need More Information" September	Final "Projects of Concern"
Chehalis Basin County Lead Entity	7	3	4	0	0	0
Green, Duwamish, and Central Puget Sound Watershed (WRIA 9) Lead Entity	7	4	3	1	0	0

Lead Entity	Projects Reviewed Early Site Visits	Projects Submitted by Due Date	Projects Withdrawn After Review	"Projects of Concern" September	"Need More Information" September	Final "Projects of Concern"
Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity	26	23	3	3	6	0
Island County Lead Entity	5	5	0	1	0	0
Kalispel Tribe-Pend Oreille Lead Entity	3	2	1	0	1	0
Klickitat County Lead Entity	3	3	0	1	0	0
Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8) Lead Entity	4	3	1	0	2	0
Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity	23	21	2	3	2	0
Nisqually River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity	12	10	2	1	0	0
North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity for Salmon	9	6	3	2	1	0
North Pacific Coast Lead Entity	3	2	1	0	0	0
Pacific County Lead Entity	2	2	0	0	0	0
Pierce County Lead Entity	9	8	1	0	4	0
Quinault Indian Nation Lead Entity	2	2	0	0	0	0
San Juan County Community Development Lead Entity	6	5	1	2	0	1
Skagit Watershed Council Lead Entity	9	8	1	0	2	0
Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity	12	11	1	1	1	0
Snohomish Basin Lead Entity	10	10	0	1	3	1
Stillaguamish River Salmon Recovery Co-Lead Entity	9	5	4	0	3	0

Lead Entity	Projects Reviewed Early Site Visits	Projects Submitted by Due Date	Projects Withdrawn After Review	"Projects of Concern" September	"Need More Information" September	Final "Projects of Concern"
Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity	15	14	1	1	2	0
West Sound Watersheds Council Lead Entity	20	11	9	0	2	0
WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity	16	15	1	1	3	0
WRIA 13 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee	8	8	1	1	2	0
WRIA 14 Salmon Habitat Recovery Committee	10	7	3	0	0	0
Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board Lead Entity	15	9	6	4	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>2</b>

The number of projects submitted in 2016 was within the range submitted during the past several years. The percentage of "Projects of Concern" is similar to that of the past several grant rounds. The interaction with the review panel and the feedback to sponsors 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, technically sound projects submitted to the SRFB for funding.

**Table 4. "Projects of Concern" 2004-2016**

Grant Round	Eligible Projects Submitted	"Projects of Concern"					
		Draft, Flagged "Need More Information" or "Projects of Concern"		October		Final Report Nov. 18, 2016	
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%

Grant Round	Eligible Projects Submitted	"Projects of Concern"					
		Draft, Flagged "Need More Information" or "Projects of Concern"		October		Final Report Nov. 18, 2016	
2011	177	21		27	15%	1	0.6%
2012	175	35		35	20%	1	0.68%
2013	192	32		15	8%	0	0
2014	185	33		10	5%	2	1%
2015	181	47		12	7%	1	.55%
2016	197	47		16	9%	2	1%

The 2016 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 8, 2016. A regional organization or lead entity had to decide by that date whether to leave a "Project of Concern" on its list and have the SRFB consider it for funding in December. However, if a "Project of Concern" is left on the list and a convincing case is not made to the SRFB that the project merits funding, that dollar amount will not remain in the target allocation. If lead entities withdraw a "Project of Concern" before the funding meeting, alternates may be considered for funding.

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

### "Conditioned" Projects

The review panel labeled 20 projects as "Conditioned" because it felt the projects needed to meet specific conditions to satisfy the SRFB's benefit, certainty, and cost-effectiveness criteria. Attachment 7 contains a summary of the "Conditioned" projects and their review panel condition.

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 that otherwise meet the SRFB evaluation criteria can proceed to 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.

Last year, the review panel worked with RCO grants managers to develop and launch a condition tracking application in SharePoint. This tracking application 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 review the sponsor's responses to the condition. The new application makes it easy to track the status of each

condition and provides RCO with documentation that each year's batch of 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 for salmon funding and to submit a portfolio of PSAR projects. Sometimes, when projects were withdrawn because of a "Project of Concern" designation or because they 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 or update their ranked lists. Applicants working through the lead entity and region could make adjustments in project costs (if warranted) up through November 8. Those adjustments are defined as:

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

## **Observations from the SRFB Review Panel**

As in past years, the review panel supported RCO grants managers and the SRFB by reviewing all proposals for SRFB funding to ensure that they met the board's minimum criteria for benefit to salmon recovery, certainty of successful implantation, and cost effectiveness. During 2016, the panel reviewed 224 proposals at the "pre-application" stage, traveling to each region 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 are working in that lead entity.

The office presentations and field visits generated lively and engaged discussions in which strengths and weaknesses of each proposal were identified and discussed and improvements suggested. Usually, lead entity staff 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 staff frequently use our reviews not only to improve their project portfolios, but 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 for review panel members, it is a productive 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. Most of these have been described in funding reports from previous years; 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 2016 funding cycle.

### PSAR Biennial Funding Portfolio

This year lead entities in the Puget Sound region were directed to prepare project proposals for assembling into a regional project portfolio for consideration for legislative funding during the 2017-19 Biennium. One inevitable result of this effort to proactively look 3 years ahead was that the review panel found itself reviewing a larger than usual number of proposals that lacked adequate technical foundation. Manual 18 rules allow proposals for PSAR large capital funding to be submitted before completing final designs, and several proposals took advantage of this rule to be included in the regional portfolio. The review panel spent disproportionate time working with sponsors to clarify project objectives and (when available) their preliminary designs, and ended up “conditioning” several of these projects for future design review, which will entail additional time and expense for the review panel in the coming 2 years. Several Hood Canal Coordinating Council projects that were identified in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer’s Skokomish General Investigation process were the highest profile examples of this trend, but similar situations played out with other Puget Sound lead entities as well.

### Floodplains by Design Cost Match Proposals

This year several proposals requested SRFB funding to provide match for proposed Floodplains by Design projects. The review panel worked with sponsors to try to steer the proposed project objectives to comply with Manual 18 eligibility criteria, namely that the primary focus of the work must benefit salmon recovery objectives, rather than a secondary benefit, such as flood risk management. The combined Floodplains by Design/SRFB proposals showed a wide range of proposed benefit to salmon recovery, from projects with clearly defined habitat restoration objectives in high priority river reaches, to ones with a primary focus on flood risk management and only weak or even implausible salmon recovery benefit. In particular, some proposals had difficulty reconciling SRFB’s theme of restoring natural habitat-forming fluvial processes with the common flood risk management priority of controlling river flows. The review panel anticipates a continuing trend of sponsors seeking SRFB funding as cost match for Floodplains by Design projects, and we hope that the sponsors and lead entities will do so only when their proposed projects will make a significant contribution to accomplishing their local and regional salmon recovery plans.

### Invasive Weed Eradication Projects

In 2016 as in previous years, the review panel continued to see proposals for eradicating knotweed and other non-native invasive plants in riparian areas. 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 many of these proposals continue to straddle the limit of eligibility.

We felt that some of this year's proposals more accurately represented on-going, 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 define SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time bound) objectives that we hope will help guide these projects to clear benefits to salmon. For example, the panel worked with a Nisqually lead entity sponsor to "clear" the first yellow flag iris eradication project that will be funded by SRFB, making sure that it provided clear and substantial benefits to achieving salmon recovery objectives. Treating yellow flag iris is typically a project type that we would expect a local weed control entity to address. However, in this case, the project sponsor was able to demonstrate site-specific circumstances that justified SRFB funding. Specifically, the SRFB already had made significant salmon habitat investment in this high priority tributary of the Nisqually watershed, which would be compromised by the severe infestation if left unchecked. The sponsor has strategically selected Ohop Creek drainage for its high priority value to recovering Nisqually Chinook salmon and has demonstrated a systematic, top-down approach for treating the entirety of the drainage. The sponsor will be able to get to maintenance control within the 4-year grant period and has provided assurances that any future maintenance needed can be accomplished without additional SRFB funds.

### **In-Stream Flow Augmentation Projects**

Likewise as in previous years, 2016 had several proposals for augmenting in-stream flows through projects involving such actions as promoting water conservation by piping irrigations ditches or purchasing senior water rights and placing them in trust for in-stream flows. In-stream flow augmentation was a particular priority this year for the mid-Columbia region, where some excellent projects were proposed for innovative actions at strategic locations. The North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity proposed a large off-line reservoir project, which potentially will result in a significant improvement in late summer flows in the Dungeness River.

However, not all water conservation projects necessarily will result in significant benefit to achieving salmon recovery objectives. The panel continues to emphasize that in-stream flow augmentation actually must make a measurable improvement in correcting limiting factors at high priority river reaches that are identified in the local recovery plans, at the time of the year relevant to the targeted salmon life histories. The panel determined that two of this year's in-stream flow augmentation projects were "Projects of Concern" because they would not result in these standards of benefit.

### **Monitoring and Adaptive Management**

The SRFB Monitoring Panel reviewed the SRFB's monitoring portfolio and made specific recommendations for each component of the monitoring program (i.e. Intensively Monitored Watersheds, Project Effectiveness Monitoring, and Status and Trends Fish Monitoring). The panel's recommendations were presented to the SRFB in September; a copy of the panel's

report can be found at: <http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/monitoring/SRFB-MonitoringPanelRecommendations2016.pdf>

In addition to the monitoring panel review of the Intensively Monitored Watersheds program overall, individual Intensively Monitored Watersheds' restoration treatment projects were reviewed by the SRFB Review Panel to bring a fuller suite of restoration expertise to bear in review of these projects (hydrogeomorphology, engineering, and fish and watershed ecology). In 2016 and in past years, the lead entity or region has provided certification about a restoration project's fit to the Intensively Monitored Watersheds study in all watersheds with an Intensively Monitored Watersheds. In 2017, this certification will come from the lead scientists overseeing these studies, the western Washington Intensively Monitored Watersheds Technical Oversight Committee and the principal investigator for the Asotin Intensively Monitored Watersheds. If the SRFB approves dedicated funds for Intensively Monitored Watersheds restoration treatments in 2017, the technical oversight committee will prepare a ranked list of projects for the SRFB's consideration.

Regional monitoring projects were an eligible project type again in 2016 and were reviewed by the monitoring panel (rather than the technical review panel) on the same schedule as restoration, acquisition, and planning projects. Regional monitoring projects have a more streamlined review process than do the other SRFB-funded projects: a field visit is not conducted and projects are assigned a status without the dialogue between panelists and project sponsors that is typical of other SRFB-funded projects. This requires a more detailed proposal and a well-designed study plan to evaluate the merit of the proposal. Five projects were submitted as regional monitoring projects across four regions.

The monitoring panel continues to work with the SRFB Monitoring Subcommittee to advance the SRFB's adaptive management framework. Adaptive management will be a focal point for the SRFB's winter retreat and a subset of monitoring panel members are providing materials to support the board's discussion at the retreat.

### **Watershed Funding Allocations and Strategic Benefit**

Finally, the review panel continues to struggle with reconciling its charge of ensuring that each project will result in high benefit to recovering salmon – whether Endangered Species Act-listed stocks or non-listed priority populations, depending on each individual region's recovery plans – with being mindful of the social objectives of the Washington Salmon Recovery Act. In particular, we find that the annual funding allocations among the various Puget Sound region lead entities tend to result in incentives for individual lead entities to propose less-strategic, lower benefit projects for meeting the local salmon recovery priorities within their own watersheds, as compared with the broader goal of recovering Endangered Species Act-listed Puget Sound Chinook salmon within the region as a whole.

By comparison, the lower Columbia, mid-Columbia, upper Columbia and Snake regions maintain more flexibility to evaluate and rank each year's projects within the context of the entire region's recovery objectives. These regions have developed processes for scoring and ranking the suite of proposals from each of their several watersheds without the rigid framework of annual watershed funding allocations. Their processes are both technically robust and socially

acceptable from the standpoint of the Salmon Recovery Act's community buy-in objectives. During some years a particular watershed may not propose high benefit projects and would not receive funding. Another year that watershed might propose several high benefit projects and receive a large share of the region's funding. In the review panel's experience, in the long run this kind of flexibility tends to result in more strategic projects while still achieving the Act's important community buy-in objectives.

The review panel feels that the Puget Sound region's PSAR large capital project funding process is analogous to the processes that are used by other regions across the state. Regional technical reviewers evaluate and rank each proposed project's benefit in the context of the entire Puget Sound region and then PSP's Salmon Recovery Council completes final ranking and approval of the project list. On the other hand, regular PSAR and SRFB-funded projects continue to be evaluated and ranked at the watershed level, compared only with other projects within the same watershed. The review panel feels that it would be worthwhile for the SRFB to consider working with policy-makers at the state level to explore changing the current watershed allocation-based approach to project funding within the Puget Sound region to an approach more similar to PSAR large capital projects – or to the several other models used in the other salmon recovery regions – that could produce more strategic and consistently higher-benefit projects, while continuing to support the Act's social goals.

## Noteworthy Projects

As in previous years, a small percentage of 2016's proposals have the potential to result in large-scale actions that will make significant contributions to implementing the local or regional salmon recovery plans. This year's "noteworthy" proposals include:

**Table 5. Noteworthy Projects**

Project Number and Name	Sponsor Lead Entity Region	Goal	Phase/Funding
<a href="#">16-1496</a> U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Skokomish Ecosystem Restoration Support 1	Mason Conservation District	Acquisition and design support for implementation of the corps Skokomish General Investigation projects. One of a series of interrelated projects in the large, complex program.	Part of the local 35% cost share for the Corps project.
<a href="#">16-1901</a> Klickitat Canyon Conservation	Columbia Land Trust	Acquire and protect a large, high priority reach of the lower Klickitat River	Phase 2. Phase 1 is funded by the USFS Legacy program
<a href="#">16-1567</a> Gosnell Creek Large Woody Materials and Riparian Enhancement	Mason Conservation District	Restore 1 mile of a high priority reach: via livestock fencing, large wood installation, and riparian planting over 7 acres.	Design and construct concurrent with CREP implementation.

Project Number and Name	Sponsor Lead Entity Region	Goal	Phase/Funding
<a href="#">16-2094</a> Tucannon River PA 28 Phase 2 Habitat Restoration Project	Columbia Conservation District	Second phase of a large-scale levee setback and in-stream habitat enhancement project on private land. Builds on years of cooperation and trust with local farm owners.	Second of three construction phases
<a href="#">16-1559</a> Mid-Spencer Island Estuary Restoration	Snohomish County Public Works Department	Cost-effective expansion of a previous marsh channel restoration project in the strategic Snohomish Delta.	Construction, supplementing previous project work.
<a href="#">16-1760</a> Upper Yakima Tributary Flow Restoration	Trout Unlimited, Inc.	Design and construct innovative irrigation canal modifications to bypass water to flow-limited salmon creeks on a real-time, as-needed basis	Construction, expands on previous funded project work.
<a href="#">16-1318</a> Leque Island Estuary Restoration Project	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Construction of a long-planned dike breaching project to restore estuary processes on 250 acres of department-owned land in the Stillaguamish delta.	Construction, after years of studies and community engagement

## 2016 Recommendations

### Summary of Recommendations for Improving Project Implementation

The following is a summary of key recommendations to the SRFB based on the general observations for the 2016 grant round.

- Work with the state policy-makers to explore changing the current watershed allocation-based approach to project funding in the Puget Sound region to an approach more similar to PSAR large capital projects – or the several other models used in the other salmon recovery regions – that could produce more strategic and consistently higher-benefit projects, while continuing to support the Act’s social goals.
- RCO and the SRFB Monitoring Panel should continue to look for opportunities for project sponsors to easily use existing monitoring data for project development and adaptive management.

### Manual 18 Updates

The review panel does not have any recommendations for Manual 18 policy revisions this year. As a “housekeeping” measure, the panel will work with RCO staff to clarify the “Project Eligibility” text (Section 2) with regard to the requirement for completing a preliminary design before a restoration project will be eligible for funding. We are finding that the current trigger of a \$250,000 project budget can lead to arbitrary decisions, and believe that a more nuanced set of criteria that address the underlying interests of liability and risk management may be more

appropriate. The panel also will work with RCO staff to clarify the process for reviewing and prioritizing restoration projects in Intensively Monitored Watersheds.

### **In Memoria**

The review panel expresses our gratitude and esteem for Rich Geiger, who passed away this summer. Rich was a champion for salmon recovery efforts in the Puget Sound and Hood Canal regions, providing conservation districts, tribes, and regional fisheries enhancement groups with engineering and project management leadership since the early 2000s. He was instrumental in accomplishing dozens of high profile projects from the Jimmy Come Lately Creek restoration to the Nalley Farm/Skokomish Estuary Restoration to guiding the sprawling U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Skokomish General Investigation from inception to the threshold of project implementation. Rich also mentored younger colleagues, who are now taking leading roles in salmon recovery, and was an admired and loved colleague to the entire Puget Sound salmon recovery community. We miss Rich and will try to follow his example as we carry on.



## Part 3 – Region Summaries

### Introduction

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

Regional organizations were required to respond to questions regarding their:

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

Lead entities were asked to:

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

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

### How is the Regional Review Process Implemented?

SRFB staff concluded that processes in regional areas generally were consistent with the processes laid out in *Manual 18, Salmon Recovery Grants*, which, is informed by the Salmon Recovery Act.<sup>1</sup> This is based on the information from the regional responses (provided at the links below), application materials, and presentations to the review panel at the regional area meetings in October in Olympia. Staff notes that the pre-proposal meetings and 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.

---

<sup>1</sup>Revised Code of Washington 77.85

## Region Overview

- Hood Canal  
[www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional\\_Summary\\_Hood%20Canal.pdf](http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional_Summary_Hood%20Canal.pdf)
- Lower Columbia River  
[www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional\\_Summary\\_Lower\\_Columbia.pdf](http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional_Summary_Lower_Columbia.pdf)
- Middle Columbia River  
[www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional\\_Summary\\_Middle\\_Columbia.pdf](http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional_Summary_Middle_Columbia.pdf)
- Northeast Washington  
[www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional\\_Summary\\_Northeast.pdf](http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional_Summary_Northeast.pdf)
- Puget Sound  
[www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional\\_Summary\\_Puget%20Sound.pdf](http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional_Summary_Puget%20Sound.pdf)
- Snake River  
[www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional\\_Summary\\_Snake%20River.pdf](http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional_Summary_Snake%20River.pdf)
- Upper Columbia River  
[www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional\\_Summary\\_Upper\\_Columbia.pdf](http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional_Summary_Upper_Columbia.pdf)
- Washington Coast:  
[www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional\\_Summary\\_Coast.pdf](http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/salmon/Regional_Summary_Coast.pdf)

## Attachment 1 – 2016 Grant Schedule

Date	Action	Description
February 12	<b>Due Date:</b> 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 3 weeks before site visit <b>(required)</b>	<b>At least 3 weeks before the site visit</b> , applicants enter application materials through PRISM Online (See <a href="#">Draft Application Checklist</a> ). The lead entity will provide applicants with a project number from the Habitat Work Schedule <b>before</b> work can begin in PRISM Online.
February-June 30	Pre-application reviews and site visits <b>(required)</b>	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 <b>June 30, 2016</b> .
February-May	Application workshops <b>(on request)</b>	RCO staff holds an online application workshop. RCO can provide additional in-person trainings to lead entities upon request.
February-July 15	SRFB Review Panel completes initial project comment forms	About 2 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 <a href="#">Appendix C</a> project proposals (using Microsoft Word track changes).
August 12	<b>Due Date:</b> Applications due	Applicants submit final application materials, including attachments, via PRISM Online. See <a href="#">Final Application checklist</a> .
August 15	Lead entity submittals due	Lead entities submit draft ranked lists via PRISM Online.
August 15-26	RCO grants managers review	RCO screens all applications for completeness and eligibility.
August 26	Review panel post-application review	RCO grants managers forward project application materials to review panel members for evaluation.
September 7	<b>Due Date:</b> 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.
September 30	Project comment forms available for sponsors	RCO grants managers provide the review panel comment forms to lead entities and applicants. Projects will be identified with a status of <i>Clear</i> ,

Date	Action	Description
		<i>Conditioned, Need More Information (NMI), or Project of Concern (POC).</i>
October 13	<b>Due Date:</b> Response to project comment forms	Applicants with projects labeled <i>Conditioned, NMI</i> , or <i>POC</i> provide responses to review panel comments through revisions to project proposals in PRISM. If the applicant does not respond to comments by this date, RCO will assume the project was withdrawn from funding consideration.
October 19	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 <i>POCs</i> 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 <i>POCs</i> 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 8	<b>Due Date:</b> Lead entities submit final ranked lists	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 17	Final 2016 grant report available for public review	The final funding recommendation report is available online for SRFB and public review.
December 7-8	Board funding meeting	Board awards grants. Public comment period available.

---

**Attachment 2 – 2016 SRFB Review Panel Biographies**

---

**Michelle Cramer**, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia

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

**Kelley Jorgensen**, consultant, Ridgefield

Ms. Jorgensen is a senior watershed ecologist who brings over 25 years of private and public sector experience in applied watershed science and regulatory compliance to her current position managing the Plas Newydd Farm (PN Farm) Conservation Program. Kelley's current focus is the restoration of over 1,000 acres of Columbia River floodplain habitats including the development of the proposed Wapato Valley Wetland Mitigation and Habitat Conservation Bank. The Columbia River basin has been her focus for more than two decades, where she has worked on numerous restoration and development project teams, managing projects large and small involving field biology, watershed ecology, aquatic and terrestrial habitat restoration project development and site selection, restoration design, mitigation services, and environmental permitting and regulatory compliance. She has been on the SRFB Review Panel since 2007, and a member of the Lower Columbia FRB Technical Advisory Committee from 2000-2002, and 2007-present. She was an officer and Board of Director for River Restoration Northwest 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 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 certifies him as a fisheries professional. He has worked extensively throughout Puget Sound estuarine and nearshore environments on restoration and projection planning and design projects. He has 19 years of experience working on salmon recovery, habitat restoration, and salmon ecology projects. He holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in environmental sciences from the University of Virginia and a Master of Science degree in fisheries from the University of Washington.

**Tom Slocum**, PE, Mount Vernon

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

**Steve Toth**, consulting geomorphologist, Seattle

Mr. Toth is a licensed engineering geologist with more than 25 years of experience working in forestlands 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 – 2016 SRFB Review Panel Evaluation Criteria**

The following criteria is from Appendix H in Manual 18.

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

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

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

The SRFB Review Panel uses the SRFB Individual Comment Form to capture its comments on individual projects. To download a template of the comment form, visit the RCO Web Site at [www.rco.wa.gov/doc\\_pages/app\\_materials.shtml#salmon](http://www.rco.wa.gov/doc_pages/app_materials.shtml#salmon).

When a project of concern is identified, the sponsor will receive a comment form identifying the evaluation criteria on which the status was determined. Prior to the regional area meetings, the regional recovery organization that represents the area in which the project is located<sup>1</sup> can contact the review panel chair if there are further questions. At the regional area meetings there is opportunity for the review panel to discuss project issues and work with the regional recovery organization and representative from regional technical team advisors to determine if the issues can be resolved before the list of “Projects of Concern” is presented to the SRFB.

### **Criteria**

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

1. It is unclear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing. For acquisition projects, this criterion relates to the lack of a clear threat if the property is not acquired.
2. Information provided or current understanding of the system, is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of, the project.
  - A. Incomplete application or proposal.
  - B. Project goal or objectives not clearly stated; or do not address salmon habitat protection or restoration.

---

<sup>1</sup>For Puget Sound, this will be the Puget Sound Regional Implementation Technical Team chair.

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

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

17. The project does not clearly lead to project design or does not meet the criteria for filling a data gap.
18. The project does not appear to be coordinated with other efforts in the watershed; or does not use appropriate methods and protocols.

## Attachment 4 –Intensively Monitored Watershed Treatment Project List Submitted August 2016

Total Available \$1,830,000

Total Request \$1,529,210

Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB	
				Request	Funding
	<a href="#">16-1477</a>	Big Beef Creek Restoration Phase 3 Construction	Hood Canal SEG	\$229,840	\$229,840
Total Funded:					\$229,840

North Olympic Peninsula Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB	
				Request	Funding
	<a href="#">16-1427</a>	Strait of Juan de Fuca Restoration Project	Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe	\$600,546	\$600,546
Total Funded:					\$600,546

Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity					
Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB	
				Request	Funding
	<a href="#">16-1533</a>	Sarah Creek Habitat & Passage Enhancement	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	\$698,824	\$698,824
Total Funded:					\$698,824

## Attachment 5 – Regional Monitoring Project List Submitted August 2016

## Klickitat County Lead Entity

Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB	
				Request	Funding
	<a href="#">16-2111</a>	Assess Salmonid Recolonization 2017 WS River	Mid-Columbia RFEG	\$86,000	\$86,000
Total Funded:					\$86,000

## Pierce County Lead Entity

Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB	
				Request	Funding
	<a href="#">16-1507</a>	Puyallup River Juvenile Salmon Assessment Project	Puyallup Tribe of Indians	\$58,825	\$58,825
Total Funded:					\$58,825

## San Juan County Community Development

Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB	
				Request	Funding
	<a href="#">16-1672</a>	Evaluating Causes of Decline of Pacific Herring	Puget Sound Institute	\$165,448	\$165,448
Total Funded:					\$165,448

## Snake River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity

Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB	
				Request	Funding
	<a href="#">16-2101</a>	Asotin Intensively Monitored Watershed Monitoring YR10	Asotin County Conservation District	\$86,000	\$86,000
Total Funded:					\$86,000

## Upper Columbia Lead Entity

Rank	Number	Name	Sponsor	SRFB	
				Request	Funding
	<a href="#">16-1783</a>	Spring Chinook Survival in Lake Wenatchee	Chelan County Natural Resources	\$140,000	\$140,000
	<a href="#">16-1797</a>	Methow Bull Trout Population Status Evaluation	Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation	\$75,472	\$75,472
Total Funded:					\$215,472

## PUGET SOUND PARTNERSHIP

2016 December (Ranked List is in "Draft" status) Number of Projects: 18

Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	PSAR Large Cap Request	Total Funding
	1	<a href="#">16-1372</a> <a href="#">Rst</a>	Clallam Co Community Dev Lower Dungeness Floodplain Restoration	\$3,000,000.00	\$500,000.00	\$3,000,000.00	\$3,500,000.00
	2	<a href="#">16-1899</a> <a href="#">Rst</a>	King County Lower Russell Levee Setback & Habitat Restoration	\$10,255,524.00	\$5,217,506.00	\$10,255,524.00	\$15,473,030.00
	3	<a href="#">16-1318</a> <a href="#">Rst</a>	Dept of Fish & Wildlife Leque Island Estuary Restoration Construction	\$6,630,991.00	\$375,000.00	\$6,630,991.00	\$7,005,991.00
	4	<a href="#">16-2163</a> <a href="#">Rst</a>	City of Kent Downey Farmstead Side Channel Restoration	\$4,835,743.00	\$853,366.00	\$4,835,743.00	\$5,689,109.00
	5	<a href="#">16-1497</a> <a href="#">Rst</a>	Mason Conservation Dist USACE Skokomish Ecosystem Restoration Support 2	\$6,441,322.00	\$1,208,916.00	\$6,441,322.00	\$7,650,238.00
	6	<a href="#">16-1431</a> <a href="#">Acq</a>	Whidbey Camano Land Trust Pearson Shoreline	\$1,250,000.00	\$1,016,875.00	\$1,250,000.00	\$2,266,875.00
	7	<a href="#">16-2053</a> <a href="#">Rst</a>	Nooksack Indian Tribe NF Nooksack (Xwqélém) Farmhouse Ph 4 Restoration	\$3,304,422.00	\$33,500.00	\$3,304,422.00	\$3,337,922.00
	8	<a href="#">16-1579</a> <a href="#">Rst</a>	Squaxin Island Tribe West Oakland Bay Restoration	\$3,225,750.00	\$569,250.00	\$3,225,750.00	\$3,795,000.00
	9	<a href="#">16-1365</a> <a href="#">Acq</a>	Pierce County Surface Water Clear Creek Targeted Acquisition	\$6,400,000.00	\$1,600,000.00	\$6,400,000.00	\$8,000,000.00
	10	<a href="#">16-1479</a> <a href="#">Rst</a>	North Olympic Salmon Coalition Kilisut Harbor Restoration 2016	\$4,093,665.00	\$750,000.00	\$4,093,665.00	\$4,843,665.00
	11	<a href="#">16-2062</a> <a href="#">Rst</a>	City of Bellingham Middle Fork Nooksack Fish Passage	\$10,904,369.00	\$1,924,300.00	\$10,904,369.00	\$12,828,669.00
**12	<a href="#">16-1429</a> <a href="#">Acq</a>	Whidbey Camano Land Trust Barnum Point Acquisition	\$2,186,728.00	\$4,446,360.00	\$1,949,856.00	\$6,633,088.00	
**13	<a href="#">16-1651</a> <a href="#">Rst</a>	Skagit County Public Works Hansen Creek Reach 5 Restoration	\$3,681,245.00	\$649,631.00	\$1,377,109.00	\$4,330,876.00	
	14	<a href="#">16-2114</a> <a href="#">Rst</a>	Suquamish Tribe Chico Bridge - Keta restore	\$3,441,400.00	\$400,000.00	\$3,441,400.00	\$3,841,400.00
	15	<a href="#">16-1370</a> <a href="#">Pln</a>	Clallam Conservation Dist Dungeness Off-Channel Reservoir: Final Design	\$1,250,000.00	\$225,000.00	\$1,250,000.00	\$1,475,000.00
	16	<a href="#">16-2045</a> <a href="#">Acq</a>	Whatcom Land Trust Upper SF and Tributaries Corridor Acquisition	\$1,872,911.00	\$330,514.00	\$1,872,911.00	\$2,203,425.00
	17	<a href="#">16-1377</a> <a href="#">Acq</a>	North Olympic Land Trust Morse Creek Riparian Conservation	\$1,107,550.00	\$195,450.00	\$1,107,550.00	\$1,303,000.00
	18	<a href="#">16-1619</a> <a href="#">Rst</a>	Kitsap County Harper Estuary Bridge Construction	\$2,469,844.00	\$575,000.00	\$2,469,844.00	\$3,044,844.00
Totals:				\$76,351,464.00	\$20,870,668.00	\$73,810,456.00	\$97,222,132.00

\*\* Note: Ranked projects #11 and #13 are requesting PSAR and Salmon funding.

## Attachment 7 – Conditioned Project Summary

### “Conditioned” Projects = 20

#### Grays Harbor County Lead Entity

- [16-1756](#) Middle Fork Hoquiam Tidal Habitat Restoration Design

**Condition:** The review panel conditions this project for panel review of the technical memo or design report that identifies the alternatives considered, including alternatives analysis and selection criteria and rationale, all supporting technical documents and proposed or selected alternative, prior to advancing preliminary design on any given alternative. The review panel will turn around comments to the sponsor in 30 days or less. Please account for this review timing in your project delivery schedule.

#### Hood Canal Coordinating Council Lead Entity

- [16-1487](#) Skokomish Valley Road Relocation Final Design

**Condition:** The review panel conditions this project for panel review of the preferred alternative, including all supporting documentation, prior to releasing funds to advance the preliminary design. The review panel will turn around comments to the sponsor in 30 days or less. Please account for this review timing in your project delivery schedule.

- [16-1481](#) Lower Big Quilcene Restoration Final Design

**Condition:** The review panel conditions this project for panel review of the preliminary design, including all required deliverables per Manual 18 for a preliminary design, prior to releasing funds to advance the final design. The review panel will turn around comments to the sponsor in 30 days or less. Please account for this review timing in your project delivery schedule.

#### Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity

- [16-1517](#) Baldwin Site Restoration Phase 2

**Condition:** The sponsor provided sufficient design documentation to support the review panels technical evaluation of the benefit and certainty of the upstream LWD treatments. Before RCO releases construction funding, the sponsor will provide equivalent design documentation for the downstream LWD treatments. The documentation will meet the minimum technical requirements in Manual 18, Appendix D-2. The review panel will review and approve the documentation prior to release of construction funding.

- [16-1557](#) Grays 3B Reconnect Design

**Condition:** This project is conditioned for review by the SRFB technical review panel to review and approve the preliminary project design prior to proceeding to the final design.

- [16-1515](#) Elkinton Property Stream Restoration

**Condition:** The project will follow the revised scope of work that was submitted to RCO on November 3, 2016. The design work will include but not be limited to surveying of the existing channel thalweg profile over the entire project reach and representative channel cross sections at locations where design elements will be located. The survey will include accurate documentation of typical low water, ordinary high water, and channel bank full water surface elevations (WSE). The design of LWD placement and other channel treatments will take these water surface elevations into account and they will be shown in the design drawings.

The sponsor will provide a draft of the design deliverables for the review panel to review at least one month before the final application date for a subsequent project construction grant. The final project deliverables will address the review panel's technical comments.

## Pacific County Lead Entity

- [16-1683](#) Lower Green Creek Restoration

**Condition:** The review panel conditions this project to remove from the project scope and budget the cost for replanting the same area planted using funds from SRFB project #10-1916. The original plantings were subsequently mowed by the previous landowner, is a compliance issue, and as such, is not eligible for SRFB funds.

- [16-2039](#) C-400 Church Road North River Barrier Correction

**Condition:** The review panel conditions this project for panel review and approval of the final design and all supporting technical documents per Manual 18, prior to releasing funds for construction. The Review Panel will turn around comments to the sponsor in 30 days or less. Please account for this review timing in your project delivery schedule.

## Pierce County Lead Entity

- [16-1457](#) South Prairie Creek Acquisition and Restoration-Decker

**Condition:** The review panel conditions this project for panel review of the conceptual design (30% design), technical memo or design report that identifies the alternatives considered, including alternatives analysis and selection criteria and rationale, all supporting technical documents and proposed or selected alternative, prior to advancing preliminary design on any given alternative. The review panel will turn around comments



to the sponsor in 30 days or less. Please account for this review timing in your project delivery schedule.

- [16-1545](#) Carbon Bridge Street Setback Preliminary Feasibility Report

**Condition:** The review panel conditions this project for review of the draft deliverables (technical memo or draft design report) that identifies the alternatives considered, including alternatives analysis and selection criteria and rationale, all supporting technical documents and proposed or selected alternative, prior to advancing preliminary design on any given alternative. In addition, the design of bank protection structures in front of the levee will be removed from the scope of work and not funded by the SRFB. The review panel will turn around comments to the sponsor in 30 days or less. Please account for this review timing in your project delivery schedule.

## Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Lead Entity

- [16-2092](#) Asotin Creek Riparian Protection Project

**Condition:** The sponsor will submit the preliminary design for the bridge and approach ramps to the review panel for review and approval to ensure that they minimize interference with natural floodplain processes, as described in the preapplication comments.

- [16-2098](#) Bridge to Bridge Restoration Phase 2

**Condition:** The Bridge-to-Bridge Restoration Project Phase 2 scope of work shall be expanded to include additional large wood with or without root wads to be placed in the main stem river between Stations 34+00 and 64+00. The wood can be placed in currently proposed apex and flow deflection jams to augment their size and stability. Alternatively, the larger meander jam or other existing designs could be adapted for different locations to create additional jams outside of the meander bend. The review panel recognizes that additional funds will be needed to procure more wood and to modify engineering designs. However, we feel that a combination of larger and more stable jams, as well as a higher number of jams in the main stem Walla Walla River will better address the fish habitat deficiencies within this reach of the river and mitigate for the channel filling and bank protection along the meander bend.

## Snohomish County Lead Entity

- [16-1632](#) South Fork Skykomish Acquisitions

**Condition:** The project is cleared for acquisition of the “Baring North” property. If the acquisition cannot be completed, the review panel will need to review the alternative property(ies) for consistency with the SRFB’s evaluation criteria.

## Stillaguamish River Salmon Recovery Lead Entity

- [16-1318](#) Leque Island Estuary Restoration Project

**Condition:** The sponsor included \$2 million in their budget for replacement lands to satisfy a conversion with USFWS. RCO determined that this cost is not eligible; however the sponsor requested a policy change for that decision. If final eligibility determination is not made prior to awarding funding for this project, the project agreement will not include the \$2 million and not allow the replacement property in the scope of the agreement.

## West Sound Watershed Council

- [16-1596](#) Finn Creek Restoration Project

**Condition:** The review panel conditions this project for panel review of the technical memo or design report that identifies the alternatives considered, including alternatives analysis and selection criteria and rationale, all supporting technical documents and proposed or selected alternative, prior to advancing preliminary design on any given alternative. The review panel will turn around comments to the sponsor in 30 days or less. Please account for this review timing in your project delivery schedule.

- [16-1462](#) Huge Creek Fish Passage Design at 160<sup>th</sup> Street Northwest

**Condition:** The review panel conditions this project for panel review of the preliminary design and all supporting technical documents, prior to advancing to final design. The review panel will turn around comments to the sponsor in 30 days or less. Please account for this review timing in your project delivery schedule.

- [16-1631](#) Fleming Fish Passage and Restoration

**Condition:** The review panel conditions this project for panel review of the technical memo or design report that identifies the alternatives considered, including alternatives analysis, selection criteria and rationale, all supporting technical documents, and proposed or selected alternative, prior to advancing preliminary design on any given alternative. The review panel will turn around comments to the sponsor in 30 days or less. Please account for this review timing in your project delivery schedule.

## WRIA 8

- [16-1213](#) Lower Taylor Creek Restoration Project Design

**Condition:** The project is conditioned for review panel review and acceptance of the preliminary design deliverable, as specified in Manual 18 Appendix D-2, before funds will be disbursed for subsequent design tasks.

## WRIA 13

- [16-1408](#) Spurgeon Creek Remeander

**Condition:** The project is conditioned for review panel review and acceptance of the preliminary design deliverables, as specified in Manual 18 Appendix D-2, before funds will be disbursed for subsequent tasks.

## Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board Lead Entity

- [16-1742](#) Upper Kachess River Assessment

**Conditioned:** The project sponsor will revise the scope of work to focus the assessment on the eastern portion of the floodplain because of the potential to increase or improve habitat conditions in tributary streams or by excavating historical flow paths of the Kachess River. The conceptual design budget element should be reduced by \$40,000 since the budget for the combined geomorphic/hydrologic/habitat assessment should be sufficient to develop conceptual designs.

## Attachment 8 – Project of Concern Summary

### Project of Concern: 2

#### San Juan County Community Development Lead Entity

- [16-1293](#) Zylstra Lower Lake Acquisition

**The project does not work towards restoring natural watershed processes or prohibits natural processes**

As commented previously, the proposal to acquire and maintain the lower lake impoundment is contradictory to salmon recovery efforts in the watershed as the impoundment reduces the length of potentially functional stream habitat, increases summer water temperatures, and is a barrier to fish. The 2016 water rights management report indicated that the storage volume of Lower Zylstra Lake was not necessary to provide the targeted base flows because the flows could be provided by the upper lake.

The review panel has additional concerns about the proposal. We are concerned about the quality of water from the lakes serving as the summer water supply to creek areas downstream. Given the surface release of water and the relatively shallow depths in the lake, it is foreseeable that summer water temperatures may be elevated. In such a situation, the water released to the creek during the summer could be much higher than optimal and therefore limit the suitability of the creek for salmon. The review panel is also concerned that the proposed flows included in the analysis will not be effective in providing functioning resident or anadromous salmonid habitat in the lower creek as 0.1 cfs may go subsurface in areas and create challenges for keeping invasive vegetation out of the channel.

#### Snohomish County Lead Entity

- [16-1741](#) South Fork Snoqualmie River Levee Setback

**It is unclear how the project will achieve its stated objectives.**

**It is unlikely that the project will achieve its stated objectives.**

The sponsor's presentation at the regional presentation meeting did not provide any additional analysis to convincingly demonstrate that the proposed levee setback would result in measurable improvements in hydrology and sediment transport processes, LWD recruitment or water quality, which would directly benefit ESA-listed salmonid habitat downstream of Snoqualmie Falls.

<b>Lead Entity:</b>	San Juan County Public Works
<b>Project Number:</b>	16-1293
<b>Project Name:</b>	Zylstra Lower Lake Acquisition
<b>Project Sponsor:</b>	San Juan Preservation Trust
<b>Grant Manager:</b>	Mike Ramsey

	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>Post-Application</b>	7/14/16	POC
<b>Final</b>	10/26/16	POC

### Project Summary (for Review Panel reference only)

The goal of this acquisition project is to purchase the 122 acre Zylstra Lower Lake parcel of the Zylstra Lake acquisition to protect natural habitat, water quality, water quantity and riparian vegetation in the False Bay Creek/San Juan Valley watershed for restoration of chum and coho salmon and anadromous trout populations. The lakes were formed in the 1960s when they were dammed. The Lower Lake parcel includes 11 acres of palustrine emergent wetlands and 6 acres of lacustrine wetlands. There is an upper lake on an adjacent property that is being acquired as part of a separate project and match for this purchase is being provided by a conservation easement on the October Farm Parcel also adjacent to the property. There are two dams on the two lakes that store water on the site. The goal of the project is to provide increased flow to maintain False Bay Creek as a perennial stream.

### FINAL REVIEW PANEL Comments

**Date:** October 26, 2016

**Final Project Status:** POC

**Review Panel Member(s):** Full Panel Review

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

7 – The project does not work towards restoring natural watershed processes or prohibits natural processes

As commented previously, the proposal to acquire and maintain the lower lake impoundment is contradictory to salmon recovery efforts in the watershed as the impoundment reduces the length of potentially functional stream habitat, increases summer water temperatures, and is a barrier to fish. The 2016 water rights management report indicated that the storage volume of Lower Zylstra Lake was not necessary to provide the targeted base flows because the flows could be provided by the upper lake.

The review panel has additional concerns about the proposal. We are concerned about the quality of water from the lakes serving as the summer water supply to creek areas downstream. Given the surface release of water and the relatively shallow depths in the lake, it is foreseeable that summer water temperatures may be elevated. In such a situation, the water released to the creek during the summer could be much higher than optimal and therefore limit the suitability of the creek for salmon. The review panel is also concerned that the proposed flows included in the analysis will not be effective in providing functioning resident or anadromous salmonid habitat in

1CLEAR: Cleared to proceed; CONDITIONED: Cleared to proceed with a condition; NMI: Needs More Information; POC: Project of Concern; NOTEWORTHY: Exemplary Project

the lower creek as 0.1 cfs may go subsurface in areas and create challenges for keeping invasive vegetation out of the channel.

## Post-Application REVIEW PANEL comments

**Date:** September 28, 2016

**Project Status:** POC

**Review Panel Member(s):** Full Panel Review

**\*\*\*NOTE: this is the second set of post-application comments provided. Please see below for the earlier post-application comments and site visit comments.\*\*\***

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

7 – The project does not work towards restoring natural watershed processes or prohibits natural processes

**2. If the project is a POC, identify the changes that would make this a technically sound project:**

As commented previously, the Lower Zylstra Lake site would work better towards restoring natural processes through the removal of the impoundment and rehabilitation of the channel or establishment of a wetland to store water and more naturally prolong the time frame over which water is flowing in the downstream creek reaches. Based on the analysis presented in the recent water rights management report to the Washington Water Trust, year-round flows could be provided to False Bay Creek without the storage volume in Lower Zylstra Lake. Therefore, the creek flow objectives for restoration of the creek are not dependent on the lower lake. The proposal to acquire and maintain the lower lake impoundment is contradictory to salmon recovery efforts in the watershed as the impoundment reduces the length of potentially functional stream habitat and is a barrier to fish.

Based on the information presented in Boyd Pratt's 2016 Zylstra Lake History document, specifically the 1960 Aerial photo of S20,T35N,R3W, the stream channel in the lower lake footprint had a sinuous alignment that added stream length with riparian cover. The removal of the impoundment of the lower lake would create the opportunity to re-establish a functional stream corridor, including a wide vegetated riparian corridor, through this area. In this way, removing the impoundment would provide additional habitat for fish use while also meeting the creek flow objectives.

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

**4. General comments:**

The review panel remains concerned about the quality of water from the lakes serving as the summer water supply to creek areas downstream (not marine areas). Releases of high temperature water to serve as the summer flow in the lower creek areas will limit the suitability of the creek for salmon. An analysis of anticipated creek water temperatures should be conducted to understand the potential water temperatures and the potential effectiveness of techniques to reduce temperatures, e.g., riparian shading and engineering of the upper lake outlet to release cooler deeper water.

**Date:** July 14, 2016**Project Status:** POC**Review Panel Member(s):** Full Panel**5. If the project is a POC, identify the SRFB criteria used to determine the status of the project:**

7 – The project does not work towards restoring natural watershed processes or prohibits natural processes

Acquiring and maintaining an artificial lake is contradictory to salmon recovery efforts to restore natural processes. The SRFB funding is not intended to protect habitat that has the long-term function of disruption of natural processes.

The review panel has additional concerns about the quality of water from the lakes serving as the summer water supply to the creek downstream. The water temperature of the lake affects the appropriateness of releases. Additional releases of high (above 20 degrees F) water may cause further risk to colder waters downstream in an already limited system. Riparian plantings for shading are being implemented to improve water quality and instream complexity downstream and adding high temperature flows with the potential for predator introduction would set the goals of these projects farther back.

**6. If the project is a POC, identify the changes that would make this a technically sound project:**

The Zylstra Lake site would work better towards restoring natural processes if rehabilitation of the channel or establishment of a wetland to store water and more naturally prolong the time frame over which water is flowing in the downstream creek reaches. However, based on the information provided in the application, the site was not historically a wetland and this may be an unsustainable feature.

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

The review panel appreciates the additional information provided by the project sponsor in response to earlier comments. Given the lack of wetlands on the site and the likely large construction effort necessary to restore the site if the lake was removed, the project is not appropriate for salmon restoration funding. In addition, any lake outlet adjustment to reduce the influence of the lake outlet structure would be assumed to result in more salmon interactions with warm water predators (e.g., bass) and warmer water temperatures.

**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:** May 4, 2016**Project Site Visit?**☒ Yes ☐ No**Review Panel Member(s):** Jen O’Neal and Paul Schlenger**1. Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB’s criteria:**

This project provides an opportunity to purchase a parcel of land in a watershed that is one of the largest on San Juan Island and is part of an overall strategy to protect most of the watershed in conservation. The efforts of the sponsor to coordinate across groups to achieve joint goals are recognized. The Review Panel supports the acquisition, but has strong reservations about the dams that are present at the site, and the proposed option to maintain or increase the height of the dams. In the interest of restoring natural processes and improving water quality conditions (e.g., temperature and dissolved oxygen) to downstream habitats, we would like to see the option to remove, or decrease the influence of the dams included in all considerations for long-term management of the property. Acknowledging that the goal of the project is to maintain flows during the low flow season, we would recommend that development of additional storage in wetland habitat at the site be considered and developed as a viable alternative.

This approach would also require management of invasive species such as bass and removal of those species from the project area. Maintaining the lower lake property for the preservation of recreation opportunities (swimming and fishing for bass) limits the benefits to salmon that can be gained from the acquisition of the parcel, and weakens the application for funding under the Salmon Recovery Funding Board. Further, fish passage into the lake may introduce salmon to a high predation risk area through spatial overlap with warm water predators.

We also recognize that there is a hydrology study being conducted that will shed some light on the flows in False Bay Creek and the need for additional water. The Review Panel would like to review the outcomes of that study and work with the sponsor to develop more process based alternatives that help meet the flow needs in the creek, but also provide greater benefits to salmon.

Please include information on the water rights included in the acquisition.

**2. Missing Pre-application information:**

Historic pre-1960s photos of the area would be helpful, particularly any aerial photos.

**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.



<b>Lead Entity:</b>	Snohomish
<b>Project Number:</b>	16-1741
<b>Project Name:</b>	South Fork Snoqualmie River Levee Setback
<b>Project Sponsor:</b>	City of North Bend
<b>Grant Manager:</b>	Josh Lambert

	Date	Status <sup>2</sup>
Post-Application	9/22/16	POC
Final	10/27/16	POC

### Project Summary (for Review Panel reference only)

The project will prepare conceptual designs for removing portions of 2,500 feet of existing levee, which will allow for improved hydraulic connection with a minimum of 25 acres of the South Fork Snoqualmie River floodplain. Plans include constructing a new setback levee along a dedicated right of way, allowing for construction of a new access road to a Nintendo factory and a trail connection to other city trail corridors. The Snoqualmie River is 303(d) listed for temperature, and restoration of canopy trees and vegetation along the shoreline will reduce some solar effects to the river and improve microclimate. These water quality improvements are intended to help resident fish and benefit water quality and hydraulic conditions for downstream salmonids. This project is above Snoqualmie Falls and, as such is above the andromous barrier for fish. The proposal identifies the project's primary objectives are hydrology and water quality benefits to downstream reaches that are used by chinook, coho, and other species.

### FINAL REVIEW PANEL Comments

**Date:** October 27, 2016

**Final Project Status:** POC

**Review Panel Member(s):** Review Panel

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

#8: it is unclear how the project will achieve its stated objectives

#9: it is unlikely that the project will achieve its stated objectives

The sponsor's presentation at the regional presentation meeting did not provide any additional analysis to convincingly demonstrate that the proposed levee setback would result in measurable improvements in hydrology and sediment transport processes, LWD recruitment or water quality, which would directly benefit ESA-listed salmonid habitat downstream of Snoqualmie Falls.

<sup>2</sup>CLEAR: Cleared to proceed; CONDITIONED: Cleared to proceed with a condition; NMI: Needs More Information; POC: Project of Concern; NOTEWORTHY: Exemplary Project

## Post-Application REVIEW PANEL comments

**Date:** September 22, 2016

**Project Status:** POC

**Review Panel Member(s):** Full panel

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

This project is of concern to the panel based on criteria #8:

Evaluation Criterion #8: It is unclear how the project, once constructed, will achieve its stated goal of helping to correct the habitat limiting factors of extreme high and low flows, excess sedimentation and reduced LWD recruitment in the Chinook spawning and rearing reaches of the Snoqualmie downstream of the dam and falls.

**10. If the project is a POC, identify the changes that would make this a technically sound project:**

Although additional information was provided by the project sponsor on the benefits of the project, the relative direct benefit to salmonids downstream of the barrier could not be substantiated with quantified information. Since the direct connection between benefits to salmonids and the actions of this project could not be substantially established, the project remains a Project of Concern for the panel. These types of actions have hydrologic benefit in a limited way, but are not high priority for current funding allocations.

The sponsor provided additional documentation from the Snohomish River Basin (WRIA7) Salmon Conservation Plan to justify the benefit of the proposed project. This material reflects a general strategic view that cumulatively restoring natural floodplain processes upstream of the falls will generally benefit downstream habitat conditions, but does not provide a scientifically-robust analysis of the actual benefit that this particular project likely will produce. The specific, direct effect that the project will likely have on flow attenuation, sediment transport and LWD recruitment in the targeted downstream rearing and spawning reaches has not been quantified, and is likely to be very small, given the size of the watershed and the large effect that the flow barrier at the dam and falls has on these habitat forming processes. A credible analysis that demonstrates direct benefit in achieving quantifiable project objectives would strengthen the certainty of the project.

### **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:** May 10, 2015

**Project Site Visit?**

☒ Yes ☐ No

**Review Panel Member(s):** Slocum and O'Neal

**3. Recommended improvements to make this a technically sound project according to the SRFB's criteria:**

The placement of this project effort above the anadromous barrier to salmon makes the benefits to salmon less direct than areas where fish can access the habitat affected by the project. Additional flow and sediment storage from the project would need to show a substantial effect on the current issues affecting wild fish downstream. The limiting factors identified in Section 5 for Chinook salmon identify water quality as an issue, and summer low flows, but do not identify fine sediment as an issue. Similarly, temperature is identified as being on the 303d list for this reach, but fine sediment is not. Further, storage of sediment will not likely reduce redd scour, it would likely increase the sediment transport capacity of the water in downstream reaches. Better linkage between the needs of salmon species and the benefits of this project are needed. In addition, due to the more indirect level of benefit, a significant effect on limiting factors would need to be shown in order to substantiate the cost of the project.

Please provide more description of how the proposed work at this site fits within the larger context of strategic floodplain restoration plans in the upper SF Snoqualmie. King County staff have reportedly completed preliminary hydrology and hydraulic modeling of levee setback opportunities along much of the upper SF Snoqualmie on a coarse scale, and did not identify this project site as a high priority. Are there site-specific conditions (e.g. hyporheic exchange, etc.) that make this particular site a higher priority for floodplain reconnection than the majority of other potential levee setback sites?

Please discuss opportunities for removing the creosote timber railroad trestle from the floodplain after setting back the levee. This action should be an integral part of habitat restoration efforts at the site.

**4. Missing Pre-application information.**

The budget needs additional detail for design elements.

**5. General Comments:**

The description of the project objectives needs further attention. The objectives listed in the pre-application are actually a listing of the scope of work tasks. Please review Manual 18 guidance on writing SMART objectives and revise this section in the final proposal.

**6. Staff Comments:**

Grant manager Salmon Application Review comments will be provided via email w/ attached pdf.



**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.

## REGION: HOOD CANAL/PUGET SOUND

Regional Allocation/Allotment:

\$1,390,093.00

\$0.00

Remaining:

\$0.00

(\$8,694,094.00) PSAR Request

### HOOD CANAL COORDINATING COUNCIL LEAD ENTITY

2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status) Number of Projects: 22

Salmon Allocation  
\$1,390,093.00

PSAR Allocation  
\$0.00

Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Proposed PSAR Funding	Total Funding
	1	<u>16-1496</u> <u>Plan.Acq</u>	Mason Conservation Dist USACE Skokomish Ecosystem Restoration Support 1	\$2,403,627.00	\$450,000.00	\$0.00	\$2,403,627.00	\$2,853,627.00
	2	<u>16-1482</u> <u>Rst</u>	Wild Fish Conservancy Dosewallips Floodplain & Estuary Restoration 2016	\$389,251.00	\$373,185.00	\$389,251.00	\$0.00	\$762,436.00
	3	<u>16-1480</u> <u>Plan.Acq</u>	Jefferson County Public Health Lower Big Quilcene Floodplain Acquisitions	\$202,926.00	\$35,811.00	\$202,926.00	\$0.00	\$238,737.00
	4	<u>16-1487</u> <u>Pln</u>	Mason Conservation Dist Skokomish Valley Road Relocation Final Design	\$804,350.00	\$141,950.00	\$0.00	\$804,350.00	\$946,300.00
	5	<u>16-1494</u> <u>Plan.Acq</u>	Hood Canal SEG Big Quilcene Moon Valley Acquisition and Planning	\$725,473.00	\$640,425.00	\$725,473.00	\$0.00	\$1,365,898.00
	6	<u>16-1492</u> <u>Acq</u>	Hood Canal SEG Duckabush Estuary Restoration Support Acquisition	\$164,670.00	\$247,005.00	\$29,436.00	\$135,234.00	\$411,675.00
	7	<u>16-1472</u> <u>Pln</u>	Hood Canal SEG Duckabush Oxbow Side Channel Restoration Design	\$25,398.00	\$0.00	\$25,398.00	\$0.00	\$25,398.00
	8	<u>16-1474</u> <u>Pln</u>	Hood Canal SEG Hood Canal Nearshore Forage Fish Assessment	\$17,609.00	\$42,170.00	\$17,609.00	\$0.00	\$59,779.00
	9	<u>16-1489</u> <u>Rst</u>	Mason Conservation Dist Southern Hood Canal Riparian Enhancement Phase 3	\$349,189.00	\$61,700.00	\$0.00	\$349,189.00	\$410,889.00
	10	<u>16-1473</u> <u>Plan.Rest</u>	North Olympic Salmon Coalition East Jefferson Summer Chum Riparian Phase 3	\$216,767.00	\$54,300.00	\$0.00	\$216,767.00	\$271,067.00
	11	<u>16-1476</u> <u>Rst</u>	Hood Canal SEG Hood Canal Summer Chum Riparian Enhancement	\$189,141.00	\$33,380.00	\$0.00	\$189,141.00	\$222,521.00
	12	<u>16-1481</u> <u>Pln</u>	Hood Canal SEG Lower Big Quilcene Restoration Final Design	\$784,500.00	\$378,257.00	\$0.00	\$784,500.00	\$1,162,757.00
	13	<u>16-1488</u> <u>Rst</u>	Mason Conservation Dist South Fork Skokomish LWD Enhancement Phase 5	\$2,167,054.00	\$382,422.00	\$0.00	\$2,167,054.00	\$2,549,476.00
	14	<u>16-1491</u> <u>Pln</u>	Mason Conservation Dist Vance Creek Watershed Restoration Assessment	\$417,350.00	\$73,650.00	\$0.00	\$417,350.00	\$491,000.00
	15	<u>16-1483</u> <u>Rst</u>	Mason Conservation Dist Lower Mainstem Skokomish LWD - RM 5	\$798,818.00	\$140,969.00	\$0.00	\$798,818.00	\$939,787.00
	17	<u>16-1484</u> <u>Plan.Rest</u>	Mason Conservation Dist Old Bourgault Farm Comprehensive Restoration Plan	\$60,992.00	\$11,000.00	\$0.00	\$60,992.00	\$71,992.00
	18	<u>16-1486</u> <u>Pln</u>	Mason Conservation Dist Skokomish River Local GI Project Development	\$198,184.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$198,184.00	\$198,184.00
Partial	19	<u>16-1495</u> <u>Acq</u>	Jefferson Land Trust Chimacum Creek Lower Mainstem Protection	\$107,000.00	\$26,080.00	\$0.00	\$18,149.00	\$44,229.00
	20	<u>16-1490</u> <u>Pln</u>	Hood Canal SEG Tahuya River Watershed Assessment	\$150,739.00	\$26,709.00	\$0.00	\$150,739.00	\$177,448.00
Alternate		<u>16-1477</u> <u>Rst</u>	Hood Canal SEG IMW Big Beef Creek Restoration Ph 3 Construction	\$209,729.00	\$37,011.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$37,011.00
		<u>16-1479</u> <u>Rst</u>	North Olympic Salmon Coalition Kilisut Harbor Restoration 2016	\$4,093,665.00	\$750,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,843,665.00
		<u>16-1497</u> <u>Rst</u>	Mason Conservation Dist USACE Skokomish Ecosystem Restoration Support 2	\$6,441,322.00	\$1,208,916.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7,650,238.00
Totals:				\$20,917,754.00	\$5,114,940.00	\$1,390,093.00	\$8,694,094.00	\$25,734,114.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	(\$8,694,094.00)	

\*\*\* North Olympic Peninsula is giving Hood Canal \$520,743 in SRFB funds this round that they used on their ranked list in the 2015 grant round. The allocations on the Ranked Lists on Attachment 9 reflect this.

## REGION: NORTHEAST WASHINGTON

Regional Allocation/Allotment: \$261,860.00  
 Remaining: \$0.00

### KALISPEL TRIBE-PEND OREILLE LEAD ENTITY

2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status) Number of Projects: 2

*Salmon Allocation*  
\$261,860.00

Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Total Funding
	1	<u>16-2013</u> <u>Rst</u>	Kalispel Tribe-Pend Oreille LE West Branch LeClerc Crib Dam Cultural Inventory	\$47,013.00	\$8,297.00	\$47,013.00	\$55,310.00
	2	<u>16-2104</u> <u>Rst</u>	Kalispel Tribe Ruby Creek Fish Passage Restoration	\$214,847.00	\$38,625.00	\$214,847.00	\$253,472.00
Totals:				\$261,860.00	\$46,922.00	\$261,860.00	\$308,782.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	

## REGION: LOWER COLUMBIA

Regional Allocation/Allotment: \$1,963,950  
 Remaining: \$0

### Klickitat County Lead Entity

2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status) Number of Projects: 3

*Salmon Allocation*  
\$480,197.00

*\*Lower Columbia gave \$98,197 to Klickitat*

Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Total Funding
	1	<u>16-2111</u> <u>Mon</u>	Mid-Columbia RFEG Assess Salmonid Recolonization 2017 WS River	\$48,020.00	\$16,812.00	\$48,020.00	\$64,832.00
	2	<u>16-1901</u> <u>Acq</u>	Columbia Land Trust Klickitat Canyon Conservation	\$343,800.00	\$112,671.00	\$343,800.00	\$456,471.00
	3	<u>16-1998</u> <u>Pln</u>	Klickitat County Lower Spring Creek Floodplain Reconnection Plan	\$88,377.00	\$59,500.00	\$88,377.00	\$147,877.00
Totals:				\$480,197.00	\$188,983.00	\$480,197.00	\$669,180.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	

*Note: Lower Columbia gave \$98,197 to Klickitat  
 Middle Columbia gave \$380,000 to Klickitat*

LOWER COLUMBIA FISH RECOVERY BOARD LEAD ENTITY						Salmon Allocation \$1,865,753.00		
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)      Number of Projects: 21								
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Total Funding	
	1	<u>16-1515</u> <u>Pln</u>	Wahkiakum Conservation Dist Elkinton Restoration Preliminary Design	\$67,000.00	\$0.00	\$67,000.00	\$67,000.00	
	2	<u>16-1668</u> <u>Pln</u>	Lower Columbia River FEG Coweeman Headwaters Design	\$97,316.00	\$0.00	\$97,316.00	\$97,316.00	
	3	<u>16-1517</u> <u>Rst</u>	Wahkiakum Conservation Dist Baldwin Site Restoration Phase 2	\$82,800.00	\$14,700.00	\$82,800.00	\$97,500.00	
	4	<u>16-1534</u> <u>Rst</u>	Cowlitz Indian Tribe Lower South Fork Grays River Restoration	\$599,638.00	\$500,000.00	\$599,638.00	\$1,099,638.00	
	5	<u>16-1532</u> <u>Rst</u>	Lower Columbia River FEG Kalama 1A Tidal Restoration	\$357,400.00	\$88,125.00	\$357,400.00	\$445,525.00	
	6	<u>16-1522</u> <u>Rst</u>	Cowlitz Conservation Dist Kalama Stream Restoration Project Gaddis	\$16,085.00	\$7,900.00	\$16,085.00	\$23,985.00	
	7	<u>16-1524</u> <u>Pln</u>	CREST Columbia- Pacific Passage, Hungry Harbor Design	\$185,952.00	\$0.00	\$185,952.00	\$185,952.00	
	8	<u>16-1520</u> <u>Rst</u>	Wahkiakum Conservation Dist Skamokawa Stream Restoration Project McClellan	\$161,200.00	\$32,000.00	\$161,200.00	\$193,200.00	
	9	<u>16-1694</u> <u>Rst</u>	Lower Columbia River FEG Toutle Confluence Riparian	\$247,576.00	\$43,690.00	\$247,576.00	\$291,266.00	
	Alternate	10	<u>16-1366</u> <u>Pln</u>	Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd Ridgefield Pits Restoration Assessment	\$215,600.00	\$41,680.00	\$0.00	\$41,680.00
		11	<u>16-1519</u> <u>Rst</u>	Wahkiakum Conservation Dist Elochoman Stream Restoration Cothren	\$50,786.00	\$169,514.00	\$50,786.00	\$220,300.00
	Alternate	12	<u>16-1516</u> <u>Rst</u>	Wahkiakum Conservation Dist Goldinov Site Restoration	\$308,900.00	\$59,500.00	\$0.00	\$59,500.00
Alternate	13	<u>16-1601</u> <u>Rst</u>	Lower Columbia River FEG Toutle River Confluence Restoration- Phase II	\$255,400.00	\$57,000.00	\$0.00	\$57,000.00	
Alternate	14	<u>16-1521</u> <u>Rst</u>	Cowlitz Conservation Dist Germany Creek Stream Restoration Godinho	\$148,500.00	\$26,500.00	\$0.00	\$26,500.00	
Alternate	15	<u>16-1381</u> <u>Pln</u>	Lower Columbia Fish Recov Bd Lower Elochoman Habitat Strategy Development	\$131,500.00	\$23,500.00	\$0.00	\$23,500.00	
Alternate	16	<u>16-1557</u> <u>Pln</u>	Cowlitz Indian Tribe Grays 3B Pond Reconnection Design	\$85,400.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
Alternate	17	<u>16-1533</u> <u>Rst</u>	Cowlitz Indian Tribe IMW Sarah Cr. Habitat & Passage Enhancement	\$698,824.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
Alternate	18	<u>16-1805</u> <u>Pln</u>	Lower Columbia River FEG NF Toutle 3 Habitat Restoration Design	\$168,983.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
Alternate	19	<u>16-1523</u> <u>Rst</u>	Cowlitz Conservation Dist Coweeman Stream Restoration Kuhn	\$184,500.00	\$33,400.00	\$0.00	\$33,400.00	
Alternate	20	<u>16-1696</u> <u>Acq</u>	Clark County Mason Creek Acquisition	\$366,996.00	\$64,764.00	\$0.00	\$64,764.00	
Alternate	21	<u>16-1556</u> <u>Pln</u>	Cowlitz Indian Tribe Colvin Dam Removal Design	\$93,335.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
Totals:				\$4,523,691.00	\$1,162,273.00	\$1,865,753.00	\$3,028,026.00	
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00		

## REGION: PUGET SOUND

\*\*\* North Olympic Peninsula is giving Hood Canal \$520,743 in SRFB funds this round that they used on their ranked list in the 2015 grant round. The allocations on the Ranked Lists on Attachment 9 reflect this.

Regional Allocation/Allotment:

\$4,421,891.00

\$0.00

Remaining:

\$0.00

(\$33,389,725.00)

PSAR Request

### GREEN, DUWAMISH, AND CENTRAL PUGET SOUND WATERSHED (WRIA 9) LEAD ENTITY

2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status) Number of Projects: 4

Salmon Allocation  
\$238,113.00

PSAR Allocation  
\$0.00

Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Proposed PSAR Funding	Total Funding
	1	<u>16-1852</u> <u>Rst</u>	King Co Water & Land Res Porter Levee Setback - Construction	\$238,113.00	\$42,945.00	\$238,113.00	\$0.00	\$281,058.00
	2	<u>16-1892</u> <u>Rst</u>	City of Tukwila Riverton Creek Flapgate Removal	\$551,070.00	\$97,248.00	\$0.00	\$551,070.00	\$648,318.00
	3	<u>16-1893</u> <u>Pln</u>	King Co Water & Land Res Lones - Turley Restoration - Final Design	\$250,000.00	\$45,000.00	\$0.00	\$250,000.00	\$295,000.00
	4	<u>16-2120</u> <u>Acq</u>	King Co Water & Land Res Maury Island Aquatic Reserve Protection II	\$955,625.00	\$172,375.00	\$0.00	\$955,625.00	\$1,128,000.00
Totals:				\$1,994,808.00	\$357,568.00	\$238,113.00	\$1,756,695.00	\$2,352,376.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	(\$1,756,695.00)	

### ISLAND COUNTY LEAD ENTITY

2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status) Number of Projects: 5

Salmon Allocation  
\$175,144.00

PSAR Allocation  
\$0.00

Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Proposed PSAR Funding	Total Funding
	1	<u>16-1429</u> <u>Acq</u>	Whidbey Camano Land Trust Barnum Point Acquisition	\$2,186,728.00	\$4,446,360.00	\$175,144.00	\$61,728.00	\$6,633,088.00
	2	<u>16-1428</u> <u>Rst</u>	NW Straits Marine Cons Found Cornet Bay Riparian Planting Stewardship	\$26,932.00	\$5,600.00	\$0.00	\$26,932.00	\$32,532.00
	3	<u>16-1306</u> <u>Rst</u>	NW Straits Marine Cons Found Seahorse Siesta Barge Removal	\$419,228.00	\$73,982.00	\$0.00	\$419,228.00	\$493,210.00
	4	<u>16-1307</u> <u>Rst</u>	NW Straits Marine Cons Found Maylor Pt Armoring Removal	\$302,065.00	\$53,306.00	\$0.00	\$302,065.00	\$355,371.00
		<u>16-1431</u> <u>Acq</u>	Whidbey Camano Land Trust Pearson Shoreline	\$1,250,000.00	\$1,016,875.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,266,875.00
Totals:				\$4,184,953.00	\$5,596,123.00	\$175,144.00	\$809,953.00	\$9,781,076.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	(\$809,953.00)	

### LAKE WASHINGTON/CEDAR/SAMMAMISH WATERSHED (WRIA 8) LEAD ENTITY

2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status) Number of Projects: 3

Salmon Allocation  
\$315,218.00

PSAR Allocation  
\$0.00

Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Proposed PSAR Funding	Total Funding
Partial	1	<u>16-1213</u> <u>Pln</u>	Seattle Public Utilities Lower Taylor Creek Restoration Project - Design	\$350,000.00	\$87,500.00	\$315,218.00	\$0.00	\$402,718.00
	2	<u>16-1210</u> <u>Acq</u>	City of Bothell Wayne Sammamish Riverfront Project- Acq Phase II	\$1,000,000.00	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,000,000.00	\$1,200,000.00
Partial	4	<u>16-1215</u> <u>Rst</u>	Adopt A Stream Foundation Bear Creek Reach 6 - Phase II Construction	\$170,000.00	\$30,000.00	\$0.00	\$125,248.00	\$155,248.00
Totals:				\$1,520,000.00	\$317,500.00	\$315,218.00	\$1,125,248.00	\$1,757,966.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	(\$1,125,248.00)	

NISQUALLY RIVER SALMON RECOVERY LEAD ENTITY						Salmon Allocation	PSAR Allocation	
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)    Number of Projects: 10						\$303,178.00	\$0.00	
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Proposed PSAR Funding	Total Funding
Partial	1	<u>16-1450</u> <u>Acq</u>	Nisqually Land Trust Wilcox Reach - North Shoreline Protection	\$1,040,900.00	\$390,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,040,900.00	\$1,430,900.00
	2	<u>16-1453</u> <u>Acq,Rest</u>	Nisqually Land Trust Middle Ohop Protection Phase III	\$386,469.00	\$70,308.00	\$123,178.00	\$263,291.00	\$456,777.00
	3	<u>15-1231</u> <u>Rst</u>	South Puget Sound SEG Mashel Eatonville Restoration Phase III	\$1,190,000.00	\$210,060.00	\$180,000.00	\$0.00	\$390,060.00
	4	<u>16-1451</u> <u>Acq</u>	Nisqually Land Trust Wilcox Reach - Small Lots Acquisition	\$272,394.00	\$50,000.00	\$0.00	\$272,394.00	\$322,394.00
	5	<u>16-1454</u> <u>Pln</u>	Nisqually Land Trust Lower Ohop "Acquisition for Restoration" Planning	\$22,972.00	\$4,055.00	\$0.00	\$22,972.00	\$27,027.00
	6	<u>16-1449</u> <u>Pln</u>	South Puget Sound SEG Nisqually River Tributaries Habitat Assessment	\$113,000.00	\$21,000.00	\$0.00	\$113,000.00	\$134,000.00
	7	<u>16-2192</u> <u>Acq,Rest</u>	Nisqually Land Trust Middle Ohop Protection Ph II	\$195,500.00	\$34,500.00	\$0.00	\$195,500.00	\$230,000.00
	8	<u>16-1444</u> <u>Rst</u>	Pierce Co Conservation Dist Ohop Creek Early Action Riparian Restoration	\$105,450.00	\$24,748.00	\$0.00	\$105,450.00	\$130,198.00
	9	<u>16-2191</u> <u>Plan,Acq</u>	Nisqually Land Trust McKenna Area Small Lot Acquisition	\$600,000.00	\$110,000.00	\$0.00	\$600,000.00	\$710,000.00
	10	<u>16-1445</u> <u>Acq</u>	Nisqually Land Trust Busy Wild Protection Phase II	\$1,105,000.00	\$195,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,105,000.00	\$1,300,000.00
Totals:				\$5,031,685.00	\$1,109,671.00	\$303,178.00	\$3,718,507.00	\$5,131,356.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	(\$3,718,507.00)	

NORTH OLYMPIC PENINSULA LEAD ENTITY FOR SALMON						Salmon Allocation	PSAR Allocation	
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)    Number of Projects: 5						\$0.00	\$0.00	
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Proposed PSAR Funding	Total Funding
	1	<a href="#"><u>16-1373</u></a>	Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe	\$1,325,210.00	\$237,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,325,210.00	\$1,562,210.00
		<a href="#"><u>Rst</u></a>	Little River Large Woody Debris					
	3	<a href="#"><u>16-1529</u></a>	North Olympic Land Trust	\$284,822.00	\$50,263.00	\$0.00	\$284,822.00	\$335,085.00
		<a href="#"><u>Acq</u></a>	Upper Elwha River Protection					
	4	<a href="#"><u>16-1369</u></a>	North Olympic Salmon Coalition	\$188,561.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$188,561.00	\$188,561.00
		<a href="#"><u>Pln</u></a>	Lower Hoko River Restoration Planning					
	5	<a href="#"><u>16-1375</u></a>	North Olympic Land Trust	\$632,612.00	\$111,638.00	\$0.00	\$632,612.00	\$744,250.00
		<a href="#"><u>Acq</u></a>	Lower Elwha River Protection					
	6	<a href="#"><u>16-1427</u></a>	Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe	\$625,546.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$625,546.00	\$625,546.00
		<a href="#"><u>Rst</u></a>	Strait of Juan de Fuca IMW Restoration Project					
Totals:				\$3,056,751.00	\$398,901.00	\$0.00	\$3,056,751.00	\$3,455,652.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	(\$3,056,751.00)	



PIERCE COUNTY LEAD ENTITY						Salmon Allocation	PSAR Allocation	
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)    Number of Projects: 7						\$408,804.00	\$0.00	
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Proposed PSAR Funding	Total Funding
	1	<u>16-1577</u> <u>Rst</u>	South Puget Sound SEG South Prairie Creek (RM 4.0-4.6) Phase 2	\$1,653,413.00	\$291,779.00	\$349,979.00	\$1,303,434.00	\$1,945,192.00
	2	<u>16-1507</u> <u>Mon</u>	Puyallup Tribe of Indians Puyallup River Juvenile Salmon Assessment Project	\$58,825.00	\$10,400.00	\$58,825.00	\$0.00	\$69,225.00
	3	<u>16-1457</u> <u>Plan,Acq</u>	Forterra South Prairie Creek Acq & Restoration - Decker	\$152,384.00	\$42,500.00	\$0.00	\$152,384.00	\$194,884.00
	4	<u>16-1552</u> <u>Rst</u>	King Co Water & Land Res Middle Boise Creek Restoration - Van Wieringen	\$450,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	\$450,000.00	\$550,000.00
	5	<u>16-1549</u> <u>Acq</u>	Pierce Co Conservation Dist SPC Stubbs Acquisition	\$95,495.00	\$16,855.00	\$0.00	\$95,495.00	\$112,350.00
	7	<u>16-1545</u> <u>Pln</u>	Pierce County Surface Water Carbon Bridge ST Setback Feasibility Report	\$215,050.00	\$37,950.00	\$0.00	\$215,050.00	\$253,000.00
	8	<u>16-1389</u> <u>Acq</u>	Pierce County Surface Water Alward Road Acquisition Phase 3	\$1,465,000.00	\$260,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,465,000.00	\$1,725,000.00
Totals:				\$4,090,167.00	\$759,484.00	\$408,804.00	\$3,681,363.00	\$4,849,651.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	(\$3,681,363.00)	

SAN JUAN COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LEAD ENTITY						Salmon Allocation	PSAR Allocation	
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)    Number of Projects: 4						\$223,505.00	\$0.00	
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Proposed PSAR Funding	Total Funding
Partial	2	<u>16-1701</u> <u>Plan,Rest</u>	Friends of the San Juans San Juan Islands Marine Riparian Restoration	\$113,838.00	\$20,090.00	\$18,192.00	\$0.00	\$38,282.00
	3	<u>16-1670</u> <u>Acq</u>	San Juan Island Cons.Dist False Bay Creek Riparian Acquisition	\$128,100.00	\$22,700.00	\$39,865.00	\$88,235.00	\$150,800.00
	4	<u>16-1293</u> <u>Acq</u>	San Juan Preservation Trust Zylstra Lower Lake Acquisition	\$450,000.00	\$80,000.00	\$0.00	\$450,000.00	\$530,000.00
	5	<u>16-1672</u> <u>Mon</u>	University of Washington Evaluating Causes of Decline of Pacific Herring	\$165,448.00	\$31,213.00	\$165,448.00	\$0.00	\$196,661.00
Totals:				\$857,386.00	\$154,003.00	\$223,505.00	\$538,235.00	\$915,743.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	(\$538,235.00)	

SKAGIT WATERSHED COUNCIL LEAD ENTITY						Salmon Allocation	PSAR Allocation	
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)    Number of Projects: 8						\$901,833.00	\$0.00	
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Proposed PSAR Funding	Total Funding
	1	<u>16-1647</u> <u>Plan,Acq</u>	Seattle City Light Skagit Watershed Habitat Acquisition	\$1,466,250.00	\$258,750.00	\$400,000.00	\$1,066,250.00	\$1,725,000.00
	2	<u>16-1652</u> <u>Pln</u>	Skagit County Public Works South Fork Delta Channel Final Design	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$200,000.00	\$200,000.00
	3	<u>16-1653</u> <u>Plan,Rest</u>	Skagit River Sys Cooperative Nookachamps Forks Restoration	\$270,653.00	\$47,763.00	\$50,000.00	\$220,653.00	\$318,416.00
	4	<u>16-1648</u> <u>Pln</u>	Dept of Fish & Wildlife Lower Cascade Floodplain Restoration Feasibility	\$199,970.00	\$0.00	\$199,970.00	\$0.00	\$199,970.00
	5	<u>16-1644</u> <u>Rst</u>	Swinomish Tribe Kukutali Preserve Tombolo Restoration	\$230,641.00	\$40,702.00	\$0.00	\$230,641.00	\$271,343.00
	6	<u>16-1651</u> <u>Rst</u>	Skagit County Public Works Hansen Creek Reach 5 Restoration	\$3,681,245.00	\$649,631.00	\$50,000.00	\$2,254,136.00	\$4,330,876.00
		<u>16-1642</u> <u>Pln</u>	Skagit River Sys Cooperative Steelhead Fish Passage Prioritization	\$199,796.00	\$35,259.00	\$121,863.00	\$77,933.00	\$235,055.00
		<u>16-1650</u> <u>Rst</u>	Skagit Fish Enhancement Group 2016 Collaborative Riparian Stewardship	\$199,940.00	\$35,716.00	\$80,000.00	\$119,940.00	\$235,656.00
Totals:				\$6,448,495.00	\$1,067,821.00	\$901,833.00	\$4,169,553.00	\$7,516,316.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	(\$4,169,553.00)	

SNOHOMISH BASIN LEAD ENTITY						Salmon Allocation	PSAR Allocation	
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)    Number of Projects: 10						\$411,533.00	\$0.00	
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Proposed PSAR Funding	Total Funding
	1	<a href="#"><u>16-1559</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Rst</u></a>	Snohomish County Public Works Mid-Spencer Estuary Restoration	\$350,000.00	\$700,000.00	\$350,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,050,000.00
	2	<a href="#"><u>16-1548</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Pln</u></a>	King Co Water & Land Res Tolt River - Lower Frew Floodplain Reconnection	\$400,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	\$400,000.00	\$500,000.00
	3	<a href="#"><u>16-1716</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Rst</u></a>	Sound Salmon Solutions Cherry Creek Phase II & III Construction	\$764,565.00	\$135,435.00	\$0.00	\$764,565.00	\$900,000.00
	4	<a href="#"><u>16-1719</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Pln</u></a>	Wild Fish Conservancy Beckler Confluence LWD Design	\$61,533.00	\$57,453.00	\$61,533.00	\$0.00	\$118,986.00
	5	<a href="#"><u>16-1632</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Acq</u></a>	Forterra South Fork Skykomish Acquisitions	\$477,294.00	\$111,000.00	\$0.00	\$477,294.00	\$588,294.00
	6	<a href="#"><u>16-1639</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Pln</u></a>	Adopt A Stream Foundation Woods Creek RR Bridge Removal & Restoration	\$78,395.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$78,395.00	\$78,395.00
	7	<a href="#"><u>16-1608</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Rst</u></a>	Snohomish County Woods Creek Culvert Replacements Cooperative	\$363,000.00	\$527,500.00	\$0.00	\$363,000.00	\$890,500.00
	8	<a href="#"><u>16-1574</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Rst</u></a>	Tulalip Tribe South Fork Skykomish Restoration Using Beaver	\$192,089.00	\$34,627.00	\$0.00	\$192,089.00	\$226,716.00
	9	<a href="#"><u>16-1717</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Pln</u></a>	City of Mukilteo Japanese Gulch Creek Estuary - Design	\$212,500.00	\$37,500.00	\$0.00	\$212,500.00	\$250,000.00
	10	<a href="#"><u>16-1741</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Pln</u></a>	City of North Bend SF Snoqualmie Levee Setback Design in North Bend	\$300,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	\$300,000.00	\$400,000.00
Totals:				\$3,199,376.00	\$1,803,515.00	\$411,533.00	\$2,787,843.00	\$5,002,891.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	(\$2,787,843.00)	

STILLAGUAMISH RIVER SALMON RECOVERY CO-LEAD ENTITY						Salmon Allocation	PSAR Allocation	
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)    Number of Projects: 5						\$401,613.00	\$0.00	
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Proposed PSAR Funding	Total Funding
	1	<u>16-1553</u> <u>Rst</u>	Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians N and S Fork Stillaguamish ELJ Placement	\$850,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$0.00	\$850,000.00	\$1,000,000.00
	2	<u>16-1539</u> <u>Rst</u>	Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians Stillaguamish Riparian Crew 4	\$500,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$0.00	\$500,000.00	\$750,000.00
	3	<u>16-1638</u> <u>Acq,Rst</u>	Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians Stillaguamish Floodplain Acquisitions (PSAR 17-19)	\$1,120,500.00	\$200,000.00	\$401,613.00	\$718,887.00	\$1,320,500.00
	4	<u>16-1671</u> <u>Pln</u>	Wild Fish Conservancy Stillaguamish e-DNA Pilot Project	\$55,160.00	\$9,735.00	\$0.00	\$55,160.00	\$64,895.00
	5	<u>16-1558</u> <u>Rst</u>	Snohomish County Secret Creek Culvert Replacements Project	\$1,528,725.00	\$269,775.00	\$0.00	\$1,528,725.00	\$1,798,500.00
Totals:				\$4,054,385.00	\$879,510.00	\$401,613.00	\$3,652,772.00	\$4,933,895.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	(\$3,652,772.00)	

# WEST SOUND WATERSHEDS COUNCIL LEAD ENTITY

2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status) Number of Projects: 11

Salmon Allocation  
\$214,329.00

PSAR Allocation  
\$0.00

Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Proposed PSAR Funding	Total Funding
	1	<u>16-1591</u> <u>Acq</u>	Great Peninsula Conservancy Curley Creek Acquisition	\$236,225.00	\$41,725.00	\$0.00	\$236,225.00	\$277,950.00
	2	<u>16-1596</u> <u>Pln</u>	Wild Fish Conservancy Finn Creek Restoration Design	\$84,000.00	\$0.00	\$49,329.00	\$34,671.00	\$84,000.00
	3	<u>16-1460</u> <u>Pln</u>	Pierce Co Public Works Purdy Creek Fish Passage Feasibility at 160th St NW	\$76,000.00	\$13,500.00	\$0.00	\$76,000.00	\$89,500.00
	4	<u>16-1462</u> <u>Rst</u>	Pierce County Surface Water Huge Creek Fish Passage Construction @ 160th St	\$600,000.00	\$135,000.00	\$0.00	\$600,000.00	\$735,000.00
	5	<u>16-1589</u> <u>Acq</u>	Great Peninsula Conservancy East Fork Rocky Creek Acquisition	\$455,000.00	\$81,000.00	\$0.00	\$455,000.00	\$536,000.00
	6	<u>16-1599</u> <u>Pln</u>	Wild Fish Conservancy Gig Harbor Peninsula Watertype Assessment	\$165,000.00	\$30,000.00	\$165,000.00	\$0.00	\$195,000.00
	7	<u>16-1448</u> <u>Pln</u>	Bremerton Public Works Kitsap Creek @ Northlake Way Prelim Design	\$152,200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$152,200.00	\$152,200.00
	8	<u>16-1607</u> <u>Pln</u>	Kitsap County Kitsap Nearshore Restoration and Armor Removal	\$231,440.00	\$41,115.00	\$0.00	\$231,440.00	\$272,555.00
	9	<u>16-1631</u> <u>Pln</u>	Kitsap Conservation District Fleming Fish Passage and Restoration Design	\$88,450.00	\$2,000.00	\$0.00	\$88,450.00	\$90,450.00
		<u>16-1619</u> <u>Rst</u>	Kitsap County Harper Estuary Bridge Construction	\$2,469,844.00	\$575,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,044,844.00
		<u>16-2114</u> <u>Rst</u>	Suquamish Tribe Chico Bridge - Keta restore	\$3,441,400.00	\$400,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,841,400.00
Totals:				\$7,999,559.00	\$1,319,340.00	\$214,329.00	\$1,873,986.00	\$9,318,899.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	(\$1,873,986.00)	

WRIA 1 SALMON RECOVERY BOARD LEAD ENTITY					Salmon Allocation	PSAR Allocation		
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)    Number of Projects: 15					\$517,519.00	\$0.00		
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Proposed PSAR Funding	Total Funding
	1	<u>16-2054</u> <u>Rst</u>	Nooksack Indian Tribe NF Nooksack (Xwqélém) Farmhouse Ph 3 Restoration	\$864,465.00	\$152,587.00	\$0.00	\$864,465.00	\$1,017,052.00
	2	<u>16-2049</u> <u>Rst</u>	Nooksack Indian Tribe SF Nooksack (Nuxw7iyem) Nettet Ph 2 Restoration	\$517,519.00	\$91,330.00	\$517,519.00	\$0.00	\$608,849.00
	3	<u>16-2042</u> <u>Acq</u>	Whatcom Land Trust Lower Middle Fork Reach Acquisition	\$85,680.00	\$15,120.00	\$0.00	\$85,680.00	\$100,800.00
	4	<u>16-2050</u> <u>Rst</u>	Nooksack Indian Tribe SF Nooksack (Nuxw7iyem) Nettet Ph 3 Restoration	\$1,101,418.00	\$194,412.00	\$0.00	\$1,101,418.00	\$1,295,830.00
	5	<u>16-2055</u> <u>Pln</u>	Nooksack Indian Tribe NF Nooksack (Xwqélém) Boyd Reach Design	\$211,973.00	\$37,419.00	\$0.00	\$211,973.00	\$249,392.00
	6	<u>16-2052</u> <u>Pln</u>	Nooksack Indian Tribe SF Nooksack Fish Camp (Ts'eq) Reach Design	\$199,825.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$199,825.00	\$199,825.00
	7	<u>16-2048</u> <u>Pln</u>	Whatcom County Public Works Lower Mainstem Nooksack Habitat Assessment	\$237,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$0.00	\$237,000.00	\$337,000.00
	8	<u>16-2057</u> <u>Rst</u>	Lummi Nation SF Skookum Edfro Ph 2 Instream Restoration	\$478,584.00	\$114,000.00	\$0.00	\$478,584.00	\$592,584.00
	9	<u>16-2051</u> <u>Pln</u>	Nooksack Indian Tribe NF Nooksack (Xwqélém) Maple Reach Design	\$126,156.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$126,156.00	\$126,156.00
	10	<u>16-2116</u> <u>Rst</u>	Lummi Nation MF Porter Creek Reach In-Stream Restoration Ph 4	\$443,466.00	\$78,518.00	\$0.00	\$443,466.00	\$521,984.00
	11	<u>16-2043</u> <u>Acq</u>	Whatcom Land Trust North Fork Reach Acquisition-Phase III	\$273,105.00	\$48,195.00	\$0.00	\$273,105.00	\$321,300.00
	12	<u>16-2058</u> <u>Pln</u>	Lummi Nation SF Nooksack River Elk Flats Preliminary Design	\$115,509.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$115,509.00	\$115,509.00
		<u>16-2045</u> <u>Acq</u>	Whatcom Land Trust Upper SF and Tributaries Corridor Acquisition	\$1,872,911.00	\$330,514.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,203,425.00
		<u>16-2053</u> <u>Rst</u>	Nooksack Indian Tribe NF Nooksack (Xwqélém) Farmhouse Ph 4 Restoration	\$3,304,422.00	\$33,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$3,337,922.00
		<u>16-2062</u> <u>Rst</u>	City of Bellingham Middle Fork Nooksack Fish Passage	\$10,904,369.00	\$1,924,300.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$12,828,669.00
Totals:				\$20,736,402.00	\$3,119,895.00	\$517,519.00	\$4,137,181.00	\$23,856,297.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	(\$4,137,181.00)	

WRIA 13 SALMON HABITAT RECOVERY COMMITTEE LEAD ENTITY						Salmon Allocation	PSAR Allocation	
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Returned" status)    Number of Projects: 7						\$141,663.00	\$0.00	
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Proposed PSAR Funding	Total Funding
Partial	1	<u>16-1404</u> <u>Acq</u>	Capitol Land Trust Lower Henderson Inlet Habitat Acquisition	\$300,000.00	\$800,000.00	\$23,782.00	\$0.00	\$823,782.00
	2	<u>16-1409</u> <u>Rst</u>	Capitol Land Trust Harmony Farms Riparian Restoration, Phase II	\$127,500.00	\$22,500.00	\$117,881.00	\$9,619.00	\$150,000.00
	3	<u>16-1406</u> <u>Rst</u>	Thurston Conservation District East Fork McLane Fish Passage Project	\$110,500.00	\$19,500.00	\$0.00	\$110,500.00	\$130,000.00
	4	<u>16-1405</u> <u>Rst</u>	South Puget Sound SEG Little Fishtrap Estuary Restoration	\$148,000.00	\$34,500.00	\$0.00	\$148,000.00	\$182,500.00
	6	<u>16-1408</u> <u>Rst</u>	South Puget Sound SEG Spurgeon Creek Remeander	\$255,000.00	\$45,000.00	\$0.00	\$255,000.00	\$300,000.00
	7	<u>16-1399</u> <u>Plan,Rest</u>	South Puget Sound SEG Butler Cove Estuary Connectivity Project	\$192,000.00	\$35,000.00	\$0.00	\$192,000.00	\$227,000.00
	8	<u>16-1407</u> <u>Pln</u>	Capitol Land Trust WRIA 13 Habitat Acquisition Project Development	\$22,665.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$22,665.00	\$26,665.00
	Totals:				\$1,155,665.00	\$960,500.00	\$141,663.00	\$737,784.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	(\$737,784.00)	

WRIA 14 SALMON HABITAT RECOVERY COMMITTEE LEAD ENTITY						Salmon Allocation	PSAR Allocation	
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)      Number of Projects: 7						\$169,439.00	\$0.00	
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Proposed PSAR Funding	Total Funding
	1	<u>16-1567</u>	Mason Conservation Dist	\$302,697.00	\$53,420.00	\$78,194.00	\$224,503.00	\$356,117.00
		<u>Rst</u>	Gosnell Creek LWD and Riparian Enhancement					
	2	<u>16-1568</u>	Thurston County	\$65,000.00	\$0.00	\$65,000.00	\$0.00	\$65,000.00
		<u>Pln</u>	Hunter Point Road Fish Barrier Improvement					
	3	<u>16-1565</u>	Capitol Land Trust	\$250,000.00	\$250,000.00	\$26,245.00	\$223,755.00	\$500,000.00
		<u>Acq</u>	Frye Cove Creek Habitat Acquisition					
	4	<u>16-1675</u>	South Puget Sound SEG	\$404,343.00	\$71,355.00	\$0.00	\$404,343.00	\$475,698.00
		<u>Rst</u>	Coffee Creek Fish Passage Funding Package					
	5	<u>16-1111</u>	Forterra	\$306,588.00	\$1,665,000.00	\$0.00	\$306,588.00	\$1,971,588.00
		<u>Acq</u>	Little Skookum Inlet Shoreline					
	6	<u>16-1560</u>	Capitol Land Trust	\$22,665.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$22,665.00	\$26,665.00
		<u>Pln</u>	WRIA 14 Habitat Acquisition Project Development					
	7	<u>16-1570</u>	South Puget Sound SEG	\$162,000.00	\$29,000.00	\$0.00	\$162,000.00	\$191,000.00
		<u>Rst</u>	Madrone Beach Bulkhead Removal					
Totals:				\$1,513,293.00	\$2,072,775.00	\$169,439.00	\$1,343,854.00	\$3,586,068.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	(\$1,343,854.00)	

### REGION: SNAKE RIVER

Regional Allocation/Allotment: \$1,162,658.00  
 Remaining: \$0.00

SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY BOARD LEAD ENTITY						Salmon Allocation	
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)    Number of Projects: 11						\$1,162,658.00	
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Total Funding
Alternate	1	<u>16-2097</u>	Tri-State Steelheaders Inc	\$4,501,779.00	\$794,660.00	\$0.00	\$794,660.00
		<u>Rst</u>	Mill Creek Passage Implementation - Upper Flume				
	2	<u>16-2091</u>	Umatilla Confederated Tribes	\$406,864.00	\$90,000.00	\$406,864.00	\$496,864.00
		<u>Rst</u>	Tucannon Complexity & Connectivity (PA-18)				
	3	<u>16-2092</u>	Asotin Co Conservation Dist	\$90,000.00	\$24,000.00	\$90,000.00	\$114,000.00
		<u>Rst</u>	Asotin Creek Riparian Protection Project				
	4	<u>16-2094</u>	Columbia Conservation Dist	\$304,775.00	\$63,896.00	\$304,775.00	\$368,671.00
		<u>Rst</u>	Tucannon River PA 28 Phase II Habitat Restoration				
	5	<u>16-2099</u>	Walla Walla Co Cons Dist	\$227,073.00	\$45,670.00	\$227,073.00	\$272,743.00
		<u>Rst</u>	McCaw Reach Habitat Rest. Phase B Construction				
	6	<u>16-2101</u>	Asotin Co Conservation Dist	\$86,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$86,000.00	\$111,000.00
		<u>Mon</u>	Asotin IMW Monitoring YR10				
Partial	7	<u>16-2095</u>	Dept of Fish & Wildlife	\$50,238.00	\$8,866.00	\$47,946.00	\$56,812.00
		<u>Pln</u>	Tucannon Mobile PIT Tag Detection				
Alternate	8	<u>16-2098</u>	Tri-State Steelheaders Inc	\$273,904.00	\$50,200.00	\$0.00	\$50,200.00
		<u>Rst</u>	Bridge to Bridge Restoration Phase 2				
Alternate	9	<u>16-2096</u>	Tri-State Steelheaders Inc	\$48,600.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
		<u>Pln</u>	Mill Creek Passage Update				
Alternate	10	<u>16-2100</u>	Walla Walla Co Cons Dist	\$55,578.00	\$31,378.00	\$0.00	\$31,378.00
		<u>Rst</u>	Walla Walla Co. Fish Screen Projects 2017-18				
Alternate	11	<u>16-2093</u>	Columbia Conservation Dist	\$200,600.00	\$37,472.00	\$0.00	\$37,472.00
		<u>Pln</u>	Touchet River Conceptual Restoration Plan				
Totals:				\$6,245,411.00	\$1,171,142.00	\$1,162,658.00	\$2,333,800.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	

## REGION: UPPER COLUMBIA

Regional Allocation/Allotment: \$1,420,591.00

Remaining: \$591.00

### UPPER COLUMBIA SALMON RECOVERY BOARD LEAD ENTITY

2016 December (Ranked List is in "Returned" status) Number of Projects: 13

*Salmon Allocation*  
\$1,420,591.00

Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Total Funding
	1	<u>16-1780</u> <u>Pln</u>	Chelan Co Natural Resource Nason RM 2.3 Side Channel Reconnection Design	\$149,778.00	\$0.00	\$149,778.00	\$149,778.00
	2	<u>16-1795</u> <u>Acq</u>	Methow Salmon Recovery Found Silver Side Channel Acquisition	\$494,297.00	\$236,406.00	\$494,297.00	\$730,703.00
	3	<u>16-1787</u> <u>Pln</u>	Chelan Co Natural Resource Peshastin Irrigation District Pump Exchange	\$169,484.00	\$29,909.00	\$169,484.00	\$199,393.00
	4	<u>16-1796</u> <u>Acq</u>	Methow Salmon Recovery Found Twisp River Floodplain Lower Acquisition Phase II	\$219,406.00	\$523,429.00	\$219,406.00	\$742,835.00
	5	<u>16-1783</u> <u>Mon</u>	Chelan Co Natural Resource Spring Chinook Survival in Lake Wenatchee	\$140,000.00	\$570,125.00	\$140,000.00	\$710,125.00
	6	<u>16-1792</u> <u>Pln</u>	Cascade Col Reg Fish Enhance Burns-Garrity Restoration Design	\$81,785.00	\$95,550.00	\$81,785.00	\$177,335.00
	7	<u>16-1790</u> <u>Acq</u>	Chelan-Douglas Land Trust Wenatchee Sleepy Hollow Floodplain Acquisition	\$165,250.00	\$495,750.00	\$165,250.00	\$661,000.00
Alternate	8	<u>16-1784</u> <u>Pln</u>	Chelan Co Natural Resource ID of Thermal Refugia in the Wenatchee Basin	\$41,485.00	\$7,322.00	\$0.00	\$7,322.00
Alternate	9	<u>16-1799</u> <u>Pln</u>	Okanogan Conservation Dist Upper Okanogan Habitat Feasibility Assessment	\$115,313.00	\$26,000.00	\$0.00	\$26,000.00
Alternate	10	<u>16-1789</u> <u>Acq</u>	Chelan-Douglas Land Trust Nason Lower White Pine Floodplain Protection	\$127,500.00	\$23,400.00	\$0.00	\$23,400.00
Alternate	11	<u>16-1800</u> <u>Rst</u>	Trout Unlimited Inc. Beaver Fever: Restoring Ecosystem Function	\$143,429.00	\$135,850.00	\$0.00	\$135,850.00
Alternate	12	<u>16-1782</u> <u>Pln</u>	Chelan Co Natural Resource Upper Peshastin Wood Replenishment Prelim Design	\$60,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Alternate	14	<u>16-1797</u> <u>Mon</u>	Methow Salmon Recovery Found Methow Bull Trout Population Status Evaluation	\$75,472.00	\$16,766.00	\$0.00	\$16,766.00
Totals:				\$1,983,199.00	\$2,160,507.00	\$1,420,000.00	\$3,580,507.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$591.00	

## REGION: COASTAL

Regional Allocation/Allotment: \$1,178,370.00

Remaining: \$704.00

### CHEHALIS BASIN LEAD ENTITY

2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status) Number of Projects: 3

*Salmon Allocation*  
\$257,540.00

Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Total Funding
	1	<u>16-1776</u> <u>Pln</u>	Chehalis Basin FTF Taylor Cr. South Bank Rd. Correction Design	\$26,500.00	\$0.00	\$26,500.00	\$26,500.00
	2	<u>16-1803</u> <u>Pln</u>	Lewis County Public Works Van Ornum Creek Barrier Removal	\$31,040.00	\$7,760.00	\$31,040.00	\$38,800.00
	3	<u>16-1756</u> <u>Pln</u>	Chehalis R Basin Land Trust M. Fork Hoquiam Tidal Habitat Restoration Design	\$200,000.00	\$0.00	\$200,000.00	\$200,000.00
Totals:				\$257,540.00	\$7,760.00	\$257,540.00	\$265,300.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	

NORTH PACIFIC COAST LEAD ENTITY						Salmon Allocation	
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)    Number of Projects: 2						\$398,249.00	
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Total Funding
	1	<a href="#">16-1231</a>	Quileute Tribe of the Quileute	\$235,249.00	\$133,879.00	\$235,249.00	\$369,128.00
		<a href="#">Rst</a>	Thunder Road Fish Passage Project				
	2	<a href="#">16-1378</a>	10,000 Years Institute	\$163,000.00	\$30,000.00	\$163,000.00	\$193,000.00
		<a href="#">Rst</a>	Perfecting Riparian Restoration on the Hoh River				
Totals:				\$398,249.00	\$163,879.00	\$398,249.00	\$562,128.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	

PACIFIC COUNTY LEAD ENTITY						Salmon Allocation	
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)    Number of Projects: 2						\$323,232.00	
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Total Funding
	1	<u>16-1683</u>	Pacific County Anglers	\$238,884.00	\$42,157.00	\$238,884.00	\$281,041.00
		<u>Rst</u>	Lower Green Creek Restoration				
	2	<u>16-2039</u>	Grays Harbor Conservation Dist	\$84,348.00	\$84,348.00	\$84,348.00	\$168,696.00
		<u>Rst</u>	C-400 Church Rd North River Barrier Correction				
Totals:				\$323,232.00	\$126,505.00	\$323,232.00	\$449,737.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	

QUINAUT INDIAN NATION LEAD ENTITY						Salmon Allocation		
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)		Number of Projects: 2		\$198,645.00				
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Total Funding	
	1	<u>16-1509</u>	Quinault Indian Nation	\$150,000.00	\$26,471.00	\$150,000.00	\$176,471.00	
		<u>Rst</u>	Lower Quinault Invasive Plant Control (Phase 5)					
	2	<u>16-1322</u>	Quinault Indian Nation	\$48,645.00	\$0.00	\$48,645.00	\$48,645.00	
		<u>Pln</u>	Halbert Creek Fish Passage and Instream Design					
	Totals:				\$198,645.00	\$26,471.00	\$198,645.00	\$225,116.00
	Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	

REGION: MID COLUMBIA

Remaining: \$0

KLICKITAT COUNTY LEAD ENTITY						Salmon Allocation	
2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)		Number of Projects: 3				\$480,197.00	*Middle Columbia gave \$380,000 to Klickitat
Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Total Funding
	1	<a href="#">16-2111</a>	Mid-Columbia RFEG	\$48,020.00	\$16,812.00	\$48,020.00	\$64,832.00
		<a href="#">Mon</a>	Assess Salmonid Recolonization 2017 WS River				
	2	<a href="#">16-1901</a>	Columbia Land Trust	\$343,800.00	\$112,671.00	\$343,800.00	\$456,471.00
		<a href="#">Acg</a>	Klickitat Canyon Conservation				
	3	<a href="#">16-1998</a>	Klickitat County	\$88,377.00	\$59,500.00	\$88,377.00	\$147,877.00
		<a href="#">Pln</a>	Lower Spring Creek Floodplain Reconnection Plan				
Totals:				\$480,197.00	\$188,983.00	\$480,197.00	\$669,180.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	

*Note: Lower Columbia gave \$98,197 to Klickitat  
Middle Columbia gave \$380,000 to Klickitat*

YAKIMA BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE RECOVERY BOARD LEAD ENTITY

2016 December (Ranked List is in "Accepted" status)    Number of Projects: 9

Salmon Allocation  
\$910,279.00

Alternate or Partial	Rank	Project Number, Project Type	Project Sponsor, Project Name	Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Proposed Salmon Funding	Total Funding
	1	<u>16-1606</u> <u>Rst</u>	Washington Water Trust Swauk Creek - Permanent Flow Restoration	\$247,850.00	\$71,463.00	\$247,850.00	\$319,313.00
	2	<u>16-1749</u> <u>Rst</u>	Mid-Columbia RFEG NF Manastash Creek Floodplain Restoration	\$204,495.00	\$62,005.00	\$204,495.00	\$266,500.00
	3	<u>16-1760</u> <u>Rst</u>	Trout Unlimited Inc. Upper Yakima Tributary Flow Restoration	\$245,593.00	\$43,340.00	\$245,593.00	\$288,933.00
	4	<u>16-1753</u> <u>Rst</u>	North Yakima Conserv Dist Restoring Fish Passage on Cowiche Creek	\$318,746.00	\$57,070.00	\$212,341.00	\$269,411.00
	5	<u>16-1742</u> <u>Pln</u>	Kittitas Conservation Trust Upper Kachess River Assessment	\$173,400.00	\$30,600.00	\$0.00	\$30,600.00
	6	<u>16-1745</u> <u>Rst</u>	Washington Water Trust Big Creek - Ensign Ranch Flow Restoration	\$125,550.00	\$81,250.00	\$0.00	\$81,250.00
	7	<u>16-1748</u> <u>Rst</u>	Mid-Columbia RFEG Swauk Creek Floodplain Reconnection	\$154,700.00	\$27,400.00	\$0.00	\$27,400.00
	8	<u>16-1751</u> <u>Pln</u>	Kittitas County Public Works Ringer Loop Road Restoration Design	\$110,080.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	9	<u>16-1743</u> <u>Rst</u>	Kittitas Conservation Trust Upper Yakima River Aquatic Habitat Restoration	\$350,638.00	\$62,818.00	\$0.00	\$62,818.00
Totals:				\$1,931,052.00	\$435,946.00	\$910,279.00	\$1,346,225.00
Remaining Allocation:						\$0.00	