

## Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region



Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board  
11018 NE 51<sup>st</sup> Circle  
Vancouver, WA 98682  
[LCFRB Website](#)  
[LCFRB Salmon Resource Map](#)

Executive Director  
Steve Manlow  
(360) 425-1553  
[smanlow@lcfrib.gen.wa.us](mailto:smanlow@lcfrib.gen.wa.us)

Klickitat County Lead Entity  
115 W. Court Street, Box 204  
Goldendale, WA 98620  
[www.klickitatcounty.org](http://www.klickitatcounty.org)



## Region Overview

### Geography

The Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region encompasses Clark, Skamania, Cowlitz and Wahkiakum counties, and portions of Pacific, Lewis and Klickitat counties. The region includes 18 major subbasins that span from the Chinook River near the mouth of the Columbia River, upstream to the White Salmon River watershed, as well as the Columbia River mainstem and estuary. These watersheds include over 2,280 anadromous stream miles that support 74 Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed populations of salmon, steelhead and bull trout. The region also provides essential migration and rearing habitat for all ESA listed species within the broader Columbia River basin.

### Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIA)

Grays-Elochoman (25), Cowlitz (26), Lewis (27), Salmon-Washougal (28), Wind (29A), and White Salmon (29B).

### Federally Recognized Tribes

Cowlitz Indian Tribe, Yakama Indian Nation, The Confederated Tribes of the Grande Ronde, Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, and Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation.

### Endangered Species Act Listings

**Table 1. Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region Listed Species.**

Species Listed	Listed As	Date Listed
Lower Columbia River Chinook	Threatened	March 24, 1999
Lower Columbia River Coho	Threatened	June 28, 2005
Columbia River Chum	Threatened	March 25, 1999
Lower Columbia River Steelhead	Threatened	March 19, 1998
Bull Trout	Threatened	June 10, 1998

### Salmon Recovery Plan

**Table 2. Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region Recovery Plan**

Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region Recovery Plan	
Regional Organization	Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board
Plan Timeframe	25 years
Actions Identified to Implement Plan	364
Estimated Cost	\$1,257,000,000 <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Funding For Salmon Recovery In Washington State*, D. Canty, March 2011

Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region Recovery Plan	
Status	In June 2013, NOAA adopted the lower Columbia domain recovery plan <sup>2</sup> incorporating the Oregon, Washington, and White Salmon management plans, and the estuary module.
Implementation Schedule	The suite of actions, strategies and measures identified in the recovery plan provide a trajectory leading to recovery of ESA-listed species to healthy and harvestable levels within 25 years.
Web Information	Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board <a href="#">website</a> Klickitat County Lead Entity <a href="#">Web page</a>

## Region and Lead Entities

The Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board (Board) was established by State legislation (RCW 77.85.200) in 1998 to oversee and coordinate salmon and steelhead recovery efforts in the Lower Columbia salmon recovery region. The law also designated the Board as the Lead Entity for the entire region, except for the White Salmon River subbasin. The Board includes local elected officials, private citizens and representatives from the state legislature, hydro-electric utilities, the Cowlitz Indian Tribe, and environmental organizations. The Board serves as the citizen's committee and final approval authority for the region's Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) habitat project list.

The Klickitat County Lead Entity was established under RCW 77.85.050 in 1999 to serve a geographic area consisting of WRIAs 29b, 30 and 31. WRIA 29b supports ESA-listed populations from both the Lower Columbia and Middle Columbia Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESUs). Therefore, a portion of the SRFB project funding allocated to the Lower Columbia and Middle Columbia salmon recovery regions is allocated by those organizations to the Klickitat County Lead Entity, for projects benefitting Lower Columbia and Middle Columbia salmon and steelhead populations.

## Regional Area Summary Questions and Responses

### 1. Internal funding allocations

#### A. Describe the process and criteria used to develop allocations across lead entities or watersheds within the region.

The LCFRB, as a regional recovery organization, currently receives 20% of the total statewide allocation from the SRFB. The LCFRB is also the designated Lead Entity for 17 of the 18 subbasins in the region, as well as the estuary. Klickitat County serves as the Lead Entity for the remaining subbasin, the White Salmon River, which supports Lower Columbia River coho and Chinook salmon, Columbia River chum salmon, and Mid-Columbia steelhead. As a Lead Entity, the LCFRB does not review or rank White Salmon

---

<sup>2</sup>ESA Recovery Plan for Lower Columbia River Coho Salmon, Lower Columbia River Chinook Salmon, Columbia River Chum Salmon, and Lower Columbia River Steelhead, NOAA, June 2013

River proposals. The Klickitat County Lead Entity submits a separate project list to the LCFRB regional organization for projects within the White Salmon River subbasin.

There were three SRFB funding sources for the 2024 grant round. Both standard and riparian funds were allocated to Lead Entities. Targeted Investments funds were allocated using a statewide competitive program.

The SRFB used the interim statewide allocation formula to allocate both standard and riparian funds to each regional organization. This formula provides 20% of the statewide total to the Lower Columbia Region, which resulted in a \$5,620,000 standard allocation for the 2024 grant round. This regional allocation is divided between the Lower Columbia Lead Entity and the Klickitat County Lead Entity, which has received 2.7% of the standard Lower Columbia Region allocation in previous years to fund projects in the White Salmon subbasin that support Lower Columbia populations. The Klickitat County Lead Entity did not have any projects targeting Lower Columbia populations this grant round, so the LCFRB used the entire regional allocation in 2024 on Lower Columbia Lead Entity projects. However, by agreement, the LCFRB will provide any unused standard allocation grant dollars to the Klickitat County Lead Entity in the next grant round, which will result in an addition of \$151,740 to the 2.7% standard allocation to Klickitat County Lead Entity in 2025. Table 1 depicts funding allocations for the 2024 grant round.

The state riparian allocation was also based on the interim statewide formula, so the total 2023-25 Lower Columbia riparian allocation was \$4,774,000. However, the SRFB included a requirement that each Lead Entity receive a minimum of \$300,000 in riparian funds. The LCFRB and the Yakama Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board agreed to both provide the Klickitat County Lead Entity \$150,000 from their respective regional riparian allocations, making \$4,624,000 available for Lower Columbia Lead Entity riparian projects.

The Targeted Investment program was focused on accelerating salmon recovery across the state through a strategic and large-scale funding opportunity and included a \$20 million total statewide allocation. Lower Columbia priorities were identified in the [Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Targeted Investment Program 2024 Request for Proposals](#), and were grounded in the recent viability status assessment for the region. Priorities focused on bolstering viable “stronghold” populations, and restoring and protecting populations where viability is currently very low to low but must be improved to high to achieve the regional recovery scenario. The LCFRB provided letters of support for Targeted Investment proposals describing how each recommended proposal aligns with regional recovery priorities and/or addresses key limiting factors for target populations. While the SRFB makes final decisions on which Targeted Investments proposals to fund statewide, their decisions are informed by scoring and ranking by the State Review Panel. Additional points (up to 13%) are assigned to projects based on how they ranked at the regional level.

**Table 1. Funding Allocations for the 2024 SRFB grant round in order they are allocated for each Lead Entity in the Lower Columbia Region. Lower Columbia regional allocation totals are 20% of the statewide standard and riparian funds.**

SRFB Funding Allocation	SRFB - Standard	SRFB - Riparian
<b>Statewide Available Funds:</b>	<b>\$28,100,000</b>	<b>\$23,870,000</b>
Klickitat County Lead Entity	\$0 – deferred to 2025	\$150,000
LCFRB Lead Entity	\$5,620,000	\$4,624,000
<b>Lower Columbia Regional Allocated Funds:</b>	<b>\$5,620,000</b>	<b>\$4,774,000</b>

**B. Explain if the project list(s) submitted in your region funds the highest priority projects.**

The project ranking and allocation of funding within and across the subbasins in the LCFRB Lead Entity area is accomplished through a habitat strategy and project evaluation and ranking process based on the goals, measures, actions, and priorities of the [Lower Columbia Salmon Recovery and Fish & Wildlife Subbasin Plan](#) (Recovery Plan). The [Lower Columbia habitat strategy](#) identifies protection and restoration needs and priorities using the same analytical methods and criteria across all of the region's 17 subbasins and estuary. The LCFRB's project evaluation and ranking process uses the habitat strategy as the basis for assessing a project's potential benefits to fish. The evaluation and ranking process also applies uniform evaluation questions in assessing each project's certainty of success and cost. As a result, the scores for projects are comparable, allowing projects to be objectively ranked, and funding allocated, both within and across all subbasins. As described further below, the technical foundation for the habitat strategy, including the project evaluation criteria and evaluation questions, are integrally connected to the Recovery Plan's broader technical foundation and recovery priorities. This ensures that projects address the highest priority species for recovery (e.g., Primary and Contributing populations) at the watershed, strata and Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) scales, and focus on the highest priority reaches and limiting factors for those species, from a fish population performance perspective. Given these strong linkages between the habitat strategy and Recovery Plan, the annual SRFB project lists submitted by the LCFRB strategically and consistently address the highest priority habitat needs in the region.

**C. If the highest priority projects were not funded, explain the barriers to implementing the highest priority projects in your region.**

The LCFRB's habitat strategy ensures that projects focus on the highest priority fish populations, and restoration needs for those populations, but given the broad geographic scope of our Lead Entity area, and the fact that fewer than half of all Lower Columbia watersheds typically receive project funding each year, establishment of long term and functional watershed-scale project lists for the entire region has not been practicable.

However, LCFRB is updating our habitat strategy in a manner that reflects recovery progress and changes in landscape conditions since final recovery plan adoption in 2010, and "all-H" recovery considerations, by developing a Focused Investment Strategy for Habitat (FISH), to augment the existing region-wide habitat strategy. In future years, this effort is expected to lead to more focused investment

of restoration and protection dollars based on emerging recovery needs, progress, and gaps, in the context of the Board's "all-H" recovery approach.

**D. Do suballocations to lead entities limit your region from getting to the highest priority projects?**

Our suballocations as described in Section A above are not limiting implementation of the highest priority projects in the region.

**2. Regional technical review process**

**a. Explain how the regional technical review was conducted.**

The LCFRB advertised the 2024 grant rounds and called for projects in February 2024, following approval of the annual grants manual at the February 2, 2024 LCFRB meeting. Through March 22, LCFRB staff hosted voluntary pre-proposal meetings for one-on-one discussions with potential applicants on their proposals. SRFB proposal presentations were held virtually in late April and early May. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members, Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) grant managers, State Review Panel members, and sponsors all participated in the proposal presentations. Tom Smayda and Alex Uber participated on behalf of the state SRFB Review Panel, and Bob Warinner served as the RCO Grants Manager, with support from RCO Grants Manager John Foltz. Feedback from the TAC, RCO grants managers, SRFB Review Panel, as well as responses from applicants, was provided electronically as well as verbally during proposal presentations. The Lower Columbia Targeted Investment proposal process was conducted parallel to the SRFB standard and riparian grant rounds up through proposal presentations.

Sponsors submitted 13 standard SRFB final applications totaling \$4,902,559 in requested grant funds, 7 riparian SRFB final applications totaling \$4,514,655 in requested grant funds, and three Targeted Investment final proposals totaling \$14,993,875.

The LCFRB Targeted Investment ranked list was due to the SRFB earlier than the standard and riparian ranked list, so the Targeted Investment proposals were reviewed and scored by the LCFRB TAC in May and the proposals for SRFB standard and riparian funding were scored and ranked in July. All final Lower Columbia Lead Entity proposals, including Targeted Investment, were deemed eligible, subject to approval of any conditions, for funding by the state Review Panel under the appropriate funding program. TAC members individually scored and ranked all proposals, using the [evaluation questions](#) in the [Lower Columbia Salmon Recovery Grants Manual](#) for all proposals, and additional evaluation questions for Targeted Investment proposals based on the goals of the program.

TAC members submitted their scores and rationales to staff and met to review the draft ranked lists based on their averaged scores, related scoring statistics, and rationales. Based on their review of the three Targeted Investment proposals, proposal presentations and discussions, the TAC by consensus recommended the following ranked list to the Board. The LCFRB Board approved the Targeted Investments Ranked Project List at their June meeting.

1. STHD 2 - SFT Reach D & Loch and Trouble Creeks – \$4,994,564:  
<https://secure.rco.wa.gov/prism/search/projectsnapshot.aspx?ProjectNumber=24-1452>
2. GMC 1 - Mulholland Creek Restoration - \$4,999,569:  
<https://secure.rco.wa.gov/prism/search/projectsnapshot.aspx?ProjectNumber=24-1451>
3. Mid Grays River Conservation Area - \$4,999,742:  
<https://secure.rco.wa.gov/prism/search/projectsnapshot.aspx?ProjectNumber=24-1755>

The Klickitat Lead Entity uses the Klickitat Lead Entity Strategy (2021), along with the professional insight of our Technical Advisory Group (TAG) as the guiding criteria for technical review and evaluation of proposed projects. The strategy is used for the following:

- Guiding the identification, sequencing, and prioritization of salmonid habitat projects for funding through the SRFB;
- Recruiting project sponsors and guiding their efforts towards higher priority areas and projects;
- Guiding the identification and selection of mitigation projects;
- Contributing to the habitat restoration and protection (non-regulatory) component of watershed plans developed under RCW 90.82;
- Enlisting the support and active participation of landowners and the community at large in the effort to restore and protect salmonid habitat;
- Assessing completed projects to determine if the desired results are realized, and to refine and retune the strategy and project guidance for maximum benefit to salmonids;
- Seeking sources of project funding to augment SRFB monies; and
- Serving as a tool for education and community outreach

The Klickitat Lead Entity has developed 3 matrices in our strategy that reflect geographic prioritizations of projects within our 3 WRIAS, WRIA 29b - White Salmon, WRIA 30 - Klickitat, WRIA 31 - Rock/Glade. Each matrix defines what reaches/basins should be prioritized when considering projects. The following criteria is listed in the matrix:

- The “tier” of the basin/reach from A-C, with A being the highest priority, with a scientific rationale for its listing
- The present salmonid species (or ancillary fish such as lamprey) in the listed reach
- The life history significance of the listed species
- The limiting habitat factors present in the reach
- Processes that might form quality habitat
- A priority tier for actions that would benefit the reach
- Listed actions/needs for the reach, with a scientific rationale
- Existing scientific literature for the reach
- The level of community interest for project development within the listed reach

These 3 matrices allow for the TAG to analyze and prioritize projects within the WRIAs that could have the most impact on fish habitat restoration and conservation.



The Klickitat Lead Entity does not currently have a list of priority projects but will be in the process of developing one when our Lead Entity Strategy is updated in 2025. The matrices for geographic prioritization can be found on pages 48-95 of our [strategy](#).

**b. What criteria were used for the regional technical review?**

The LCFRB Lead Entity relies on the Lower Columbia habitat strategy to determine whether projects are consistent with the goals, measures, actions, and priorities of the Recovery Plan. The LCFRB habitat strategy is incorporated in the online [Lower Columbia Salmon Resource map](#). This is an interactive map that identifies: species presence, with associated population recovery priorities and designations (based on the regional recovery scenario); stream reach designations identifying importance to fish population performance; prioritized habitat limiting factors by life history stage (variety of formats); and, high priority restoration and protection approaches that target the most limiting life history needs. Reach-level restoration and protection needs are identified on both a multi-species and individual population basis. The map also contains links to assessments, watershed-based habitat strategies, land use, fish barriers, and other information.

In conducting the regional technical review, the LCFRB TAC evaluates and scores projects based on benefits to fish, certainty of success, and cost. Benefits to fish project evaluation questions are designed to consider the above-described data and information housed in the habitat strategy. The following is a more detailed description of key criteria and considerations:

Stream reaches are ranked using a four-tier approach, with Tier 1 reaches being the highest priority for protection and/or restoration, and Tier 4 reaches being the lowest. A reach's tier designation is based on the following two factors:

- The regional recovery priority of the populations (Primary, Contributing or Stabilizing); and,
- The relative importance of the target reaches (in habitat degradation and restoration modeling scenarios) to the performance of each population based on Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment (EDT) modeling.

In addition to ranking reaches, the habitat strategy uses the EDT model to identify and rank:

- The relative importance of restoring versus preserving habitat conditions within a specific reach to population performance (Species Reach Potential); and,
- Reach-specific habitat restoration needs based on the salmon and steelhead recovery priorities, life history stages and their associated limiting factors. Restoration needs or habitat attribute priorities within a reach are rated as High, Medium, or Low.

The extent to which a project addresses key habitat attributes and their effectiveness is based on the review of the project and related data by Board staff and the TAC. Additionally, the size of the area



being treated, the number of targeted high priority populations (multi-species benefits), and the project objectives and technical approach are also considered.

To further support and inform the benefits to fish evaluation and scoring, staff provides TAC members with Benefits to Fish summaries for each project that include information and data on the following: population recovery (e.g., Primary, Contributing, Stabilizing) and special status (e.g., historic legacy or core) designations; population progress toward delisting targets; all-H threat reduction targets and impact reduction progress at population and species scales; habitat trajectories at watershed-scales; climate change impacts and benefits; watershed function impairment ratings; and, presence of cold water refuge and tidally influenced habitats. These Benefits to Fish summaries are supplemented map layers that contain information on EDT stream reach tier ratings, species reach potential ratings, and multi species restoration and protection priorities from EDT analyses.

A project's certainty of success is based on TAC review of the project using the following general criteria:

- The project's objectives and scope;
- Proposed technical approach and methodologies;
- Coordination and sequencing with other recovery work;
- Technical, physical, legal, or funding uncertainties;
- Sponsor capabilities, experience and track record; and,
- Community and landowner support.

The TAC also evaluates each project to determine if the cost is reasonable relative to the work performed and the likely benefits. This evaluation is based on professional judgment taking into consideration labor, material, and administrative costs in comparison to past and similar projects. The following considerations guide TAC cost evaluation:

- Amount and total project cost relative to the likely salmon recovery benefits;
- Total project cost relative to the amount and type of work proposed;
- Whether costs are well described and justified; and,
- Whether more appropriate fund sources are available for the proposed work.

Projects are given High, Medium, or Low ratings for benefits to fish (BTF), certainty of success (COS), and cost, based on numerical scores. If a project receives an average Low rating in any category, it is generally not recommended for funding unless there are other factors that outweigh the low rating, such as potential benefits for the Lower Columbia Intensively Monitored Watershed (IMW) program.

**c. Who completed the review (name, affiliation, and expertise) and are they part of the regional organization or independent?**

## Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity

Projects are reviewed by the TAC and submitted to the Board, who reviews the recommended ranking and approves the final list. The Board may amend the list based on policy considerations such as community support, economic impacts and social and cultural issues.

### *Technical Advisory Committee*

The LCFRB TAC was established pursuant to RCW 77.85.200. The principal role of the TAC is to advise the Board on technical matters relating to habitat protection and restoration. By statute, the Washington Departments of Fish and Wildlife, Ecology, Transportation, and Natural Resources are required members. The Board adds additional members from federal and state agencies, local government, Tribes and private business to augment the breadth and depth of technical expertise. Table 4 below lists the current TAC membership.

### *Conflict of Interest*

The Board recognizes that, given TAC experience and expertise in fish-related issues, some members may have knowledge of, or some connection to, a proposal. It is the policy of the Board that TAC members conduct an unbiased review of the proposals. If for any reason a member believes that he or she cannot be unbiased, the member is expected to recuse himself or herself from the process. If a TAC member stands to gain personally if a proposal is funded, this is a legal conflict of interest and the TAC member must recuse himself or herself. In 2019, the Board updated its conflict-of-interest policies to include a blanket (rather than case by case) limitation on TAC members scoring projects from their own organizations, and improvements to scoring statistic tracking and distribution. There were no TAC member conflicts in the 2024 SRFB grant round.

**Table 4. Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Technical Advisory Committee Membership**

Member	Affiliation	Expertise
David Lindley, Interim Chair	Yakama Nation Fisheries	M.P.A., Public and Non-Profit Administration; M.S., Natural Resources; B.S., Forest Resources Ecosystem Management; Professional Certification in River Restoration
Lisa Brown	WA Department of Fish and Wildlife	B.S., Zoology
Jim Fisher	Private consultant	B.S., Zoology and Chemistry
DeeDee Jones	WA Department of Transportation	B.S., Wildlife and Fisheries Biology
Joshua Jones	U.S. Forest Service	B.S. Fisheries Biology; Fisheries Program Manager for Gifford Pinchot National Forest
Jared McKee	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Engineer and hydrologist; M.S., Civil and Environmental Engineering
Vacant	WA Department of Natural Resources	
Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride	WA Department of Ecology	

### ***Citizen Committee***

The Board serves as the citizen committee and has final approval authority for the lead entity's project list. The Board is responsible for the resolution of any dispute arising from the TAC decisions. In developing the final project list, the Board may amend the list based on policy considerations as noted above, provided the rationale is documented in writing. Table 5 below provides a list of Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board members.

### ***Conflict of Interest***

As with the TAC, the Board recognizes that, given members' experience and expertise in fish-related issues, some members may have knowledge of, or some connection to, a proposal. However, this does not necessarily prevent a Board member from participating in approving the ranked list. If for any reason a Board member believes that he or she cannot be unbiased, the member is expected to recuse himself or herself from the process. If a member stands to gain personally if a proposal is funded, the member must recuse himself or herself. For the record, no conflicts were noted for the 2024 grant round.

**Table 5. Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Membership**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Todd Olson, Chair	Hydro-electric operators representative, PacifiCorp
Scott Brummer, Vice Chair	Lewis County Commissioner
Dennis Weber, Secretary-Treasurer	Cowlitz County Commissioner
Dan Cothren	Wahkiakum County Commissioner
Dalton Fry	Cowlitz Indian Tribe
Marylynne Kostick	Lewis County citizen representative
Asa Leckie	Skamania County Commissioner
Robert Sudar	Cowlitz County citizen representative and private property representative
Troy McCoy	Southwest Washington Cities representative, City of Battle Ground
Sue Marshall	Clark County Councilor
Senator Lynda Wilson	Washington State Senate, 17 <sup>th</sup> Legislative District
Sandra Staples-Bortner	Wahkiakum County citizen representative
Don Swanson	Southwest Washington environmental representative
Jade Unger	Clark County citizen representative
Nathan Phillips	Skamania County citizen representative

- d. Were there any projects submitted to the SRFB that the regional implementation or Habitat Work Schedule did not specifically identify? If so, please provide justification for including these projects in the list of projects recommended to the SRFB for funding. If the projects were identified in the regional implementation plan or strategy but considered a low priority or in a low priority area please provide justification.**

All projects on the Board’s final project list stem directly from the region-wide habitat strategy and/or watershed-based habitat strategies, and target high priority populations, reaches and recovery needs (Table 8).

**3. Criteria the SRFB considers in funding regional project lists. How did the regional review consider whether a project:**

- a. Provides benefit to high priority stocks for the purpose of salmon recovery or sustainability. In addition to limiting factors analysis, Salmonid Stock Inventory, and Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Inventory and Assessment Program, provide stock assessment work completed to date to characterize the status of salmonid species in the region. Briefly describe.**

The consistency of a project with the priorities of the Recovery Plan is an integral element in the Board’s project evaluation and ranking process and criteria. The consistency of the overall project list with the Recovery Plan is determined based on three factors. Specifically, the project evaluation assesses whether the projects on the list target:

- Priority populations for recovery;
- Priority reaches;
- Priority limiting factors or habitat attributes; and,
- Benefits to other Columbia Basin stocks<sup>3</sup>.

The Recovery Plan sets three population priorities or categories: Primary, Contributing, and Stabilizing (Table 6). While highest priority is given to Primary and Contributing populations, it should be noted that the NOAA-approved Recovery Plan requires improvement in the abundance, productivity, spatial distribution, and diversity for all populations, except Stabilizing, to achieve recovery.

Additional consideration is given for other upstream Columbia Basin (“out of basin”) populations using the tidally influenced reaches of tributary streams and the importance of such reaches to these populations.

**Table 6. Population Classifications**

Population Classification		Viability Goal	Description	Persistence Probability*
P	Primary	High (H) or Very High (VH)	Low (negligible) risk of extinction (represents a “viable” level)	95-99%
C	Contributing	Medium	Medium risk of extinction	75-94%
S	Stabilizing	Low	Stable, but relatively high risk of extinction	40-74%

\*100-year persistence probabilities.

<sup>3</sup>While out-of-basin populations are not considered in the recovery plan, the Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board recognizes the importance of estuarine habitat where upriver stocks use these areas during their migration seasons and has included language and guidance to address them in the LCFRB Salmon Recovery Grants Manual.

Reach priorities are established in two steps. First, the importance of the reach to each population is rated as High, Medium, or Low based on EDT analysis. Then, reaches are grouped into ranked tiers using the criteria in Table 7.

**Table 7. Reach Tier Designation Rules. Reach priorities (High, Medium, or Low) are based on Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment (EDT) results.**

Reaches	Rule
Tier 1	All high priority reaches for one or more Primary populations.
Tier 2	All reaches not included in Tier 1 and which are medium priority reaches for one or more Primary species and/or all high priority reaches for one or more Contributing populations.
Tier 3	All reaches not included in Tiers 1 and 2 and which are medium priority reaches for Contributing populations and/or high priority reaches for Stabilizing populations.
Tier 4	Reaches not included in Tiers 1, 2, and 3 and which are medium priority reaches for Stabilizing populations and/or low priority reaches for all populations.

**Table 8. Fish and Priority Tiers for Stream Reaches Addressed by each Project. Fish priorities are identified by recovery designations: Primary = P, Contributing = C, Stabilizing = S.**

	Project	Steelhead		Chinook		Chum	Coho	Out of Basin	Reach Tiers			
		Wtr	Sum	Fall	Spr				1	2	3	4
1	24-1450 SF Toutle Restoration at Brownell Crk	P		P	C		P		X	X		
2	24-1452 STHD 2 – SFT Reach D & Loch and Trouble Creeks	P		P	C		P		X	X		
3	24-1524 Cedar Creek – Masser-Instream Design	C		P			C				X	
4	24-1455 Delameter-Arkansas Barrier Bundle	C				C	P			X		X
5	24-1853 Cleveland Skamokawa Creek Restoration	C		P		P	P	C	X			
6	24-1451 GMC 1 – Mulholland Crk Rest	P		P		C	P					X
7	24-1854 Uncle Henry’s Lake Elochoman Restoration	C		P		P	P		X			
8	24-1525 Cedar Creek – Masser-Riparian	C		P			C				X	
9	24-1851 Elochoman Headwaters Design	C		P		P	P		X			X
10	24-1453 Timber Creek Fish Passage and Instream Design		P							X		
11	24-1454 Beaver-Bear NFT Rest	P		P	C		P					X
12	24-1526 Dyer Creek and E Fork Lewis Habitat Improvements	P	P	P		P	P	P	X			
13	24-1753 Cowlitz WLA Spears Unit Design	P		S			P					X
14	24-1578 Lower Woodard Creek Restoration	P		C			P					

## Appendix M Regional Area Summary

### Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region

	Project	Steelhead		Chinook		Chum	Coho	Out of Basin	Reach Tiers			
		Wtr	Sum	Fall	Spr				1	2	3	4
15	24-1641 Riparian Enhancements in the Wind River Watershed		P						X	X		
16	24-1527 Lower Woodard Creek Design -Ph 3	P		C		P	P	P				
17	24-1755 Mid Grays River Conservation Area	P		C		P	P			X		
18	24-1617 Lena Springs Design	P		C		P	P			X		
19	24-1528 Campen Crk Rest	P		C		P	P	P				
20	24-1523 Coweeman Headwaters Riparian Stewardship	P		P		C	P		X			
21	24-1500 EF Deep River Fish and Human Resilience-Ph1	P		C		P	P	P		X		
22	24-1756 Elochoman LWD and Floodplain Connection	C		P		P	P		X			

The TAC also evaluates benefits to high priority populations based on the degree to which proposals target key life history stages and associated limiting factors for each population and have the proper scope and technical approach to achieve biological goals and objectives. The certainty that a project will deliver benefits to high priority stocks is also evaluated through certainty of success criteria that address project coordination, sequencing, constraints and uncertainties, sponsor qualifications, community support and stewardship.

#### **b. Addresses cost-effectiveness. Provide a description of cost-effectiveness considered.**

The TAC considers the cost of a project during its evaluation of final applications. The consideration of cost is based on professional judgment taking into consideration labor, material, and administrative costs in comparison to past projects. The following questions guide the TAC's cost evaluation.

- Are the requested amount and total project cost reasonable relative to the likely salmon recovery benefits?
- Is the total project cost (grant request and match) reasonable relative to the amount and type of work proposed?
- Are costs well described and justified?
- Are there more appropriate funding sources available for the proposed work?

This evaluation process provides for scoring, as well as the assignment of low, medium and high categories for each question.

- c. Provides benefit to listed and non-listed fish species. Identify projects on the regional list that primarily benefit listed fish. Identify projects on the regional list that primarily benefit non-listed species.**

All projects on the 2024 list primarily benefit ESA-listed listed salmon and steelhead species (Table 8), in addition to non-listed species such as resident and anadromous cutthroat trout, lamprey and other non-salmonid species.

- d. Preserves high quality habitat. Identify the projects on the list that will preserve high quality habitat.**

Targeted Investment project 24-1755 Mid Grays River Conservation Area will result in the conservation of approximately 800 acres through fee simple acquisition in the Grays River watershed. The project will protect existing at risk but high quality, spawning, adult holding and juvenile rearing habitat for chum, coho, fall Chinook, and winter steelhead. This project will also bolster and protect a regionally significant stronghold population of chum salmon.

- e. Implements a high priority project or action in a region or watershed salmon recovery plan. Identify where and how the project is identified as a high priority in the referenced plan.**

See response to question 2D. All projects on the Board's final project list stem directly from the regional Recovery Plan priorities, and all projects target high priority populations (Table 8).

- f. Provides for match above the minimum requirement percentage. Identify the project's match percentage and the regional match total.**

All 2024 projects meet or exceed minimum match requirements (Table 9). Matching funds are from all sources and may be different than the amount reported in PRISM.

**Table 9. SRFB Grant Requests and Match for the 2023 Project List.**

Rank	Grant Program	Project Name	Sponsor	SRFB Grant Request	LCFRB SRFB Allocation	Match (all sources)	Match %
1	Riparian	24-1450 SF Toutle Restoration at Brownell Crk	LC Fish Enhancement Group	\$1,999,010	\$1,999,010	\$0	0%
2	TI	24-1452 STHD 2 – SFT Reach D & Loch and Trouble Creeks	LC Fish Enhancement Group	\$4,994,564			
3	Standard	24-1524 Cedar Creek – Masser- Instream Design	LC Fish Enhancement Group	\$94,164	\$94,164	\$0	0%
4	Standard	24-1455 Delameter- Arkansas Barrier Bundle	LC Fish Enhancement Group	\$349,782	\$349,782	\$0	0%
5	Riparian	24-1853 Cleveland Skamokawa Creek Restoration	Wahkiakum CD	\$225,085	\$225,085	\$0	0%



**Appendix M Regional Area Summary**  
Lower Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region

Rank	Grant Program	Project Name	Sponsor	SRFB Grant Request	LCFRB SRFB Allocation	Match (all sources)	Match %
6	TI	24-1451 GMC 1 – Mulholland Crk Rest	LC Fish Enhancement Group	\$4,999,569			
7	Standard	24-1854 Uncle Henry's Lake Elochoman Restoration	Wahkiakum CD	\$177,372	\$177,372	\$34,000	19.1%
8	Riparian	24-1525 Cedar Creek – Masser- Riparian	LC Fish Enhancement Group	\$274,665	\$274,665	\$0	0%
9	Standard	24-1851 Elochoman Headwaters Design	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	\$336,262	\$336,262	\$0	0%
10	Standard	24-1453 Timber Creek Fish Passage and Instream Design	LC Fish Enhancement Group	\$128,664	\$128,664	\$0	0%
11	Riparian	24-1454 Beaver-Bear NFT Restoration	LC Fish Enhancement Group	\$766,242	\$766,242	\$0	0%
12	Standard	24-1526 Dyer Creek and E Fork Lewis Habitat Improvements	LC Estuary Partnership	\$694,166	\$694,166	\$150,000	21.6%
13	Standard	24-1753 Cowlitz WLA Spears Unit Design	WDFW	\$288,648	\$288,648	\$51,000	17.7%
14	Standard	24-1578 Lower Woodard Creek Restoration	LC Estuary Partnership	\$771,045	Alternate		
15	Riparian	24-1641 Riparian Enhancements in the Wind River Watershed	Cascade Forest Conservancy	\$199,498	\$199,498	\$10,000	5.0%
16	Standard	24-1527 Lower Woodard Creek Design -Ph 3	LC Estuary Partnership	\$349,780	\$349,780	\$0	0%
17	TI	24-1755 Mid Grays River Conservation	Columbia Land Trust	\$4,999,804			
18	Standard	24-1617 Lena Springs Design	Cowlitz Indian Tribe	\$174,129	\$174,129	\$0	0%
19	Standard	24-1528 Campen Crk Restoration	LC Estuary Partnership	\$239,167	\$239,167	\$310,000	130%
20	Riparian	24-1523 Coweeman Headwaters Riparian Stewardship	LC Fish Enhancement Group	\$191,484	\$191,484	\$0	0%
21	Standard	24-1500 EF Deep River Fish and Human Resilience-Ph1	Columbia Estuary Study Taskforce	\$237,627	\$237,627	\$792,642	333.5%
22	Standard	24-1756 Elochoman LWD and Floodplain Connection	WDFW	\$973,575	\$973,575	\$190,706	19.6%
		Targeted Investment Requests:		\$14,993,937			
		Standard SRFB Requests:		\$4,814,381		\$1,538,348	32%
		Riparian Requests:		\$4,514,655			

The LCFRB tracks all match sources, including amounts that exceed the 15% minimum established by the SRFB. Tracking all match is critical in providing a comprehensive picture of how federal and other funds are leveraged at the regional and statewide levels, and in fully capturing the sponsor and community support for salmon recovery efforts.

- g. Sponsored by an organization with a successful record of project implementation. For example, identify the number of previous SRFB projects funded and completed.**

Eight sponsoring organizations have projects on the 2024 funding list. Previously funded and completed projects per organization are detailed below (Table 10). Previously funded projects includes both completed and active projects funded through the SRFB. Other Recreation and Conservation Office projects are not included.

**Table 10. SRFB Project Funding History for all 2023 Funded Project Sponsors (1999 – 2022)**

Sponsor	Project Rankings in 2024 LCFRB List	Number of previously funded habitat/monitoring projects	Number of Active Projects	Number of closed completed projects
WA Department of Fish and Wildlife	13, 22	17	5	11
Lower Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 20	80	14	65
Cascade Forest Conservancy	15	1	1	0
Cowlitz Indian Tribe	9, 18	55	18	32
Columbia Land Trust	17	25	4	21
Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership	12, 14, 16, 19	15	7	8
Wahkiakum Conservation District	5, 7	30	7	23
Columbia Estuary Study Taskforce	21	8	1	7

## Local Review Process Questions and Responses

### 4. Local Review Processes.

- a. Provide project evaluation criteria and documentation of your local Citizens Advisory Group and Technical Advisory Group ratings for each project, including explanations for differences between the two groups' ratings.**

### Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board

The Board serves as both the regional recovery organization and the Lead Entity for all WRIs in the region, except for the White Salmon subbasin, for which Klickitat County is the Lead Entity. The project evaluation criteria for the LCFRB Lead Entity review process are described above in the regional section.

### Klickitat Lead Entity

Both the Klickitat Lead Entity's Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and Citizens Review Committee (CRC) participate in project evaluation, through a ranking and scoring process at each group's final meeting of

the year. The TAG's ranking and scoring process is used to inform the decision made by the CRC, and then the CRC's final ranked and scored list is used as the basis for the official ranked list submitted to the SRFB for funding. The TAG and the CRC have separate scoring forms on the following criteria:

**TAG Scoring Criteria**

- Habitat Features and Processes
- Area and Actions
- Scientific
- Species Life and History
- Costs
- Appropriate
- Sequence
- Stewardship Capacity
- Implementation

**CRC Scoring Criteria**

- Landowner Acknowledgment
- Habitat Features and Processes
- Areas and Actions
- Scientific
- Life History and Species
- Costs Appropriate
- Sequence
- Stewardship
- Implementation
- Community Issues
- Community Support

While similar, the CRC scoring process considers community factors that might be helped/hindered by the proposed projects, and what sponsors plan to do to mitigate any community concerns.

- [Klickitat Lead Entity TAG Ranking and Scoring Meeting Minutes](#)
- [Klickitat Lead Entity CRC Ranking and Scoring Meeting Minutes](#)

**b. Identify your local technical review team**

**Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity**

The Technical Advisory Committee members are identified above in the regional section (Table 4).

## Klickitat County Lead Entity

**Table 11. Klickitat County Lead Entity Technical Advisory Committee Membership**

Name	Affiliation	Expertise
Brady Allen	Bonneville Power Administration	Fisheries Biologist
Adrienne Grimm	NOAA Fisheries	Hydrologist and Ecologist
Sean Gross	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries Biologist
Jill Hardiman	USGS - Western Fisheries Research	Fisheries Biologist
Amber Johnson	WDFW	Habitat Biologist
Gardner Johnston	Inter-Fluve	Hydrologist
Patrick Hayden	Yakama Nation Fisheries	Habitat Biology
Margaret Neuman	Mid-Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group	Salmon Recovery Project Management
Rashawn Tama	US Forest Service	Hydrologist
Tova Tillinghast	Underwood Conservation District	Conservation and Restoration
Nate Ulrich	Columbia Land Trust	Conservation Acquisition
Joe Zendt	Yakama Nation Fisheries	Fish and Habitat Biologist
Dave Ryan	Mt. Adams Resource Stewards	Ecology and Forestry
Ian Jezorek (Alternate)	USGS - Western Fisheries	Fisheries Biology
Carly Lemon (Alternate)	Underwood Conservation District	Engineering

- c. Explain how and when the SRFB Review Panel participated in your local process, if applicable.**

## Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity

Two SRFB Review Panel members, Alex Uber and Tom Smayda, attended the virtual site visits and independently reviewed projects. Formal comments on the draft applications were received from the SRFB Review Panel and provided to sponsors so feedback could be incorporated in their final applications. SRFB Review Panel participation provided early notice of issues of potential concern to the review panel and allowed sponsors an opportunity to address or resolve these issues in their final applications. Sponsors were required to submit responses to questions in their final applications indicating how and where in the application the comments were addressed.

## Klickitat County Lead Entity

SRFB Review Panel Members Kelly Jorgenson and Tom Thoth, along with RCO representative Kay Caromile attended in-person site visit tours for both the Snyder Creek and Klickitat Acquisition projects and a virtual presentation of the Howard Lake Road project on April 25<sup>th</sup>. The Howard Lake Road project is in a very remote location and would've taken hours to get to and back. Additionally, Kay Caromile

participated in site visits of several previous and ongoing projects the week of April 22<sup>nd</sup> before the official site visits for the 2024 grant round.

All projects were cleared by the SRFB review panel when comments were released several months later, and it was noted that there were no concerns about any of the projects seeking funding.

## **5. Local evaluation process and project lists.**

- a. Explain how multi-year implementation plans or habitat work schedules were used to develop project lists**

### **Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity**

Salmon recovery priorities and actions are guided by the NOAA-approved lower Columbia domain Recovery Plan for both the Columbia estuary and mainstem, and the subbasin tributaries. The Board's habitat strategy serves as its 6-year implementation work schedule. It is reviewed annually as described earlier and is consistent with the priorities outlined in the recovery plan. When individual subbasin habitat strategies are completed, information on site-specific project opportunities are incorporated, and stored on our website for accessibility. Habitat strategies help sponsors target high priority areas and restoration types to craft their proposals, as described in more detail in Sections 1 through 3 above.

### **Klickitat County Lead Entity**

The *Klickitat Lead Entity Strategy* is the basis for project prioritization and work schedule development for projects in our WRIAs. The strategy provides several matrices that give priority to projects that are located in key reaches of the different watersheds, and projects that improve/conserves habitats in specific ways that provide the most impact to fish. The current strategy was last updated in 2021, and the Klickitat Lead Entity is planning to update their strategy for 2025. Additionally, the Klickitat Lead Entity does not currently have a list of prioritized individual projects, but is seeking to establish one when we update our strategy.

- b. Explain how comments of technical, citizen, and policy reviews were addressed in finalizing the project list. Were there any issues about projects on the list and how were those resolved?**

### **Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Lead Entity**

Opportunity for public comment is provided at all LCFR Board and TAC meetings. The recommended TAC list was approved by consensus, and the final Board ranked list was approved for submittal to the SRFB by unanimous decision. No outstanding concerns with the final project list were identified.

The SRFB Review Panel members were proactive at identifying project elements that could potentially lead to "project of concern" (POC) designations during this grant round. As a result of their feedback, sponsors were successful at crafting complete final project proposals that met all applicable LCFRB and Manual 18 requirements relating to benefits to fish, certainty of success, and cost effectiveness.

### Klickitat County Lead Entity

Sponsors are provided with comments from local review committees, the SRFB review panel, and the RCO grant manager at multiple stages in the application process. This feedback is used to strengthen proposals. Sponsors first receive written and verbal feedback from the Klickitat Technical and Citizens Review Committees prior to submitting their draft application in PRISM. This initial feedback is used as a first filter to make sure that projects align with Klickitat Lead Entity priorities and to identify local technical considerations and community perspectives that could strengthen the proposal. After submitting their draft applications, sponsors then receive another round of feedback from the SRFB Review Panel, the RCO grant manager, and local committees. Comments received on the draft application are used to refine the final project proposal, ensuring that the project meets both state and local technical criteria and reflects community considerations that will help build overall support for salmon recovery.

In 2024 there were no local issues with our project list, however both committees had different rank orders for projects. The TAG ranked list informs the decision of the CRC, and their ranked list takes precedence over the TAG.