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Region Overview

Geography

The Upper Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region is comprised of salmon-bearing streams in Chelan, Douglas, and Okanogan Counties.

Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIA)

Moses Coulee (44), Wenatchee (45), Entiat (46), Methow (48), Okanogan (49), and Foster (50)

Federally Recognized Tribes

Colville Confederated Tribes and the Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation

Endangered Species Act Listings

Table 1: Upper Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region Listed Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species Listed</th>
<th>Listed As</th>
<th>Date Listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Columbia River Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>March 24, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Columbia River Steelhead</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>August 18, 1997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salmon Recovery Plan

Table 2: Upper Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region Recovery Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recovery Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions Identified to Implement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Schedule Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Region and Lead Entities**
The Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB) serves as the regional organization and the Lead Entity.

**Regional Area Summary Questions and Responses**

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

In general, the Lead Entity facilitates a process that allocates funds within the Upper Columbia based on the regional biological priorities established in the Upper Columbia Spring Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Plan (UCSRB 2007) *Appendix H: A Biological Strategy to Protect and Restore Salmonid Habitat in the Upper Columbia Region* (Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team (RTT) 2017). Since previous SRFB grants have matched the regional priorities in recent grant cycles, the Lead Entity considers these criteria to be an appropriate guideline for funding allocation. Moreover, the biological priorities in the Biological Strategy closely match those in the Recovery Plan.

The process the UCSRB Lead Entity used to develop a final Regional list in 2020 differed from previous years because of changes to Manual 18 and state guidelines, Regional changes, and the COVID-19 pandemic. Within the Upper Columbia, the Lead Entity took the opportunity to modify the Regional schedule within the context of the schedule outlined in Manual 18 to have project sponsors finish their involvement in the process in June versus July. This change serves to lessen the impacts of the SRFB grant round on project sponsors during construction and field season. Additionally, with one less review from the State Review Panel (SRP), the Lead Entity moved technical presentations and feedback earlier in the process, so project sponsors had the opportunity to modify and change proposals earlier based on technical feedback within the Region. The other significant change because of the COVID-19 pandemic was the shift to all virtual site visits, which were received positively by SRP, RTT and CAC members. Participants did suggest there may be value in a mixed approach of virtual and field visits in future rounds, though there are several questions/issues that would need to be worked out before widespread agreement could be reached.

The criteria the RTT use to score habitat restoration projects did not change and was based on biological benefit, and final ranking was completed by the Citizen Advisory Committees (CACs) The criteria used to score and rank projects was based on biological, social, economic, and community considerations.
Regional Area Summary
Upper Columbia River Salmon Recovery Region

The UCSRB Lead Entity Process Guide 2020 v12.1, 2020 UC SRFB TRIB (Regional) Funding Schedule v2, 2020 Regional Application Questions (JotForm), and 2020 UC Regional JotForm Application Instructions (Attachment A) document the steps in our funding process in detail.

**Regional Technical Review Process**

How was the regional technical review conducted?
Since 2001, the RTT has provided independent technical review for the Upper Columbia project proposals. The RTT has always used a formal process with review criteria to rate projects on their technical merits and consistency with regional biological priorities. It was the first technical team in the state to establish biological priorities at an Evolutionary Significant Unit (ESU) scale.

When the UCSRB adopted the draft Recovery Plan in June 2005, the RTT met monthly from then through March 2006 to revise its project rating criteria based on the Viable Salmonid Population (VSP) parameters established in the Recovery Plan. The RTT revised its Biological Strategy again in 2009 to ensure consistency with the Recovery Plan, and again in 2012/2013 in a process that included stakeholder input. A 2017 update to the Biological Strategy was completed as part of the five-year adaptive management process and accomplished two main objectives: 1) better definition of the prioritization of habitat actions, and 2) updating the technical appendices and the text within the main body of the strategy with new information regarding restoration strategies and priorities.

The RTT is in the process of revising its prioritization approach, including 1) refinement and prioritization of assessment units for restoration and protection; and 2) identification of limiting life stages at the population and assessment unit scale, identification and ranking of limiting factors and threats that cause certain life stages to be limiting, identification and prioritization of reaches within AUs for restoration and protection, and identification and prioritization of habitat action types to address limiting factors. This information will be integrated into the Biological Strategy in early 2021, most likely in time for the 2021 SRFB grant round.

What criteria were used for the regional technical review?

**RTT Project Scoring**
The RTT Scoring Criteria for SRFB Proposals (December 2019) used for the 2020 funding cycle can be found in Attachment B. The RTT Comments on 2020 SRFB Proposals and results from the RTT’s June 10 scoring meeting are also included in Attachment B.

**Monitoring Project Type**
The RTT developed scoring criteria for monitoring projects in April 2016. The 2016 criteria are aligned with RCO’s Manual 18 requirements and are the primary basis for UCSRB certification.
The RTT scoring criteria for monitoring proposals are articulated in the *RTT Scoring Criteria for SRFB Proposals (December 2019)* and the *UCSRB SRFB Monitoring Process 2020* and are included in Attachment B.

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

Members of the RTT participated in the final proposal review (the full list of the RTT is available [here](#)). The RTT is an independent group of natural resource professionals in the region with a broad range of expertise relevant to fish biology, engineering and habitat rehabilitation. The individuals volunteer their time to the RTT on behalf of their agency or organization to provide a service to the region. The RTT’s chair is Tracy Hillman PhD, who assumed the chairmanship in August 2016. Tables 3 and 4 identify the Upper Columbia RTT and CACs who reviewed, scored and ranked projects this year.
### Table 3. 2020 Regional Technical Reviewers (Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Scored in 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Arterburn</td>
<td>Colville Confederated Tribes</td>
<td>Habitat and fish population status and trends monitoring, Habitat RM&amp;E reporting; salmon ecology; habitat restoration evaluation and planning; project management.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Fortney</td>
<td>NOAA-NWFSC</td>
<td>Fluvial geomorphology; salmonid ecology; habitat restoration evaluation and planning; habitat status and trend monitoring.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Hillman PhD (Chair)</td>
<td>BioAnalysts, Inc.</td>
<td>Certified ecologist; habitat restoration evaluation and planning; hatchery and habitat RM&amp;E; fish ecology and population dynamics; subbasin planning and salmon recovery writing; modeling and statistical analysis.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Kahler</td>
<td>Douglas County PUD</td>
<td>Salmon ecology; habitat restoration evaluation and planning; hatchery planning and RM&amp;E; juvenile bypass development at hydro projects; RM&amp;E at hydro projects.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Polivka PhD</td>
<td>USFS PNW Research Station</td>
<td>Salmon ecology; habitat restoration evaluation.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Yeager</td>
<td>NOAA Fisheries</td>
<td>Habitat restoration evaluation and planning; ESA regulatory review; Forest/riparian ecology.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Willard</td>
<td>Chelan County PUD</td>
<td>Hatchery programs, habitat restoration; and fish population and habitat data.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Cram PhD</td>
<td>WA Dept. Fish &amp; Wildlife</td>
<td>Life cycle modeling; salmon recovery planning and implementation; habitat restoration evaluation and planning.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Terrell</td>
<td>US Fish &amp; Wildlife</td>
<td>Salmon ecology; habitat restoration evaluation and planning.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keely Murdoch</td>
<td>Yakama Nation</td>
<td>Ecology; habitat restoration evaluation.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Rogers</td>
<td>Yakama Nation</td>
<td>Habitat restoration evaluation, planning, and implementation; project management.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Baldwin</td>
<td>Colville Confederated Tribes</td>
<td>Aquatic ecology, habitat and fish population monitoring, salmon life cycle modeling, ESA recovery planning, habitat restoration prioritization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Lange</td>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>Engineering; habitat restoration evaluation, planning, design, implementation, and monitoring.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Hayes</td>
<td>Chelan County PUD</td>
<td>Habitat restoration evaluation and planning; juvenile bypass development at hydro projects; salmon ecology; hatchery planning and RM&amp;E; juvenile bypass development at hydro projects; RM&amp;E at hydro projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. 2020 Citizen’s Advisory Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chelan Citizen Advisory Committee Members</th>
<th>Representation from Statute</th>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
<th>Scored in 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mike Deason (City of Leavenworth)</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Leavenworth</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Truscott (Interested citizen)</td>
<td>Other Habitat Interests</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Whitehall (Orchardist, Fisherman)</td>
<td>Other Habitat Interests</td>
<td>Entiat</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Merighi (Interested citizen)</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Leavenworth</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Graybill (Sporting Industry)</td>
<td>Other Habitat Interests</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Schmidt (Retired Project Manager)</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Entiat</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Okanogan Citizen Advisory Committee Members</th>
<th>Representation from Statute</th>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
<th>Scored in 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Bartella (Farmer)</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Okanogan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Monetta (Business Realtor)</td>
<td>Business Interest</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Nelson (Chair) (Okanogan Conservation District)</td>
<td>Conservation District</td>
<td>Okanogan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom McCoy (Environmental Consultant)</td>
<td>Environmental Group</td>
<td>Winthrop</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Sukovaty (Farmer)</td>
<td>Business Interest</td>
<td>Winthrop</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Israel (Citizen)</td>
<td>Environmental Group</td>
<td>Twisp</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Keller (Okanogan NRCS)</td>
<td>Other Habitat Interests</td>
<td>Okanogan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Were there any projects submitted to the SRFB that were not specifically identified in the regional implementation plan or habitat work schedule? 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.

No
How did your regional review consider whether a project:

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, what stock assessment work has been done to date to further characterize the status of salmonid species in the region? Briefly describe.

Restoring the productivity of salmon and steelhead habitat in the Upper Columbia requires a prioritization of habitat actions to maximize the benefit derived from limited funding. The Biological Strategy identifies actions to consider in implementing projects with high biological benefit. The RTT rated actions and developed quartiles that compare actions across the entire ESU. The Biological Strategy provides guidance on habitat actions that are expected to contribute to the improved status of the VSP parameters. Priority areas and ecological concerns have been identified for each assessment unit within the region (see the UC SRFB Project Information Sheet 2020 in Attachment C).

Building on the Biological Strategy, the region uses a river reach-based approach to ensure priority habitat projects are implemented with a clear understanding of the existing physical processes. This approach to project development incorporates information from tributary-scale and reach-scale hydro-geomorphic assessments and monitoring, which inform actions based on an assessment of channel processes and habitat impairments. As reach-level degradations and processes are defined, alternatives are produced to identify, sequence, and prioritize specific actions to protect and/or restore channel and floodplain connectivity and complexity.

Addresses cost-effectiveness. Provide a description of how cost-effectiveness was considered.

Cost effectiveness of proposals was determined using the methods described in the RTT’s Biological Strategy and were calculated for monetary requests for both the “total project request” and the RTT biological benefit score. The RTT weighs cost effectiveness as 5% of their total score to weigh the biological benefit against the project cost, a rudimentary benefit-cost analysis (see RTT Scoring Criteria for SRFB Proposals December 2019 in Attachment B).

The CACs include a detailed cost-effectiveness review through three separate criteria: project longevity, project scope, and economics.
Preserves high quality habitat. Identify the projects on your list that will preserve high quality habitat.
See Attachment C: UC SRFB Project Information Sheet 2020.

Sponsored by an organization that has a successful record of project implementation. For example, identify the number of previous SRFB projects funded and completed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cascade Fisheries (formerly Cascade Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelan County Natural Resource Department</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanogan Conservation District</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
See Attachment C: UC SRFB Project Information Sheet 2020.

Implements a high priority project or action in a region- or watershed-based salmon recovery plan. Identify where and how the project is identified as a high priority in the referenced plan.
See Attachment C: UC SRFB Project Information Sheet 2020.

Provides for match above the minimum requirement percentage. Identify the project’s match percentage and the regional match total.
See Attachment E: Final 2020 UC SRFB Project List for match provided.

Involves members of the veteran’s conservation corps established in Revised Code of Washington 43.60A.150.
None
Local review processes. (Lead Entity provide response)

Provide project evaluation criteria and documentation (local technical reviewer and citizen committee score sheet or comment forms) of your local citizen’s advisory group and technical advisory group ratings for each project, including explanations for differences between the two groups’ ratings. RTT project scores are distributed to the local CACs to assist them in the development of their rankings see Attachment B for the RTT Comments on 2020 SRFB Proposals. Okanogan and Chelan CACs had two separate ranking meetings and then met in a joint meeting to finalize the regional list. See table 5 below for all of the 2020 project scoring and ranking documentation.
Identify your local technical review team (include expertise, names, and affiliations of members).
See Table 3 above.

Explain how and when the SRFB Review Panel participated in your local process, if applicable.
Two members of the SRP, Michelle Cramer and Paul Schlenger, participated in our process for the 2020 round as follows:

**Review Draft Proposals**
The SRP had the opportunity to review draft applications prior to the virtual site tours.

**Project Tours**
Members of the Lead Entity, CACs, RTT, Habitat Conservation Plan Tributary Committees, and SRP had virtual site visits on May 11 and 12. Typically, the site visits are organized by subbasin for efficiency, but this cycle the project site visits were all virtual.

The purpose of the tours was to evaluate the projects using drone footage, Google Earth, and/or other visual aids to provide additional understanding for project reviewers. It also allowed reviewers to provide comments to the sponsors on ways to improve the technical merit of each project. These virtual tours also facilitated productive discussions among all participants on local priorities in project development.

**SRP Comment Process**
SRP comments and feedback were distributed to individual sponsors via the new Prism platform. After project sponsors received their comments, a one-hour call was scheduled for the Lead

---

**Table 5. 2020 Project Proposal Reviewer’s Documentation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Scoring</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTT Scoring Criteria for SRFB Proposals and RTT UCSRB SRB Monitoring Process (new)</td>
<td>Attachment B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT Comments on 2020 SRFB Proposals</td>
<td>Attachment B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT Scoring Meeting Notes</td>
<td>Attachment B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAC Ranking Criteria</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAC Committee Ranking Criteria</td>
<td>Attachment D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelan and Okanogan CAC’s Ranking Meeting Final Summary</td>
<td>Attachment D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Joint 2020 CAC Meeting Final Summary</td>
<td>Attachment D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final List</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final 2020 UC SRFB Ranked List</td>
<td>Attachment E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Entity and project sponsors to ask clarifying questions about SRP comments. Upon completion of that call, project sponsors addressed comments or information needs within their Prism application either as supplemental attachments, within the application, or directly to the SRP in the applicant comment fields.

**Local evaluation process and project lists. (Lead Entity provide response)**

Explain how multi-year implementation plans or Salmon Recovery Portal were used to develop project lists.

The principle guiding document for identifying appropriate projects for implementation in the region is the Recovery Plan, a federally approved Recovery Plan for this Evolutionary Significant Unit (ESU) in Washington State. Appendix H: Biological Strategy outlines priorities so that sponsors can use this document to identify priority projects. The UCSRB staff works with project sponsors to populate the Salmon Recovery Portal (SRP), which serves as the on-line database for the UCSRB Implementation Schedule.

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?

**RTT Reviews & Scoring**

As a result of changes to the State SRFB schedule the Lead Entity modified the regional timeline/schedule to provide better guidance and input from the RTT. One key change was moving the regional technical presentations to March 11 & 12. Project sponsors presented their project ideas to technical and citizen reviewers for early feedback about relative competitiveness and suggestions on project improvements. RTT also reviewed draft proposals and provided input to project sponsors during the virtual site visits on May 11 & 12. Finally, the RTT reviewed and scored applications at their June 10 meeting, then a representative provided an overview of the biological scores and answered questions at the June 23 and 25 CAC meetings.

**Citizen’s Reviews & Ranking**

The CAC Committee Ranking Criteria can be found in Attachment D. The Okanogan CAC met on June 23 to hear presentations from project sponsors and formally ranked the projects on July 8. On June 25 the Chelan CAC heard presentations from the project sponsors and asked questions and then met again on July 8 to formally rank the projects for Chelan County. See the Joint 2020 CAC Meeting Final Summary in Attachment D.
**Joint Committee Approval of the Final Project List**

The UCSRB staff facilitated the Joint CAC on July 8, following the individual CAC ranking meetings, to combine the Chelan and Okanogan project lists into one joint list for the Upper Columbia Region. During the Joint CAC meeting, members were presented with lists combined in different ways to choose their “working” list. Like past years, the joint committee members adopted a working list that combines the individual Chelan and Okanogan lists by using the 1-1 approach. This approach honors the sequence of the individual committee lists while placing the top ranked projects in each county towards the top of the list. This year the Joint CAC modified this approach because of the discrepancy of projects with high biological scores within the respective counties. The primary determinant in breaking the tie between a project in Chelan and Okanogan Counties was the RTT biological benefit score. Once the working list was adopted, members moved projects up or down the list by utilizing the following ground rules before approving a final list.

Joint Committee ground rules for decision-making:

1. A Citizen Advisory Committee member may, at any time, make a motion to move a particular project up or down on the list.
2. The Citizen Advisory Committee member making such a request must include rationale based on the citizens’ review criteria for 2020.
3. The Joint Citizen Advisory Committee will then engage in discussion regarding the motion to move a project on the list.
4. After discussion, the Joint Citizen Advisory Committee will vote – approve, oppose, abstain – on the motion to move the project on the list.
5. The motion will carry upon unanimous approval by all Joint Citizen Advisory Committee Members (excluding “abstain” votes).

See the details in the *Joint 2020 CAC Meeting Final Summary* in Attachment D and the *Final 2020 UC SRFB Ranked List* included in Attachment E.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following Process Guide is intended to document the steps through which a potential habitat restoration project proponent, technical reviewer, or citizen will participate when pursuing funds through the Washington State Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) in the Upper Columbia recovery region (UC). This guide represents the consensus decision of participants in the UC on the process to develop and submit projects for funding to the SRFB. The Rock Island, Rocky Reach, and Wells Dam Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) Tributary Committees (TRIB) have agreed to use this process and timeline for funding consideration. In addition, the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is targeting high biological priority projects to potentially fund within the UC via a habitat programmatic funding project with the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSRB).

The principle guiding document for identifying appropriate projects for implementation in the region is the Upper Columbia Spring Chinook Salmon and Steelhead Recovery Plan (UCSRB 2007), a federally approved recovery plan for this Evolutionary Significant Unit (ESU) in Washington State.

The UCSRB is the Lead Entity (LE) for the UC. “Lead Entity” is a term used by the state to define a county, city, conservation district, special district, tribal government, regional recovery organization, or other entity that is responsible for submitting a project list to the SRFB for funding consideration.¹

The UCSRB is also the state-designated regional recovery organization² and the LE is responsible for facilitating the process of compiling one project list and submitting that list to Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) for funding consideration to the SRFB.

The UC regional approach to pursuing both mitigation and recovery funds from all available sources is the result of years of collaborative work on the part of all interested parties to establish an effective and efficient process. Regional project and funding coordination are an on-going and iterative process. The details are identified from the

¹ RCW 77.85.050 – Note: On January 1, 2013 the two active Lead Entities in the Upper Columbia consolidated into one Lead Entity under the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board.
² RCW 77.85.010
Recovery Plan’s Implementation Schedule and developed within each of the Watershed Action Teams (WATs) in the region. The UCSRB currently facilitates two approaches to funding projects in the region: (1) targeted process of habitat programmatic funds; and (2) traditional grant applications (a.k.a. “Open 6-Step Funding Process”). The following guidance document focuses on the Open 6-Step Funding Process. See “SRFB Grant Process” on the UCSRB website at: http://www.ucsrb.org.

**OPEN 6-STEP FUNDING PROCESS**

The Lead Entity (LE) Coordinator will help facilitate the movement of proposals through the review process. This includes assuring that the Regional Technical Team (RTT), BPA, TRIB, and Citizens’ Advisory Committees (CAC) receive review copies at appropriate times. Project sponsors should begin working with the LE early in the process to engage available services that will assist in developing competitive proposals for SRFB, TRIB, or BPA funding. See contact below:

**Lead Entity Coordinator**
Pete Teigen
509-662-4710
Pete.Teigen@ucsrb.org

**Funding Schedule**
The funding schedule for the regional process is included on the UCSRB website and updated as necessary.

**Eligible Applicants**
The following entities are eligible for SRFB funding:

- cities
- counties
- Conservation Districts
- Native American tribes
- non-profit organizations
- private landowners
  - Private landowners are eligible applicants for restoration projects when the project takes place on their own land.
  - Private individuals may not acquire land using these funds.
- Regional Fisheries Enhancement Groups
- Special Purpose Districts
- state agencies (state agencies must have a local partner that is independently eligible to be a grant applicant)
- Federal agencies may not apply directly but may partner with eligible applicants.
  - Projects may occur on federal lands.
Applicants should take into account federal restrictions on using federal money for a qualifying match when applying for a grant. Anyone may apply for Tributary Committee funds.

**Step One: PRE-PROPOSAL**

The first step in the process to seek funding from the SRFB and TRIB is to submit the first series of questions online regional application (referred to as the ‘JotForm’). This first step has replaced the previous “abstract” that sponsors submitted in years prior to 2018. The Lead Entity will use this information to ensure project eligibility and to plan for tours and other milestones. The RTT will evaluate the pre-proposal based on a subset of their scoring criteria (RTT 2020 SRFB Abstract Scoring Criteria).

A draft proposal is required from each project proponent wishing to pursue funds from both the SRFB and TRIB. Included in the draft proposal is the Regional Supplemental Application that includes questions that address the RTT scoring criteria (RTT 2020 SRFB Proposal Scoring Criteria) and the CAC ranking criteria (Citizen’s Advisory Committee (CAC) Ranking Criteria).

The LE can also work with the project proponent to help develop the necessary forms throughout the application process and to help develop the data that may be available for use in the project proposal.

The project proponent will need to fill out a draft proposal for each project being proposed. All proposals must be submitted electronically using the State’s PRISM database. PRISM is RCO’s web-based platform used by project sponsors to apply for and manage grants, to get grant contracts, and to produce reports about projects. In order to acquire a Prism ID Number, sponsors need to work with the Lead Entity to create a “Funding Instrument” linkage between Salmon Recovery Portal (formerly Habitat Work Schedule) and PRISM. To create a project page in Salmon Recovery Portal contact LE or see guidance document.

Although not required by PRISM, a standardized naming convention for your proposal is important for project reviewers. Proposal names may include the following elements:

- Indication of project type (Assessment, Design, Project, etc.)
- Project phase (phase I, II, III)
- Geographic link (e.g., Upper Entiat)
- The use of landowner names in proposals should be avoided to protect landowner privacy.

The pre-proposal requirement helps project sponsor in a number of ways. First, it is an opportunity for the project sponsors to think through the details of a potential project early in the funding process. It is also an opportunity for the sponsors to identify areas where technical assistance may be needed to ultimately develop the strongest possible proposal. The pre-proposal provides an indication of how close the region is to meeting the targeted allocation of funds from the SRFB and other funding sources. It is also an early opportunity to identify...
additional cost-share programs that most effectively leverage the resources needed to implement projects. It is important that project sponsor think through enough of the details of a project to submit a pre-proposal. The RTT and TRIB have the option to recommend to the LE that a proposal not continue in the review process due to lack of sufficient information.

The State Technical Review Panel is available year-round to assist with early project review and development. Project sponsor may elect to enter project data into PRISM during the draft proposal phase (it is required if the project proponent is requesting assistance from a member of the State Technical Review Panel to visit the project site). Contact your LE if you need assistance with the PRISM database. Additionally, the SRFB annually adopts Manual 18 that describes the process for pursuing funds from the State. Manual 18 and other associated documents can be found on-line on the UCSRB website and RCO’s website: https://rco.wa.gov/grant/salmon-recovery/.

**Step Two: PRESENTATIONS TO REGIONAL TECHNICAL TEAM**
Project sponsors will provide project overviews to the RTT and other reviewers. This will allow for reviewers and project sponsors to discuss strengths and weaknesses of their proposal with the goal of improving the overall application and project.

**Step Three: COMPLETE PROPOSALS DUE**
Project sponsors will submit a complete application through the online PRISM portal, including an attachment of the completed Regional Application (JotForm). Attach a coversheet (Appendix A) to the completed Regional Application, convert it to a PDF, and upload it to PRISM. Project sponsors need to reference Manual 18 and other guiding documents from Recreation and Conservation Office to ensure their applications meet the requirements of the state process (refer to Appendix C: Application Checklist in Manual 18 for requirements).

**Step Four: PROJECT-SITE VISITS**
Project site visits to the Methow, Okanogan, Entiat and Wenatchee sub-basins will be scheduled. Project proponents are strongly encouraged to attend their respective site visit to present information regarding the proposed project, answer questions, and receive additional technical feedback in the field. LE will work with project sponsors to prepare handouts for tour participants. Time will be limited and allocated based on the number of proposals and travel time necessary between project location. This is a key opportunity for project sponsors to discuss their project and receive feedback from reviewers about project elements.

Representatives from the RTT, BPA, TRIB Committees, CAC members, and State Technical Review Panel members may all attend the tours. Some project proposals may not require a site visit (e.g., an assessment project or others due to logistical issues); however, the LE will identify a location and time to discuss the project proposal with reviewers. Once the portfolio of potential projects is finalized, the UCSRB will develop the agenda and itinerary with input from the various reviewers. Project proponents are encouraged to work with the LE to develop
refined information and materials during the site visit. Please check the website for the current tour schedule.

Participants in the project tours will be asked to keep conversations and questions directed to the project proponent and refrain from any side conversation during each site visit.

**Step Five: PROPOSAL REFINEMENT AND SUBMITTAL**

After the RTT distributes their comments, project sponsors have the opportunity to refine the final project proposals and should be working to finalize the details of the proposed project(s). Final proposals are to be uploaded to PRISM so the LE can distribute them to reviewers for regional technical scoring and final ranking.

After final proposals are submitted, there are no additional opportunities for interaction with the RTT to further refine the technical details of a project. Project proponents should always communicate with the LE to answer questions as they arise throughout the process. ** Significant changes in project scope or total project cost after the final regional submittal are not allowed.** These changes make it difficult for the CACs to evaluate projects after the RTT scores have already been assigned. Therefore, sponsors are strongly discouraged from making changes to scope or total project cost following final project submittal. Changes in funding allocation requests, while discouraged after final submittal, are accepted based on outside funding decisions or conditions made by the CAC or SRP. These **changes in budget allocations must be communicated to the LE in writing before the CAC presentations.**

**Step Six: TECHNICAL SCORING AND CITIZEN RANKING**

After final project proposals have been submitted, the RTT will convene for technical scoring of the proposals. The technical review criteria for scoring projects uses the prioritization process and updated as a part of the RTT’s Upper Columbia Biological Strategy revision process and can be found on the UCSRB website.

**The RTT has requested that the project scoring meeting be closed to non-RTT members, with exceptions for technical representatives from funding entities and LE representatives.** The RTT members can only score proposals as they were submitted. Information provided after the deadline will not be taken into account during the project review. It is important that project proponents are as succinct and inclusive in the application as possible. There are limits to the amount of attachments that regional and state technical reviewers can consume. The LE may provide one hard copy of a document per review group and/or the electronic version if the document is large.

The final technical scores and comments from the RTT will be distributed to the sponsors and select partners in the Upper Columbia shortly before the CAC presentations. Sponsor presentations to the CAC will be at an evening meeting in either Chelan or Okanogan County. If a sponsor has proposals in each county, expect to present for both committees. The individual CAC will meet following the presentations to score the social and economic considerations of a
proposed project and then meet together to develop a ranked list. The individual CACs and the Joint Citizens Advisory Committee use the same review criteria.

The individual lists from each of the CAC will be combined into one list for the Joint Citizens Advisory Committee meeting, which will be comprised of members from each CAC. The initial process for merging the individual lists for discussion at the Joint Citizens Advisory Committee is as follows:

- The region will combine the individual lists using the project’s order of rank in the relative list (i.e., 1-1, 2-2, 3-3, 4-4, etc).
- The secondary consideration in merging the lists is the relative RTT score as the primary consideration (i.e., within the 1-1, 2-2 ranking on the separate citizens’ lists, the region will place those on the Joint Citizens Advisory Committee list in descending order based on RTT score).

The following ground rules for decision-making guide the Joint Citizen Advisory Committee in its deliberations to develop the final ranked list for the Upper Columbia Region.

1. A Citizens Advisory Committee member may, at any time, make a motion to move a particular project up or down on the list.
2. The Citizens Advisory Committee member making such a request must include rationale based on the citizens’ review criteria.
3. The Joint Citizens Advisory Committee will then engage in discussion regarding the motion to move a project on the list.
4. After discussion, the Joint Citizens Advisory Committee will vote – approve, oppose, abstain – on the motion to move the project on the list.
5. The motion will carry upon unanimous approval by all Joint Citizens Advisory Committee Members (excluding “abstain” votes).

The result of this meeting is the final recommended list of projects submitted to the SRFB for consideration for funding. It is recommended that letters and/or comments be submitted to the Citizens Advisory Committee by the date of their first meeting to provide time for discussion and/or response.

**SRFB/TRIB FUND REVIEW AND FUNDING**

The State Technical Review Panel (SRP) will meet during the month of May and June to review all of the project applications. The SRP evaluates projects based on benefits to salmon, likelihood of success, and a cost-benefit analysis (see Appendix F in Manual 18). The SRP will label projects as either “clear,” “need more information,” “conditional,” or “project of concern (POC)”. Projects that receive a “clear” label are eligible without restriction to receive SRFB funds. Sponsors whose projects receive a “need more information” or “conditional” label will have the opportunity to address the SRP comments by submitting additional information to SRP and/or accepting the “condition”. SRP will consider the additional information and make a final determination by July 29. Based on regional policy, proposals flagged as “Projects of Concern”
by the State Technical Review Panel in its final report will not be forwarded on the final ranked list and are ineligible for SRFB funding.

The SRFB will meet in September to make its final funding decisions for that year. The Trib Comm. will also make internal decisions for funding, after release of the draft State Technical Review Panel report. Once the SRFB has made its final decisions for funding, the TRIB commonly meet to finalize their decisions for funding projects.

**POST SRFB AWARD AMENDMENTS**

Amendments require consultation with the LE and subsequent recommendations from technical and citizen’s committees. Manual 18 outlines the process for SRFB approval of contract amendments. See the “Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Funding Request Authority Matrix” and LE Amendment Request Form on [www.ucsrb.org](http://www.ucsrb.org). Once the Amendment Request Form is filled out please work with your LE for assistance.
APPENDIX A: Sample Coversheet

Project Title/Name

Sponsor
Contact Name
Contact Information/Address
Prism #

Anticipated SRFB Request: $  
Anticipated Trib Comm Request: $  
Anticipated TOTAL Project Budget: $
## Upper Columbia SRFB/TRIB  
**DRAFT 2020 FUNDING SCHEDULE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY/MILESTONE</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>FACILITATOR/COORDINATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MARCH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12</td>
<td>Meeting: SRFB/TRIB Kick-Off Meeting</td>
<td>LE, RTT, TRIB, Sponsors, RCO</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>LE/RCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td><strong>Deadline:</strong> Regional Project Abstracts (JotForm)</td>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>Online/Email</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11-12</td>
<td>RTT Presentations</td>
<td>Sponsors, LE, RTT, TRIB, SRFB SRP, CAC</td>
<td>CFNCW-Wenatchee</td>
<td>LE/RTT/CAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>APRIL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 17</td>
<td><strong>Deadline:</strong> Complete applications due</td>
<td>Sponsors, LE, RCO</td>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27</td>
<td><strong>Deadline:</strong> Monitoring Letter of Intent</td>
<td>Sponsor, LE</td>
<td>Email/GSRO</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 11, 12, 13</td>
<td>Tours: SRFB/TRIB Project Tours</td>
<td>Sponsors, LE, RTT, TRIB, SRFB SRP, CAC</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entiat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Okanogan/Methow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>Action: TRIB reviews draft proposals</td>
<td>TRIB</td>
<td>TRIB</td>
<td>TRIB Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18</td>
<td>Action: TRIB provide comments</td>
<td>TRIB</td>
<td>Emails</td>
<td>TRIB Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18</td>
<td>Lead entity feedback (optional)</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Upper Columbia SRFB/TRIB DRAFT 2020 Funding Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY/MILESTONE</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>FACILITATOR/COORDINATOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAY</strong></td>
<td><strong>DEADLINE:</strong> Final proposals due for Regional scoring and ranking</td>
<td>Sponsors, LE, RCO, SRP, RTT, CAC, TRIB</td>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29</td>
<td><strong>DEADLINE:</strong> Final proposals due for Regional scoring and ranking</td>
<td>Sponsors, LE, RCO, SRP, RTT, CAC, TRIB</td>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNE</strong></td>
<td><strong>First Comment Form Received</strong></td>
<td>SRP, LE, Sponsors</td>
<td>Email/Prism</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5</td>
<td>First Comment Form Received</td>
<td>SRP, LE, Sponsors</td>
<td>Email/Prism</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 10</td>
<td>Action: Technical review/scoring</td>
<td>RTT, CAC, LE, BOR</td>
<td>RTT Meeting</td>
<td>RTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11</td>
<td>Action: TRIB reviews final proposals</td>
<td>TRIB</td>
<td>TRIB Meeting</td>
<td>TRIB Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15</td>
<td><strong>Deadline:</strong> Monitoring Applications Due with Regional Certification</td>
<td>Sponsors, LE</td>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15</td>
<td>Action: TRIB Decisions</td>
<td>TRIB</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>TRIB Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 23/25</td>
<td>Presentations to Citizens: Okanogan/Chelan CAC’s</td>
<td>Sponsors, CAC’s, RTT, LE</td>
<td>Twisp River Bank/Wenatchee Reclamation Office</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 29</td>
<td><strong>Deadline:</strong> Sponsors PRISM upload</td>
<td>Sponsors, LE</td>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June TBD</td>
<td>Action: RCO and SRFB Review Panel review</td>
<td>RCO, SRFB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY</strong></td>
<td>CAC Project Rankings Chelan/Okanogan CAC’s</td>
<td>CAC’s, LE</td>
<td>Chelan Fire Hall</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July TBD</td>
<td>CAC Project Rankings Chelan/Okanogan CAC’s</td>
<td>CAC’s, LE</td>
<td>Chelan Fire Hall</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>Action: SRFB Review Panel Meeting</td>
<td>SRFB, RCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Upper Columbia SRFB/TRIB
### DRAFT 2020 Funding Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>Activity/Milestone</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Facilitator/Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>Action: SRFB Monitoring Panel will request clarification (if needed)</td>
<td>SRFB,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 29</td>
<td>Action: Final Comment Form</td>
<td>SRP, LE, Sponsors</td>
<td>Email/Prism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31</td>
<td>Deadline: Response to comments from Monitoring Review Panel</td>
<td>Sponsors, UCSRB</td>
<td>Email via UCSRB</td>
<td>UCSRB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### August

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Facilitator/Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 14</td>
<td>Deadline: Regional List submitted to RCO</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>LE/RCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 14</td>
<td>Deadline: Sponsors must accept conditions in writing for monitoring projects</td>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>Email/Prism</td>
<td>LE/RCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21</td>
<td>Deadline: Regional Submittal</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Facilitator/Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2</td>
<td>Final grant report available for public review</td>
<td>RCO</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>RCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 16/17</td>
<td>Action: SRFB Decisions</td>
<td>SRFB</td>
<td>Olympia, WA</td>
<td>RCO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Acronyms

- CAC: Citizen’s Advisory Committee
- LE: Lead Entity Coordinator/Program
- RCO: Recreation and Conservation Office
- RTT: Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team
- SRFB: Salmon Recovery Funding Board
- TRIB: Tributary Committees
- UC: Upper Columbia Region
- UCSRB: Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board

### Timeline Legend

- **Meetings** Blue
- **Deadlines** Red
- **Actions** Black
2020 Upper Columbia Regional Pre-Proposal

* Pre-proposal information due March 1, 2020 for SRFB, BPA, and Tributary Committee applications

All answers will automatically be saved for the final proposal

TYPE "Pre-Proposal" TO ONLY SHOW FIELDS DUE MARCH 1st (those with an asterisk * below)

*Project Title

Contact Information

*Sponsor
Organization

*Primary Contact
First and Last Name

*E-Mail Address(es)  ex: myname@example.com
separate multiple emails with a semicolon

Budget Request
Values MAY be duplicative and do not have to equal TOTAL anticipated budget in pre-application.

*Anticipated Request - SRFB
$ 

*Anticipated Request - Tributary Committee
$ 

*Anticipated Request - BPA
$ 
Full or Partial project funding may be requested from BPA.

*Anticipated Other Funding
$

*Other Funding Source(s)
List Names
Anticipated TOTAL Budget

$ 

% of Budget Request from SRFB

$ 

Schedule and Budget (BPA ONLY)

Browse Files

Project Location

*Briefly describe the location of the project

(Example: "The project will occur in the Wenatchee River starting at RM 0.5 and ending at RM 1")

*Project subbasin

- Wenatchee
- Entiat
- Methow
- Okanogan

*Project Assessment Unit(s) (HUC 12(s)) from RTT Prioritization (Step 1)

Choose only AUs that the project directly targets. AUs can be found online at https://ucsrb.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=0cc3689f534b7cd9f629d2ea7b8e

*Latitude (decimal degrees)

*Longitude (decimal degrees)

Project Map (BPA ONLY ON THIS FORM)

Browse Files

Simple map showing the location of the project and any project elements (if applicable)

Project Information

1. *What category is the project?

Select from list above

2. *In one or two sentences, what do you propose to do?
3. **What species will the project benefit?**
- Spring Chinook
- Steelhead
- Bull Trout
- Summer Chinook
- Other

4. **Describe the project's biological objectives and desired outcomes (metrics)**

(e.g., improve instream complexity; metrics - miles, cfs, acres, number of barriers, structures, design products, miles assessed, etc.)

5. **Does this project or any of its phases (e.g., design) already exist in Habitat Work Schedule or PRISM?**
- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

6. **Has this project been submitted previously for funding through the SRFB and/or Targeted process(es)?**
- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

7. **If Yes - Explain which process(es) and how this proposal differs from the previous submission (e.g., different phase, modified scope, etc.)**

Design and Restoration Proposals

8. **What project phase(s) are proposed for completion?**
- Conceptual Design
- Preliminary Design
- Final Design
- Construction

9. **Is your project within a completed (or soon-to-be completed) Reach Assessment or other type of assessment (e.g., Rapid Site Assessment, other)?**

Please name the assessment

10. **Which Ecological Concerns does the project propose to address?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Quality (Temperature)</th>
<th>Water Quantity (Depleted Water Quantity)</th>
<th>Water Quantity (Altered Flow Timing)</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Select only the ECs the project will intentionally target.

11. **Freshwater Benefits - To what extent will your project improve survival, capacity and/or distribution for target species at the project scale?**
12. *Temporal Effect - Briefly describe how and to what extent the project would promote natural stream/watershed process consistent with reach-scale geomorph

See Attachment 1 in RTT Scoring Criteria for guidance.

13. Temporal Effect - How long will it take for the benefits of the project to be realized?

See Attachment 1 in RTT Scoring Criteria for guidance.

14. Temporal Effect - How long will the restoration action and its benefits persist? What level and/or interval of maintenance is anticipated?

See Attachment 1 in RTT Scoring Criteria for guidance.

15. Temporal Effect - Will the project ameliorate the effects of climate change?

See Attachment 1 in RTT Scoring Criteria for guidance.

16. Methods - Briefly describe the potential (for design) or proposed restoration methods and how they will achieve project objectives

Example: Remove 1,000 feet of rip rap and add three large wood structures to promote floodplain inundation.

Assessment Proposals

17. *What type of assessment are you proposing?

18. *Describe how the assessment fills a regional priority and where that priority is identified.

19. *Methods - What methods will you use in your assessment and how will they achieve your stated objective(s)?
20. Will a design result from the project?

21. If yes, what level of design (e.g. conceptual, preliminary, final)? What proportion of your budget will support design?

22. Briefly describe why SRFB funds are necessary, rather than other sources of funding.

Protection Proposals

** SRFB-Trib Only **

23. *What type of protection are you proposing?

24. *Is this protection project associated with a current or future restoration project?

25. *Placement - Does the project protect important high quality habitat and/or watershed processes and to what degree?

26. *Freshwater Benefit - What would be the anticipated loss in survival, capacity or distribution for target species at the project scale if the proposed area is not protected?

27. *Threat - How imminent is the threat of habitat degradation to the proposed land if the project is not implemented?

28. Conditions - Briefly describe if there are any conditions regarding the protection of the property that could limit the protection benefits

29. Will there be public access?
   - Yes
   - No

Monitoring Proposals

** SRFB-Trib Only **

30. *Information Need - Does this project address a Tier 1 data gap in the MaDMC Regional Data Gaps List?
31. Information Need - To what extent does your project address a regional data gap?

32. *Information Need - What is the scale of inference?

33. *Purpose - How will the monitoring will complement, enhance, or leverage ongoing monitoring efforts?

34. *Methods - Briefly describe the methods and how they are appropriate to the monitoring question

35. Information Need - How will data and information be disseminated, accessed and applied once the project is complete?

36. Explain why SRFB project funds are being requested rather than funds from other sources

Project Risk and Economic Benefits

37. *What is the landownership?

  e.g. private, DNR, Forest Service, etc.

38. *Have you secured landowner participation in or acceptance for this project?

  ✔ Yes
  ❌ No

39. *If No, please explain

40. Describe any land owner requirements (e.g., design elements, right-of-ways, access agreements, liability waivers, etc.) and if-how they could affect the project
41. Will the project raise potential concerns for interest groups (e.g., recreational users) or the community at large (including upstream/downstream/adjacent landowners)?

42. Who will have the responsibility to manage and maintain the project? What is the responsibility of current or future landowners?

43. Is there a high risk of failure associated with this project?

44. Is there any public outreach planned during and/or after implementation? Does the project build community support for salmon recovery efforts?

45. Does the project represent an opportunity for economic benefit? How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?

46. Highlight the breadth and strength/experience of the partnerships and types of contributions supporting the project

- e.g. in-kind, tech/design support, labor, financial, etc.

47. Explain any recreational use that occurs in the project reach, whether a recreational risk assessment has been/will be completed and what type (BPA ONLY)

48. Describe any potential challenges that could delay implementation of this project according to the schedule and budget proposed (BPA ONLY)
Supporting Documents

BPA Targeted Solicitation (2020)
Upper Columbia SRFB Process Guide
SRFB Manual 18 (2020)
RCO Application Link (2020)

Forms/Supporting Documents
Barrier and Expanded Barrier Evaluation Form
Correction Analysis Form
Landowner Acknowledgement Form
Project Partner Contribution Form
Regional Organization Monitoring Project Certification
Fiscal Data Collection Sheet
SRFB Application Authorization Form
Landownership Certification Form
Landowner Agreement Form
Acquisition Stewardship Plan
Restoration Stewardship Plan
2020 UCSRB Regional (JotForm) Proposal Instructions
UCSRB created the online JotForm as way to create greater efficiency to the Regional Application process.

The fields on the Regional Pre-Proposal (JotForm) marked with a small red asterisk provide the necessary information and fulfill the requirements for the Pre-Proposal. Alternatively, you can type “Pre-Proposal” into first field and the form will only show questions required for the Pre-Proposal.

When you have entered information in the fields, scroll to the bottom of the page and click the grey “Save” on the bottom left. Once you complete this step, an email will be sent to the entered email address with a copy of the entered information along with a link that will allow the user to continue working on the form. It is the “Edit Submission” link on the top of the email.

Each time you edit the document you will receive an email confirmation with your JotForm (and any updated changes or edits) and a link that will return you to the document (the link from the initial email will work and will continually be updated).

When you are ready to submit each subsequent section of the regional application you will receive an email confirmation (similar to when you save the form).

Important Notes:

- Documents can be uploaded to the JotForm on the bottom portion of the form.
- There are many important links on the JotForm including: SRFB Manual 18, RCO Application links; Application Checklist, Appendices and other important forms (these links will be updated as RCO updates them).

Questions:
Can multiple email addresses be included?
No, which is why it is imperative that the primary project sponsor share the link with others from their organization that will want/need to edit the application.
How do I save my work in the JotForm?
All changes are saved when you click the “submit” and/or “save and continue later” buttons at the bottom of the page. Note: the “create a pdf” tab does not save your document, only creates a pdf document.

Can multiple people work on/edit the document?
Yes, multiple uses will need to share the link and can edit the document from their respective work stations. Only one person can actively edit or work on the JotForm at a given time.

Is there a button on the JotForm to indicate if a project has previously been funded or submitted?
Yes.

How do sponsors handle the track changes component of the application?
UCSRB doesn’t need to see any tracked changes, that is a state requirement. When sponsors complete their RCO Applications, they will still address comments and questions using track changes in their RCO Application and upload that tracked changed Word document through JotForm.

If you have questions or issues while using the JotForm, please contact Pete Teigen at pete.teigen@ucsrb.org or Greer Maier at greer.maier@ucsrb.org.
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Introduction

In this document the RTT identifies and describes the scoring criteria used to evaluate restoration, protection, assessment, design, and monitoring proposals. These criteria are designed and intended for the review and scoring of proposals within the Salmon Recovery Funding Board process. The goal of the RTT is to use the most objective evaluation approach possible to ensure a fair and effective review and ranking of proposals across multiple project types. Because the proposal is the primary instrument by which the RTT evaluates potential projects, the clarity and completeness of the proposal is critical to the RTT’s ability to assess and score the potential benefits of the project. If a proposal does not clearly identify objectives and methods, and include all supporting materials (figures, maps, references, etc.) necessary for the RTT to understand adequately the proposed project, it will likely score low.

Scoring Criteria

The RTT identified scoring criteria that are specific to each project type (restoration, protection, assessment, design, and monitoring). Importantly, the proposed projects must be placed in high-priority areas, address important ecological concerns (aka limiting factors), and identify benefits to target species productivity and distribution. Various criteria form the basis for evaluating each of the five project types.

Criteria are assigned weights depending on their importance in the overall evaluation. That is, some criteria are considered more important than others. Thus, those criteria with high weights are considered more important in the evaluation of each project type. The assignment of weights also increases contrast in scores among project proposals.

Based on an evaluation of past projects, the RTT believes that some proposed projects, which score low in biological benefit, should not be elevated to the Citizens’ Advisory Committees (CAC) for their evaluation. That is, the RTT believes the CAC should not be burdened with evaluating proposed projects that have little to no biological benefit. Therefore, the RTT will recommend to the UCSRB Lead Entity that projects scoring under 40 points for biological benefit (save monitoring projects) should not be elevated to the CAC for their review.

Cost Effectiveness

The RTT believes it is important to assess the cost effectiveness of each proposed project. The RTT has included the evaluation of cost-benefit in various ways in the past, ranging from a qualitative evaluation that was not part of official scoring, to a quantitative assessment that applied a standardized score to each project for each reviewer. Under the current approach, RTT members will evaluate the cost effectiveness of each proposal independently. Each member will decide the points for cost effectiveness by evaluating the biological benefit and cost of each project. Scores will range from 0 to 7, with the
highest points associated with high benefit-low cost projects and the lowest points associated with low benefit-high cost projects.
Restoration Projects

1. Address Primary Ecological Concerns

   a) Does the proposed restoration project reduce the effects of primary ecological concerns (as identified in Appendix D of the Biological Strategy, or other information that pertains to the project location; e.g., if ECs are identified for a tributary of an assessment unit) at the project scale? (20% of total score)

      • Rationale: Proposed restoration actions must address primary ecological concerns limiting the freshwater survival and/or distribution of fish species. Projects that address more than one primary ecological concern, or fully rectify a single ecological concern, achieve the highest scores.

      Sequencing of projects also affects scoring. That is, projects that address ecological concerns that are unlikely to affect freshwater survival or distribution without first correcting other primary ecological concerns would achieve relatively low scores, unless the proposed sequencing is justified by extenuating circumstances.

      • Scoring:

         o 0 = no (or little) improvement in ecological concern(s) at the project scale.
         o 1-6 = intermediate improvement (ecological concern is partially addressed).
         o 7 = fully rectifies ecological concern(s) at the project scale.

2. Location and Scale of the Restoration Project

   a) Is the proposed restoration project sited within an important assessment unit for restoration? (15% of total score)

      • Rationale: Streams vary in intrinsic potential and habitat quantity and quality because of differences in geology, geomorphology, valley width, elevation, stream size, gradient, and other factors. The RTT has incorporated intrinsic potential and other information in identifying high priority assessment units for restoration within each sub-basin (see Step 1 in the Habitat Action Prioritization Within the Upper Columbia River Basin document; Prioritization Strategy). Projects that improve habitat quantity and quality within assessments units of high intrinsic potential (with consideration of other information), or provide access to such habitat, will achieve the highest scores.

      • Scoring:

1 In this document, “project-scale” refers to the area within and immediately surrounding the proposed project.
Use this link to identify AU Prioritization Scores for restoration projects.

If a proposed project targets a combination of spring Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout, the RTT will use the higher of the AU prioritization scores.

b) Is the restoration project appropriately scaled and scoped? (10% of total score)

- **Rationale**: Projects must be placed so they function within the geomorphic context of the stream reach. Projects sited without consideration of stream flows, sediment dynamics, and geomorphology will likely fail or provide limited long-term physical and biological benefit, and thus will receive the lowest scores. Similarly, a project may be too small in scope to achieve the purported benefits.

- **Scoring**:
  - 0 = scale and scope of project does not match project objectives.
  - 1-6 = intermediate (scale and scope is appropriate to meet some of the project objectives).
  - 7 = scale and scope are appropriate to meet clearly articulated project objectives.

3. Temporal Effect of Proposed Restoration Action

a) Does the proposed project promote natural stream/watershed processes that are consistent with the geomorphology of the stream? (5% of total score)

- **Rationale**: The RTT defines natural stream/watershed processes as those processes where habitat functions at large spatial and temporal scales. Floodplain connectivity, absence of barriers, and large intact riparian zones are all features of natural stream/watershed processes. As discussed within the body of the biological strategy, “process-based restoration” refers to projects that will result in long-term changes to natural watershed and fluvial processes. Projects such as riparian plantings, increasing flows, barrier removal, and floodplain and wetland reconnections are all examples of projects that restore natural processes.

- **Scoring**:
  - 0 = project does not promote watershed processes.
  - 1-6 = project improves intermediate levels of watershed processes (some level of restoration of process occurs (or the probability is high) at the reach scale).
  - 7 = project fully restores watershed processes at the reach scale.

b) How long will it take for the project to achieve its intended response? (5% of total score)
• **Rationale:** The type of restoration action will determine how long it will take before the intended response of the action is realized. For example, an engineered log jam may have an immediate effect on cover for fish, while riparian plantings can take over 25 years before the intended effect is realized (Attachment 1). It is important to not reduce the scores of projects that restore processes and take longer to achieve the intended response, and therefore the scoring below ranges from 3 to 7.

• **Scoring:**
  
  - 3 = >25 years
  - 5 = 10 ≥ 25 years
  - 7 = <10 years

c) **How long will the proposed restoration action and its benefits persist? (5% of total score)**

• **Rationale:** Restoration projects that promote long-term habitat improvements, and/or require little to no on-going maintenance are likely to have the greatest biological benefit and will receive higher scores (Attachment 1). Projects that treat only symptoms of degraded watershed processes, or require continued on-going maintenance are unlikely to persist for long periods. These projects will receive lower scores.

• **Scoring:**
  
  - 0 – 3 = restoration project will persist for less than 10 years (or require on-going maintenance).
  - 4-6 = 20-50 years (or longer with some maintenance required).
  - 7 = 50+ years with little to no maintenance.

d) **Will the proposed project ameliorate the effects of climate change? (5% of total score)**

• **Rationale:** Certain project actions are more likely to reduce or ameliorate the effects of climate change. In general, actions that restore natural stream/watershed processes are likely to have the most potential to reduce the effects of long-term climate change (Attachment 1). Projects that have a high likelihood to reduce the effects of climate change will score higher than projects that do not.

• **Scoring:**
  
  - 0 = will not ameliorate the effects of climate change.
  - 1-6 = likely to ameliorate the effects of climate change.
  - 7 = will ameliorate the effects of climate change.
4. Methods

1. Are the methods outlined within the proposal adequate to achieve the stated objectives? (10% of total score)

   • **Rationale**: The proposal must describe clearly the methods that will be used to implement the project. The proposal should demonstrate that it is using an accepted approach to achieve the objectives. If the methods are innovative, the proposal should describe how the methods will achieve the stated objectives and demonstrate the benefits of the methods relative to a standard method. In addition, projects that “over-engineer” its components to meet the objectives will likely score lower than projects that allow natural processes to achieve objectives.

   • **Scoring**:
     - 0 = the methods do not appear adequate (employs questionable treatments, methods, or practices or those not proven to be effective) to achieve the stated objectives.
     - 1-6 = intermediate (methods need substantial changes (uses methods where results are incomplete) to achieve stated objectives (1 point), or a few changes (employs experimental treatments or methods with well-developed rationale and experimental design; 6 points)).
     - 7 = the methods appear adequate (employs accepted or tested standards, methods, or practices) to achieve the stated objectives.

5. Benefits to Freshwater Survival or Capacity

   a) Will the project increase freshwater survival and/or capacity for target species at the project scale? (20% of total score)

   • **Rationale**: Habitat restoration projects are implemented to increase freshwater survival, increase capacity, and/or distribution of target fish species. Therefore, it is important to assess the effects of restoration actions on pre-spawn survival, egg-smolt survival, and spawner distribution. These factors are evaluated at the project scale.

   • **Scoring**:
     - 0 = no benefit to freshwater survival, capacity, and/or distribution of target species at the project scale.

---

2 Methods for this purpose cover the protocols used to implement projects (such as hand placement of structure instead of machinery) or the types of materials used (e.g., a bottomless culvert instead of a bridge).
6. Cost Effectiveness of Restoration Project

a) How cost effective is the proposed restoration project? (5% of total score)

- **Rationale:** There are limited funds available for salmon recovery. Therefore, it is important to ensure that the cost of a proposed project is commensurate with the potential biological benefit.

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = no benefit to freshwater survival, capacity, and/or distribution of target species at the project scale. Cost is irrelevant if there is no biological benefit.
  - 1-6 = intermediate biological benefit per cost. Greater points are given to restoration projects with high benefit-low costs, while lower points are assigned to projects with low benefit-high costs.
  - 7 = highest possible biological benefit at a relatively low cost.
## Restoration Project Scoring Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potential Score</th>
<th>Weighting factor</th>
<th>Total Maximum Potential Score</th>
<th>RTT Score (1-7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address Primary Ecological Concerns</strong></td>
<td>Does the proposed restoration project reduce the effects of primary ecological concerns (as identified in Appendix D of the Biological Strategy, or other information that pertains to the project location; e.g., if ECs are identified for a tributary of an assessment unit) at the project scale?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location and Scale of the Restoration Project</strong></td>
<td>Is the proposed restoration project sited within an important assessment unit for restoration?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the restoration project appropriately scaled and scoped?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporal Effect of Proposed Restoration Action</strong></td>
<td>Does the project promote natural stream/watershed processes that are consistent with the geomorphology of the stream?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How long will it take for the project to achieve its intended response?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How long will the proposed restoration action and its benefits persist?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will the proposed project ameliorate the effects of climate change?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td>Are the methods outlined within the proposal adequate to achieve the stated objectives?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits to Freshwater Survival or capacity</strong></td>
<td>Will the project increase freshwater survival and/or capacity for target species at the project scale?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Effectiveness of Restoration Project</strong></td>
<td>How cost effective is the proposed restoration project?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grand Total | 70 | 100 |

---

3 In this document, “project-scale” refers to the area within and immediately surrounding the proposed project.
Protection Projects

1. Placement of Protection Project

   a) Is the proposed protection project sited within an important assessment unit for protection? (15% of total score)

   • Rationale: Streams vary in intrinsic potential and habitat quantity and quality because of differences in geology, geomorphology, valley width, elevation, stream size, gradient, and other factors. The RTT has incorporated intrinsic potential and other information in identifying high priority assessment units for protection within each sub-basin (see Step 1 in the Habitat Action Prioritization Within the Upper Columbia River Basin document; Prioritization Strategy). Projects that protect high-quality habitat within priority assessments units will achieve the highest scores.

   • Scoring:
     o Use this link to identify AU Prioritization Scores for protection projects.
     o If a proposed project targets a combination of spring Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout, the RTT will use the higher of the AU prioritization scores.

   b) To what extent does the proposed project protect high-quality habitat or habitat that can be restored to high quality with appropriate restoration actions? (20% of total score)

   • Rationale: Maintaining high-quality habitat within priority spawning and rearing areas is critical to the viability of target fish populations. Thus, protecting these areas, or areas with high restoration potential, is important to the conservation of the target species.

   • Scoring:
     o 0 = Will not protect important (intact) habitat; site too small to achieve protection goal.
     o 1-6 = 40-60% of total project area is intact habitat with plans for restoration.
     o 7 = More than 60% of total project area is intact habitat; size is sufficient quantity to accommodate goal.

   c) Will the proposed project protect watershed processes or important high-quality habitat? (20% of total score)

   • Rationale: Large parcels of high-quality riparian/floodplain habitat may facilitate the full expression of watershed processes. In reaches with predominantly dysfunctional habitat, disconnected parcels of high-quality riparian/floodplain habitat can serve as
important strongholds for biological and physical processes. Therefore, the importance of protecting a given parcel depends on the context of the reach or watershed condition. Examples of areas that are important to protect are tributary junctions, parcels that contain multiple channels and side channels, areas that offer cold-water refugia, mature riparian areas for large wood recruitment, major spawning areas, and connected floodplains.

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = project does not protect important processes or is not an important stronghold.
  - 1-6 = project protects parcels that facilitate watershed processes to some degree or parcels where processes can be restored or are habitat strongholds.
  - 7 = project protects an important parcel that contains important watershed process(es), or is an important habitat stronghold.

2. Threats

  a) How imminent is the threat of habitat degradation to the proposed land if the project is not implemented? *(15% of total score)*

   - **Rationale:** Because salmon recovery funds are limited, the most pressing concerns need to be addressed first. When evaluating proposals, it is necessary to predict the extent to which a project will change habitat conditions and assess the significance of that change to fish populations. Therefore, to evaluate a habitat protection project, one must have a reasonable basis for comparing what would happen with and without the project. The ability to predict the fate of a proposed parcel of land for protection or easement is difficult, but improved when informed by knowledge of the intentions of the present landowner, market conditions, and local critical areas and zoning laws, among others. Scoring protection projects by default as if all extant habitat values will be lost but for the project would substantially and artificially inflate the value of these projects as compared to restoration projects.

   - **Scoring:**
     - 0 = No clear threat of habitat degradation exists at this time (e.g., what might or could happen is the only threat).
     - 1-6 = The threat to high-quality habitat is not imminent, but the project proponent makes a compelling argument that this protection opportunity will not exist in the future and/or is required for restoration to occur.
     - 7 = There is a demonstrated imminent threat to the property that could lead to loss of high-quality habitat.
3. Benefits to Freshwater Survival or Capacity

a) What would be the anticipated loss in freshwater survival and capacity at the project scale and/or distribution of target species if the proposed area was developed (i.e., what habitat values would be lost and to what degree would that loss reduce freshwater survival and/or distribution of target species at the project scale)? (20% of total score)

- **Rationale:** Freshwater survival is related to the quality of stream habitat. The loss of high-quality habitat or capacity will result in reduced freshwater survival or distribution of target fish species.

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = there would be no reduction in freshwater survival, capacity, or distribution if the proposed area is not protected.
  - 1-6 = intermediate reduction in survival or capacity.
  - 7 = there would be a large reduction in freshwater survival, capacity, or distribution if the proposed area is not protected.

4. Cost Effectiveness of Proposed Protection Project

a) How cost effective is the proposed protection project? (5% of total score)

- **Rationale:** As with restoration projects, the benefits associated with protecting a parcel of riparian/floodplain habitat should justify the cost of the acquisition or conservation easement.

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = no benefit to freshwater survival, capacity, and/or distribution of target species at the project scale. Cost is irrelevant if there is no biological benefit.
  - 1-6 = intermediate biological benefit per cost. Greater points are given to protection projects with high benefit-low costs, while lower points are assigned to projects with low benefit-high costs.
  - 7 = highest possible biological benefit at a relatively low cost.

5. Conditions Affecting the Proposed Project

a) Are there any conditions regarding the protection of the property that could limit the existing high-quality habitat? (5% of total score)

- **Rationale:** Purchase of a property with explicit provisions for activities or anthropogenic features that may affect the quality of habitat may reduce the overall
value of the purchase or conservation easement in terms of salmon recovery. Scores will be assigned based on whether there are activities or conditions regarding the purchase (or conservation easement) that are detrimental to riparian, floodplain, and stream conditions.

- **Scoring:**
  - 0-3 = conditions on the purchase (or conservation easement) of the property exist that will have some effect on the protection of existing high quality habitat; or the ability to do future restoration work.
  - 4-6 = conditions exist on the purchase (or CE), but will likely have minimal impact to high quality habitat; and do not hinder future restoration actions.
  - 7 = no conditions exist that could impact the protection of high quality habitat in perpetuity nor future restoration actions.
# Protection Project Scoring Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potential Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total Maximum Potential Score</th>
<th>RTT Score (1-7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placement of Protection Project</td>
<td>Is the proposed protection project sited within an important assessment unit for protection?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent does the proposed project protect high-quality habitat or habitat that can be restored to high quality with appropriate restoration actions?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will the proposed project protect watershed processes or important high-quality habitat?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>How imminent is the threat of habitat degradation to the proposed land if the project is not implemented?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits to Freshwater Survival or Capacity</td>
<td>What would be the anticipated loss in freshwater survival and capacity at the project scale and/or distribution of target species if the proposed area was developed (i.e., what habitat values would be lost and to what degree would that loss reduce freshwater survival and/or distribution of target species at the project scale)?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness of Protection Project</td>
<td>How cost effective is the proposed protection project?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions Affecting the Project</td>
<td>Are there any conditions regarding the protection of the property that could limit the existing high-quality habitat?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Projects

1. Address Primary Ecological Concerns
   a) Will the proposed assessment inform the development of projects that reduce the effects of primary ecological concerns at the reach scale (as identified in Appendix D of the Biological Strategy, or the extent to which it identifies or validates ecological concerns)? (25% of total score)
   
   • Rationale: All proposed assessments should link directly to restoration or protection actions addressing primary ecological concerns that limit freshwater production and/or distribution of fish species. Assessment projects that inform actions that address more than one primary ecological concern, or fully rectify a single ecological concern at the reach scale, will achieve the highest scores. Sequencing will also affect scores.

   • Scoring:
     o 0 = assessment will result in projects that lead to no (or little) improvement in ecological concern(s) at the reach scale.
     o 1-6 = intermediate change (ecological concern(s) will be partially addressed at the reach scale).
     o 7 = assessment will result in projects that fully rectify ecological concern(s) at the reach scale.

2. Area Covered by Assessment
   a) Is the proposed assessment project sited within an important assessment unit for restoration? (25% of total score)

   • Rationale: Streams vary in intrinsic potential and habitat quantity and quality because of differences in geology, geomorphology, valley width, elevation, stream size, gradient, and other factors. The RTT has incorporated intrinsic potential and other information in identifying high priority assessment units for restoration within each sub-basin (see Step 1 in the Habitat Action Prioritization Within the Upper Columbia River Basin document; Prioritization Strategy). Projects that improve habitat quantity and quality within assessments units of high intrinsic potential (with consideration of other information), or provide access to such habitat, will achieve the highest scores.

   • Scoring:
     o Use this link to identify AU Prioritization Scores for restoration projects.
If a proposed project targets a combination of spring Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout, the **RTT will use the higher of the AU prioritization scores**.

b) **Is the proposed assessment appropriately scaled and scoped? (25% of total score)**

- **Rationale**: Assessment projects must be sufficiently comprehensive to anticipate the physical and ecological issues that potentially influence the effectiveness of the restoration projects they inform.

- **Scoring**:
  - 0 = scale and scope of project cannot provide projected benefits.
  - 1-6 = intermediate (scale and scope should be expanded to achieve full benefit).
  - 7 = the assessment is robust with respect to all factors potentially influencing the success of subsequent projects.

3. **Methods**

   a) **Are the methods outlined within the proposed assessment adequate to achieve the stated objectives? (20% of total score)**

   b) **Rationale**: The assessment must clearly describe the methods that will be used to gather and analyze information. The proposal should demonstrate that it is using an accepted approach. If it is innovative, the proposal should discuss how the methods will achieve the stated objectives of the assessment and demonstrate the benefits of the methods relative to a standard method.

   c) **Scoring**:

     - 0 = the methods are not adequate (employs questionable methods or practices or those not proven to be effective) to achieve the stated objectives.
     - 1-6 = intermediate (methods need substantial changes (uses methods where results are incomplete) to achieve stated objectives (1 point), or a few changes (employs experimental methods with well-developed rationale and experimental design; 6 points)).
     - 7 = the methods are adequate (employs accepted or tested standards, methods, or practices) to achieve the stated objectives.

4. **Cost Effectiveness of Assessment Project**
a) How cost effective is the proposed assessment project? (5\% of total score)

- **Rationale:** It is important that the cost of an assessment project reflects the use of appropriate methods and sufficient effort to obtain the information. It is also important that the assessment provides information that can be used to guide future restoration or protection actions.

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = the proposed assessment uses inappropriate methods and will provide no useful information. Cost is irrelevant if the assessment does not provide useful information.
  - 1-6 = intermediate level of useful information per cost of the assessment. Greater points are given to assessment projects that will produce high quality information at low cost, while lower points are assigned to assessments that will produce low quality information at high costs.
  - 7 = highest possible information per cost of the assessment.
## Assessment Project Scoring Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potential Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total Potential Score</th>
<th>RTT Score (1-7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address Primary Ecological Concerns</strong></td>
<td>Will the proposed assessment inform the development of projects that reduce the effects of <em>primary</em> ecological concerns at the <em>reach</em> scale (as identified in Appendix D of the Biological Strategy, or the extent to which it identifies or validates ecological concerns)?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Covered by Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Is the proposed assessment project sited within an important assessment unit for restoration?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the proposed assessment appropriately scaled and scoped?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td>Are the methods outlined within the proposed assessment adequate to achieve the stated objectives?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Effectiveness of Assessment Project</strong></td>
<td>How cost effective is the proposed assessment project?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Design Projects

1. **Address Primary Ecological Concerns**
   
a) Will the proposed design lead to development of projects that will reduce the effects of **primary** ecological concerns at the **project** scale (as identified in Appendix D of the Biological Strategy, or other information that pertains to the project location; e.g., if ECs are identified for a tributary of an assessment unit)? **(20% of total score)**

   - **Rationale:** All designs proposed should link directly to restoration or protection actions addressing **primary** ecological concerns that limit freshwater survival and/or distribution of fish species at the **project** scale. Design projects with a direct linkage to development of actions addressing more than one important ecological concern, or fully rectifying a single ecological concern, achieve the highest scores. Sequencing also affects scores.

   - **Scoring:**
     
     o **0** = design will result in no (or little) change in ecological concern(s) at the **project** scale.
     
     o **1-6** = intermediate change (ecological concern is partially addressed) at the **project** scale.
     
     o **7** = design will result in projects that address more than one primary ecological concern, or fully rectify a single ecological concern at the **project** scale.

2. **Area Covered by Design**
   
a) Is the proposed project (created from the design) sited within an important assessment unit for restoration? **(15% of total score)**

   - **Rationale:** Streams vary in intrinsic potential and habitat quantity and quality because of differences in geology, geomorphology, valley width, elevation, stream size, gradient, and other factors. The RTT has incorporated intrinsic potential and other information in identifying high priority assessment units for restoration within each sub-basin (see Step 1 in the Habitat Action Prioritization Within the Upper Columbia River Basin document; Prioritization Strategy). Design projects leading directly to actions that improve habitat quantity and quality within high priority assessment units will achieve the highest scores.

   - **Scoring:**
Use this link to identify AU Prioritization Scores for restoration projects.

If a proposed project targets a combination of spring Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout, the RTT will use the higher of the AU prioritization scores.

b) Is the proposed design appropriately scaled and scoped? (10% of total score)

- **Rationale:** Projects must be designed so they will function within the geomorphic context of the stream reach. Projects that are sited without consideration of stream flows, sediment dynamics, and geomorphology will likely fail or provide limited long-term physical and biological benefits and will receive the lowest scores. Similarly, a project may be too small in scope to achieve the purported benefits.

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = scale and scope of project is not matched to project objectives.
  - 1-6 = intermediate (scale and scope is appropriate to meet some of the project objectives).
  - 7 = scale and scope are appropriate to meet articulated project objectives.

3. Temporal Effect of Proposed Restoration Action

   a) Will the proposed project (created from the design) promote natural stream/watershed processes that are consistent with the geomorphology of the stream? (5% of total score)

   - **Rationale:** The RTT defines natural stream/watershed processes as those processes where habitat functions at large spatial and temporal scales. Floodplain connectivity, absence of barriers, and large intact riparian zones are all features of natural stream/watershed processes. As discussed within the body of the biological strategy, “process-based restoration” refers to projects that will result in long-term changes to natural watershed and fluvial processes. Projects such as riparian plantings, increasing flows, barrier removal, and floodplain and wetland reconnections are all examples of projects that restore natural processes.

   - **Scoring:**
     - 0 = project does not promote watershed processes (it has very localized effects).
     - 1-6 = project improves intermediate levels of watershed processes (some level of restoration of process occurs (or the probability is high) at the reach scale).
b) How long will it be before the project (created from the design) achieves its intended response? (5% of total score)

- **Rationale:** The type of restoration action will determine how long it will take before the intended response of the action is realized. For example, an engineered log jam may have an immediate effect on cover for fish, while riparian plantings may take over 25 years before the intended effect is realized (Attachment 1). It is important to not reduce the scores of projects that restore processes and take longer to achieve the intended response, and therefore the scoring below ranges from 3 to 7.

- **Scoring:**
  - 3 = >25 years
  - 5 = 10 ≥ 25 years
  - 7 = <10 years


c) How long will the proposed restoration action and its benefits (created from the design) persist? (5% of total score)

- **Rationale:** Restoration projects that promote long-term habitat improvements and/or require little to no on-going maintenance are likely to have the greatest biological benefit and will receive higher scores (Attachment 1). Projects that treat only symptoms of degraded watershed processes, or require continued on-going maintenance are unlikely to persist for long periods. These projects will receive lower scores.

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 – 3 = restoration project will persist for less than 10 years (or require on-going maintenance).
  - 1-6 = 20-50 years (or some maintenance will be required).
  - 7 = 50+ years (and little to no maintenance).


d) Will the proposed project (created from the design) ameliorate the effects of climate change? (5% of total score)

- **Rationale:** Certain project actions are more likely to reduce or ameliorate the effects of climate change. In general, actions that restore *natural stream/watershed processes* are likely to have the most potential to reduce the effects of long-term climate change.
climate change (Attachment 1). Projects that have a high likelihood to reduce the effects of climate change will score higher than projects that do not.

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = will not ameliorate the effects of climate change.
  - 1-6 = likely to ameliorate the effects of climate change.
  - 7 = will ameliorate the effects of climate change.

4. **Benefits to Freshwater Survival or Capacity**

   a) Will the proposed project (created from the design) improve freshwater survival or increases capacity for target species at the project scale? *(20% of total score)*

   - **Rationale:** Habitat restoration projects are implemented to increase freshwater survival, increase capacity, and/or distribution of target fish species. Therefore, it is important to assess the effects of restoration actions on pre-spawn survival, egg-smolt survival, and spawner distribution. These factors are evaluated at the project scale.

   - **Scoring:**
     - 0 = no benefit to freshwater survival, capacity, and/or distribution of target species at the project scale.
     - 1-6 = intermediate increase in survival, capacity, and/or distribution of target species at the project scale.
     - 7 = highest possible benefit to survival, capacity, and/or distribution of target species at the project scale (e.g., > 100%).

5. **Methods**

   a) Are the methods outlined within the proposed design adequate to achieve the stated objectives? *(10% of total score)*

   - **Rationale:** The proposal must clearly show the methods that will lead to an action (project). The proponent should demonstrate that the methods proposed are an accepted approach. If the methods are innovative, then the proposal should describe how the methods will achieve the stated objectives of the design and demonstrate the benefits of the innovative method relative to a standard method.

   - **Scoring:**
o 0 = the methods are not adequate (employs questionable methods or practices or those not proven to be effective) to achieve the stated objectives.

o 1-6 = intermediate (methods need substantial changes (uses methods where results are incomplete) to achieve stated objectives (1 point), or a few changes (employs experimental methods with well-developed rationale and experimental design; 6 points)).

o 7 = the methods are adequate (employs accepted or tested standards, methods, or practices) to achieve the stated objectives.

6. **Cost Effectiveness of Design Project**

   a) How cost effective is the proposed design project? *(5% of total score)*

   - **Rationale:** It is important that the proposed design leads to a project with high biological benefit at a reasonable design cost.

   - **Scoring:**
     
     o 0 = the design will lead to no benefit to freshwater survival, capacity, and/or distribution of target species at the project scale. Design cost is irrelevant if the design leads to a project with no biological benefit.

     o 1-6 = the design will lead to intermediate biological benefit per design cost. Greater points are given to designs that will lead to high benefit at low design cost, while lower points are assigned to designs that will lead to low benefit at high design cost.

     o 7 = the design will lead to the highest possible biological benefit at relatively low design cost.
## Design Project Scoring Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potential Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Total Potential Score</th>
<th>RTT Score (1-7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address Primary Ecological Concerns</td>
<td>Will the proposed design lead to development of projects that will reduce the effects of primary ecological concerns at the project scale (as identified in Appendix D of the Biological Strategy, or other information that pertains to the project location; e.g., if ECs are identified for a tributary of an assessment unit)?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Covered by Design</td>
<td>Is the proposed project (created from the design) sited within an important assessment unit for restoration?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the proposed design appropriately scaled and scoped?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal Effect of Proposed Restoration Action</td>
<td>Will the proposed project (created from the design) promote natural stream/watershed processes that are consistent with the geomorphology of the stream?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How long will it be before the project (created from the design) achieves its intended response?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How long will the proposed restoration action and its benefits (created from the design) persist?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will the proposed project (created from the design) ameliorate the effects of climate change?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits to Freshwater Survival or Capacity</td>
<td>Will the proposed project (created from the design) improve freshwater survival or increases capacity for target species at the project scale?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Are the methods outlined within the proposed design adequate to achieve the stated objectives?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>How cost effective is the proposed design project?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring Projects

The RTT agreed to score monitoring projects independent of other project types because this is consistent with the unique SRFB allocation process. That is, scores from monitoring proposals will not be combined with scores from other project types and ranked. To avoid confusion and prevent combining monitoring proposal scores with other proposals, the RTT changed the total possible points for monitoring projects from 100 to 30. This scaling will clearly separate monitoring projects from other project types.

As noted in Manual 18, “Regional monitoring projects must address high priority information needs or data gaps identified within a recovery plan; associated regional research, monitoring, and evaluation plan; or lead entity strategy. Regional monitoring projects should complement, enhance, or leverage ongoing monitoring efforts.” High-priority monitoring projects fill data gaps associated with VSP parameters, limiting life stages, and habitat status and trends. This information is needed to evaluate the status of listed populations, identify limiting life stages, and track changes in habitat conditions over time.

1. Information Needs

   a) Will the proposed monitoring project fill Tier 1 data gaps identified in the Upper Columbia Monitoring and Data Management Committee (MaDMC) data gaps list? (20% of total score)

      • Rationale: A monitoring project must be designed to address Tier 1 data gaps, as identified by the MaDMC, or new information needs identified by a project sponsor that the RTT agrees are important information needs. Monitoring projects that focus on addressing specific information gaps previously identified by the RTT will score highest.

      • Scoring:

         o 0 = monitoring project will not address an important data gap.

         o 1-6 = monitoring project will address a less important data gap or should be expanded to more fully address the Tier 1 data gap.

         o 7 = monitoring project will adequately address a Tier 1 data gap.

   b) What is the scale of inference of the proposed monitoring study? (20% of total score)

   • Rationale: A monitoring project that provides information at the population or across populations (ESU/DPS) scales will score higher than a monitoring project that provides information at the reach or project scale.

   • Scoring:
c) Will results from monitoring be useful and available to interested parties upon completion of the project? (15% of total score)

- **Rationale:** It is important that the proposal clearly identify how this information will be used and how data and information will be disseminated and accessed (e.g., on the web) once the project is complete. Monitoring projects that produce useful information and disseminate data in an analyzed and formally reported format (e.g., with metadata and access to QA/QC raw data) will score higher than data disseminated in more raw forms.

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = no description of information dissemination or accessibility, and data or information generated will be of limited use or use is unknown.
  - 1-6 = some plan for information dissemination and accessibility, and/or some level of uncertainty regarding the usefulness of data and information generated.
  - 7 = full description of information dissemination and accessibility, and clear and compelling description of the usefulness of data and information generated.

2. **Purpose of Monitoring Project**

a) Do the objectives of the monitoring proposal complement, enhance, or leverage ongoing monitoring efforts? (15% of total score)

- **Rationale:** Millions of dollars have been spent on monitoring programs in the Upper Columbia River basin. Future monitoring efforts should be proposed in context with
previous and existing monitoring programs. In addition, the proposal should state clearly how it will use information from existing monitoring programs.

- **Scoring:**
  
  - 0-2 = proposed monitoring project will not complement, enhance, or leverage ongoing monitoring efforts.
  
  - 3-6 = intermediate; information will complement, enhance, or leverage ongoing monitoring efforts to some degree.
  
  - 7 = proposed monitoring project will completely complement, enhance, or leverage ongoing monitoring efforts.

3. **Methods**

   a) Are the methods outlined within the monitoring proposal appropriate for addressing the information need? *(15% of total score)*

   - **Rationale:** The monitoring proposal must describe clearly the methods (including study design, sampling methodology, and analytical approaches) that will be used to gather and analyze the information. The proposal should demonstrate that it is using accepted methods. If the methods are innovative, the proposal should discuss how the methods will achieve the stated objectives of the monitoring project and demonstrate the benefits of the methods relative to standard methods.

   - **Scoring:**
     
     - 0 = the methods are not adequate (employs questionable methods or practices or those not proven to be effective) to achieve the stated objectives.
     
     - 1-6 = intermediate (methods need substantial changes to achieve stated objectives [1 point] or few changes [6 points]).
     
     - 7 = the methods are adequate to achieve the stated objectives.

   b) Is the proposed monitoring project appropriately scaled and scoped? *(10% of total score)*

   - **Rationale:** The spatial and temporal scales of a monitoring project must be sufficient to ensure the information gap can be addressed sufficiently.

   - **Scoring:**
     
     - 0 = the spatial and temporal scale and/or scope of proposal cannot meet the objectives.
     
     - 1-6 = intermediate (scale and/or scope should be expanded to meet the objectives).
o 7 = the spatial and temporal scales of the monitoring project are robust with respect to all factors potentially influencing whether the project addresses the information gap(s).

4. Cost Effectiveness of Monitoring Project

a) How cost effective is the proposed monitoring project? (5% of total score)

• Rationale: It is important that the cost of monitoring reflects the quality and usefulness of the information generated from the project. It is also important that the monitoring project uses appropriate methods and sufficient effort to obtain the information.

• Scoring:

  o 0 = the monitoring project uses inappropriate methods and will not fill a data gap. Cost is irrelevant if monitoring does not provide useful information.

  o 1-6 = intermediate level of useful information per cost of the monitoring project. Greater points are given to monitoring projects that will produce high-quality, useful information at low cost; lower points are assigned to monitoring projects that will produce low-quality, less useful information at high costs.

  o 7 = completely fills a data gap at a relatively low cost.
## Monitoring Project Scoring Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Potential Score</th>
<th>Weighting Factor</th>
<th>Total Maximum Potential Score</th>
<th>RTT Score (1-7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Needs</td>
<td>Will the proposed monitoring project fill Tier 1 data gaps identified in the Upper Columbia Monitoring and Data Management Committee data gaps list?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the scale of inference of the proposed monitoring study?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will results from monitoring be useful and available to interested parties upon completion of the project?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Monitoring Project</td>
<td>Do the objectives of the monitoring proposal complement, enhance, or leverage ongoing monitoring efforts?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Are the methods outlined within the monitoring proposal appropriate for addressing the information need?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the proposed monitoring project appropriately scaled and scoped?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness of Monitoring Project</td>
<td>How cost effective is the proposed monitoring project?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 1

Effects of Different Restoration Techniques on Criteria of Success

Typical response times and duration of various types of enhancement actions and whether those actions address natural watershed processes and ameliorating effects of climate change (from Roni et al. 2002; 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Techniques</th>
<th>Restores Processes</th>
<th>Years Until Response</th>
<th>Duration of Restoration</th>
<th>Ameliorate Effects of Climate Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconnection (floodplain side channel; good groundwater interactions or spring-fed)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconnection (upstream to perennial colder water)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instream flow (cooler)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting of trees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25 to 50</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10-50</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWD</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>20 – 30</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrients</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team (RTT) held a conference call on 10 June 2020 to score Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) proposals. What follows are the average benefit scores from 13 reviewers and key issues identified by the RTT during the scoring meeting. Members with conflicts of interest on specific proposals recused themselves from participating in scoring and discussions.

Table 1. RTT scores, ranks, and cost requests for restoration, protection, assessment, and design projects, 2020. SD = standard deviation. Total possible points = 100.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>RTT Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>SRFB Cost Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nason Kahler Instream Complexity</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$513,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Meadow Creek Fish Passage Restoration</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$207,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chewuch River Mile 4 Fish Habitat Enhancement</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$266,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Creek Barrier #040016 Replacement</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>$54,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merritt Oxbow Construction</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>$378,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alder Creek Floodplain Enhancement</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>$299,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chiwawa Floodplain Reconnection</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$141,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Beaver Creek 2020 Restoration</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$336,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loup Loup Creek Habitat Restoration</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$71,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Derby Canyon Barrier Correction</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$165,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Methow Predation Assessment</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$106,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icicle Confluence Side Channel Habitat Improvement</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$285,022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These projects are listed according to their standard deviations (SD). The lower the SD, the less variation among reviewers and the higher the ranking. Because these three projects have the same RTT score and similar SDs, we urge the CACs to review RTT comments on these projects.
Table 2. RTT scores, ranks, and cost requests for monitoring projects, 2020. SD = standard deviation. Total possible points = 30. The RTT developed a separate ranking because of differences in scoring and funding processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>RTT Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>SRFB Cost Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Life History Strategies of Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$106,850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Restoration Projects

Chewuch River Mile 4 Fish Enhancement Project

Average Score: 73
Standard Deviation: 7.18
RTT Rank: 3

This project addresses high-priority ecological concerns within a high-priority assessment unit within the Methow River basin. The establishment of a 1,300-foot-long perennial side channel will provide both summer and winter rearing habitat for juvenile salmonids. Based on a similar project in the Chewuch watershed, the proposed action may also provide spawning habitat for steelhead and perhaps spring Chinook. The proposed action should provide summer and winter thermal refugia where the side channel intercepts groundwater. The RTT appreciates the fact that the sponsor intends to monitor the proposed action. This will provide useful information on the effectiveness of the proposed action.

Some members of the RTT believe a less engineered approach may be a better approach for reconnecting the floodplain at this site. That is, some members of the RTT believe the project can be accomplished with much less excavation work and disturbance to the forested floodplain by constructing a relatively short pilot channel on the floodplain. This would minimize disturbance to existing riparian habitat and maximize opportunities for the river to carve its own flow paths. This approach is more in line with restoring natural processes as it allows the river to cut flow paths across the floodplain and does not “lock” the side channel in place over a long period of time (i.e., in this case, restoring natural processes means the river can migrate across the floodplain at will). This approach, however, is more difficult to evaluate because there is less certainty of success in terms of biological benefit, time to achieve the intended response, and the longevity of the proposed action. As a final note, there appears to be a missed opportunity to engage the relic channels and connect with the wetland.
Upper Beaver Creek Final Design and Restoration Project

Average Score: 67  
Standard Deviation: 11.67  
RTT Rank: 8

This project is located within an important AU for restoration and partially addresses several ecological concerns in this AU. Importantly, it intends to improve and maintain fish passage at the two irrigation diversions and improve fish access to a 1,300-foot-long side channel that is connected to groundwater. These actions will benefit juvenile steelhead and possibly spring Chinook in the watershed. The RTT appreciates the fact that the sponsor designed actions with the understanding that upstream effects from the fires are likely to contribute to higher than normal peak flows and flashy run-off events. Ultimately, the RTT would like to see the two diversions removed.

Alder Creek Floodplain Restoration Project

Average Score: 71  
Standard Deviation: 10.93  
RTT Rank: 6

The Alder Creek Floodplain Restoration Project intends to establish a 0.5-mile-long perennial channel by reconnecting a relic side channel. This action in part addresses a high priority ecological concern in the Middle Methow Assessment Unit. If successful, this action should provide year-round rearing habitat for Chinook and steelhead (i.e., cool-water habitat during summer and warmer-water habitat during winter). Although the project is designed to minimize beaver activity (i.e., the inlet is designed to remove or breach newly formed beaver dams), the RTT is concerned that some elements of the proposed action may be compromised if designed actions are ineffective at eliminating or breaching beaver dams in the constructed channel. The project sponsor noted that they intend to adaptively manage the site for at least three years. The RTT believes a longer management period may be necessary. To be clear, the RTT believes beavers are an important component of the ecosystem and can be used to enhance salmonid habitat. In this case, however, beavers may compromise the integrity of the project before the project matures to a stage that is resistant or resilient to beaver activities (as is occurring currently in the Silver Side Channel). Once mature, beavers may actually contribute to the evolution of the site and further improve habitat conditions for salmonids. As a final point, there remains some concern that heavy metals may be buried within the project site. Although a Level 1 contamination survey was conducted, it is not clear if heavy metals were evaluated on this site. Excavation work may expose buried contaminants if they exist in the project area.
Beaver Creek Barrier #040016 Correction Project

Average Score: 71  
Standard Deviation: 10.58  
RTT Rank: 4

The RTT identified Beaver Creek as an important watershed for restoring fish passage. This watershed contains habitat for spring Chinook, steelhead, and bull trout. Having cool-water temperatures and high intrinsic potential makes it the highest-ranking watershed in the Wenatchee Basin for restoring fish passage. Replacing the lower-most partial barrier and the commitment by BPA to fund restoration of passage at two upstream barriers will increase habitat capacity for listed salmonid species. Because of the cool-water temperatures in Beaver Creek during summer, the stream will provide thermal refugia and may provide suitable habitat for juvenile spring Chinook and steelhead during winter. This stream may also be used by bull trout. If funded, the RTT would like to see this project monitored.

Icicle Confluence Side Channel Habitat Improvement Project

Average Score: 53  
Standard Deviation: 11.2  
RTT Rank: 12

The RTT is pleased the project sponsor revised this project based on comments provided by the RTT last year. As currently proposed, however, this project may provide little benefit to juvenile Chinook and steelhead. The RTT is concerned the project may actually entrap more fish. Depending on the amount of organic matter within the channel, this could create a dissolved oxygen problem during low-flow periods and increase mortality rates. In addition, given the dynamics and condition of the site, the proposed activities will likely improve conditions for coho salmon, which may have a competitive advantage over Chinook salmon and steelhead. It is likely that most of the juvenile Chinook that use the site are summer Chinook. This is because the highest densities of summer Chinook redds occur in this reach of the Wenatchee River. Therefore, summer Chinook fry will likely colonize the side channel during spring and early summer. Few juvenile spring Chinook are likely to colonize the side channel.

Merritt Oxbow Reconnection Restoration Project

Average Score: 71  
Standard Deviation: 10.87  
RTT Rank: 5

This project addresses high-priority ecological concerns within a high-priority assessment unit within the Nason Creek watershed. The project, which, among other things, will create a 1,700-foot-long perennial side channel, should provide complex habitat for juvenile salmonids and not reduce existing spawning
habitat within the main channel. Reconnecting the side channel with groundwater should have additional benefits to salmonids. The RTT is pleased that the sponsor evaluated the feasibility of elevating the streambed by constructing a riffle. This is one method that can be used to help reconnect channels with the floodplain. In this case, however, it appears to be a less feasible option than the proposed action. That said, RTT members have serious concerns with the longevity of the project. They question the stability of the intake structure, which is needed to keep the side channel perennial. If this structure fails, the side channel may be compromised, and fish stranding may occur. In addition, this is a dynamic depositional area, which may reduce the longevity and biological benefits of this project. The RTT is also concerned about unnecessary disturbance to existing riparian habitat. This project will include a large amount of excavation work and disturbance. The RTT also believes the inlet should be relocated further upstream to take advantage of the upstream relic channel. This would reconnect a larger portion of the floodplain. Finally, it is unclear if the current approach will have negative effects on the wetland (i.e., reduce water depth and wetland function).

**Big Meadow Creek Fish Passage Restoration Project**

**Average Score: 74**  
**Standard Deviation: 9.14**  
**RTT Rank: 2**

This project will replace a partial fish passage barrier on Big Meadow Creek. Big Meadow Creek is an important AU for restoration and this project will address the most important limiting factor within the AU. Thus, this is an important action to implement. Because juvenile spring Chinook, steelhead, and bull trout occur upstream and downstream from the partial barrier and no or very few adult Chinook spawn within Big Meadow Creek, the biological benefit of the action is relatively small. However, replacing the partial barrier should help expand the distribution of adult steelhead spawning. In addition, the project will promote natural processes by improving sediment processing. The design will need to consider the relatively high gradient at the project site. The RTT believes the best solution would be to replace the culvert with a bridge. The RTT would also like to see this project monitored if the proposed action is funded.

**Nason Kahler Instream Complexity Project**

**Average Score: 75**  
**Standard Deviation: 7.56**  
**RTT Rank: 1**

This project addresses important ecological concerns in a high-priority assessment unit within the Nason Creek watershed. The RTT is pleased the proposed project intends to address the lack of adult holding habitat within this reach of Nason Creek. The lack of adult holding habitat is an important limiting factor within Nason Creek. Although the BPA powerlines constrain some enhancement actions (e.g., riparian
restoration), the RTT believes additional work could be implemented to take full advantage of the enhancement potential of the site. For example, the proposed approach relies heavily on instream structures and places less emphasis on enhancing channel morphology. Some members believe additional actions could be implemented to address the large width:depth ratio more fully in this reach of the stream. Nevertheless, the RTT believes the actions proposed will improve habitat quality within this reach of Nason Creek.

Design Projects

Lower Derby Canyon Barrier Correction Final Design Project

Average Score: 63
Standard Deviation: 15.65
RTT Rank: 10

This project intends to address the partial fish-passage barrier at RM 0.1 on Derby Creek and the high-gradient reach (7-10%) just downstream from the partial barrier. The RTT appreciates the fact that the sponsor added the high-gradient reach downstream from the partial barrier to the scope of the project. However, the RTT questions the biological benefit associated with this work. There is limited habitat for steelhead in Derby Creek (~3 miles of IP for steelhead). In addition, water withdrawals, which can reduce streams flows to near 0 cfs, and remaining fish passage barriers upstream from the lower barrier reduce the quantity and quality of habitat available to steelhead. Given the existing habitat conditions (which are relatively poor) within Derby Creek and the cost to improve conditions for steelhead, enhancement work in Derby Creek at this time does not appear to be cost effective.

Lower Chiwawa River Floodplain Reconnection and In-stream Enhancement Project

Average Score: 69
Standard Deviation: 8.95
RTT Rank: 7

This project intends to reconnect floodplain habitat and restore habitat structure within the main channel of the lower Chiwawa River. This is an important AU for restoration work within the Wenatchee River basin and this project targets some of the limiting factors within the lower Chiwawa River. The floodplain of the lower Chiwawa River is mostly disconnected from the main channel and any reconnections should have biological benefit, especially for juvenile Chinook salmon. In addition, the lack of pools and cover in the lower Chiwawa River limits adult holding habitat and juvenile Chinook rearing habitat. Although the lower Chiwawa River would benefit from the addition of pools and cover,
there may be limited opportunities because of landowner constraints. In addition, the design of large wood structures will need to consider the effects of ice and ice damming.

**Assessment Projects**

**Lower Methow Predation Assessment Project**

Average Score: 59  
Standard Deviation: 13.90  
RTT Rank: 11  

This project intends to examine the abundance, distribution, movement, and diets of predatory fish in the lower Methow River. This work would then be used to inform future enhancement actions in the Lower Methow River. Although the RTT sees value in predator-prey studies and it does fill a data gap, it is not clear exactly how these studies will inform future actions (except for predator removal or suppression actions that may be beneficial but do not quality for SRFB funding). As such, when scoring this project, some RTT members “assumed” actions implemented within the lower Methow River will address important limiting factors that will improve the capacity and survival of salmonids, but not predators. The RTT agrees that it is important to implement actions that will improve habitat conditions for salmonids and not their predators (e.g., northern pikeminnow, smallmouth bass, etc.) or competitors (e.g., redside shiners), but it is not clear how this will be done. Given that we know that predators exist within the lower river, future enhancement actions should be designed with that in mind. That is, we do not necessarily need to know a lot about the abundance, movements, and diets of predators to inform future enhancement actions within the lower river. Finally, several members of the RTT believe the study should include the river delta.

**Loup Loup Creek Restoration Design Project**

Average Score: 64  
Standard Deviation: 15.75  
RTT Rank: 9  

The RTT is pleased that the project sponsor agreed to conduct a reach assessment before implementing enhancement actions within Loup Loup Creek. It appears the reach assessment intends to evaluate watershed processes upstream from the anadromous reach. This is important because upper watershed processes can have large effects on downstream reaches. It was not clear in the application what methods would be used to conduct the reach assessment. Although this is a small stream, and therefore enhancement work will probably not provide a huge lift in steelhead abundance and survival, it was nevertheless identified as an important stream for restoring steelhead within the Okanogan River basin. Its greatest benefit may be associated with improving steelhead spatial structure and diversity within
the Okanogan River basin. The RTT believes the assessment will be valuable in identifying possible actions for addressing threats and limiting factors within the watershed. The RTT trusts the sponsor will use the results from the assessment to inform the proposed design (there is language in the proposal suggesting the sponsor may move forward with the design without the benefit of the assessment). As a final note, the RTT is pleased to see landowners interested in restoring habitat for ESA-listed species and for reaching out to conservation groups. Having landowner support is a necessary component of species recovery.

Monitoring Projects

The RTT scores monitoring projects independent of other project types because this is consistent with the unique SRFB allocation process. To maintain scoring independence among project types, the RTT changed the total possible points for monitoring projects from 100 to 30. This scaling clearly separates monitoring projects from other project types.

Juvenile Life History Strategies of Spring Chinook Project

**Average Score: 26 (out of 30)**
**Standard Deviation: 1.4**
**RTT Rank: 1 out 1**

This project partially fills a Tier 1 data gap (*life-stage specific fish distribution, habitat use, growth, and survival*) and addresses a critical uncertainty identified within the Upper Columbia Spring Chinook and Steelhead Recovery Plan, it uses appropriate sampling methods and techniques, it evaluates the Entiat spring Chinook population and two important spawning aggregates of the Wenatchee spring Chinook population, and leverages ongoing monitoring efforts in the Wenatchee and Entiat River basins. This work will help identify appropriate enhancement or protection actions for different life stages of Chinook. The greatest uncertainty associated with this work is the linkage between geochemical signatures and specific rearing areas. The use of juvenile Chinook and resident non-salmonids (e.g., sculpin, dace, and/or whitefish) should improve the linkage between geochemical signatures and specific rearing areas. Results from this work will be made available to the public (making results available on a website would be useful). The RTT is pleased to see that this work can move forward under COVID-19 distancing guidelines.
### Monitoring Project Certification Process and Proposed Timeline 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Call for sponsor monitoring project abstracts</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project eligibility screening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Staff coordinates with sponsors regarding SRFB Manual 18 requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>UCSRB submits Letter of Intent for regional monitoring projects to GSRO/RCO</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>RTT scores projects based on criteria linked to certification</td>
<td>RTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>UCSRB certifies monitoring projects receiving a medium or high score on RTT criteria # 1-3</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>CAC ranks projects</td>
<td>CACs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>SRFB Monitoring Panel reviews projects and submits final recommendation to the SRFB for funding</td>
<td>SRFB Monitoring Panel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Monitoring Priority Guidance

Manual 18 requires that regional monitoring projects must address high priority information needs or data gaps that are identified within a recovery plan, or in associated regional research, monitoring, and evaluation plans. In our Region, the monitoring projects need to address data gaps identified in the Recovery Plan, Appendix F of the Biological Strategy, or the more recent analyses by the MaDMC (i.e. the data gaps analysis table that will appear in the biological strategy). The UCSRB hopes to work with the RTT and MaDMC over the next year to update the monitoring priorities in the Region, which can guide future monitoring efforts.

### Annual UCSRB Review of Monitoring Certification Process

Every year the Staff will review the project monitoring funding option and make decisions about the process for the annual grant round, as follows:

1) Does our regional organization choose to use from 0- 10% of our annual SRFB project allocation on regional monitoring projects?
2) If yes, does the board want to modify the certification process? (e.g. solicit RFPs for a regional priority monitoring project, modify eligibility criteria etc.)

### Regional Technical Team Review and UCSRB Certification
If the Board decides to allocate 0-10% towards monitoring projects in any year, UCSRB staff will coordinate with sponsors early to help ensure that proposed projects meet SRFB Manual 18 requirements. The RTT developed scoring criteria for monitoring projects in April 2016. The 2016 criteria are aligned with RCO’s manual 18 requirements and are the primary basis for UCSRB certification. To receive UCSRB certification, any monitoring project must receive a medium or high score on RTT scoring criteria #1-3. The UCSRB will be unable to certify any project that receives a score in the “does not meet objectives” range for one or more of the criteria #1-3.

**Citizen’s Advisory Committee Review**

The Citizen’s Advisory Committee will review and rank certified monitoring projects alongside other project types and include them in their final list. Any monitoring projects on the final ranked list can be funded according to their order and funding availability up to a maximum of 10% of our annual SRFB regional allocation.

USCRB staff will provide sponsors a *Regional Salmon Recovery Organization Certification Form* (RCO’s Manual 18, Appendix H) to submit with their final project application to RCO.
Attachment C

UC SRFB Project Information Sheet 2020
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Subbasin</th>
<th>Assessment Unit(s) Affected</th>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th>Protection Priority (7 is highest)</th>
<th>Restoration Priority (7 is highest)</th>
<th>Primary Ecological Concern (EC)</th>
<th>Secondary ECs</th>
<th>Primary Species</th>
<th>Secondary Species</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Methow Predation Assessment</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Methow River - Alta Coulee, Methow River - McFarland Creek, Methow River - Texas Creek</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Injury and Mortality (Predation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Steelhead, Summer Chinook</td>
<td>This project will address a tier-one data gap and improve our understanding of abundance, habitat use, and prey consumption for predators of ESA-listed salmonids. This assessment will result in a prioritized list of management, research, and restoration actions to help increase the abundance and production of ESA-listed fish species in the lower Methow River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chewuch River Mile 4 Fish Habitat Enhancement Project</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Chewuch River - Pearrygin Creek</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Peripheral and Transitional Habitats (Side Channel and Wetland Conditions)</td>
<td>Channel Structure and Form (Bed and Channel Form)</td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Steelhead, Bull Trout</td>
<td>This project will improve peripheral and transitional habitat by installing an apex structure in the mainstem to encourage scour and flow through a 1,300 foot historic side channel with the intent of promoting a year round perennial connection. The side channel will have many clusters of WDO structures and pools along the length of the channel for year round use by YOY salmonids. In addition, a large wood structure will be installed to encourage pool formation, providing instream structural complexity, hydraulic refuge, for YOY salmonids and adult holding habitat near known areas for spawning. We anticipate that the inundation extents on the floodplain will improve the hyporheic and groundwater levels as we have seen major improvements on other projects implemented by this program in the past. To monitor the hyporheic and ground water exchange, in the spring of 2020 the YN UCHRP will be installing 9 piezometer wells into this area so that a pre/post-treatment measurement of the hyporheic and groundwater zone can be measured and monitored over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Beaver Creek Final Design and Restoration</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Lower Beaver Creek</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Habitat Quality (Anthropogenic Barriers)</td>
<td>Riparian Conditions</td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Steelhead</td>
<td>The biological objectives and outcomes of the project are highlighted below: - Increase connectivity and capacity of floodplain and wetland habitats that provide rearing and refuge habitat during high flow periods. - 1.5 acres, - Improve habitat complexity and resilience within the newly meandered segment of Beaver Creek - 1,800 linear feet, - Restore fish passage across the Batie Diversion, which is currently rated at 33% passage, - Maintain fish passage at the Marracci Diversion, which is currently threatened by channel avulsion, - Improve upstream fish passage/access to 17.5 miles of habitat, including the Beaver Creek Habitat project completed by YN in 2019 at Lester Rd., - Improve fish passage / access to a 1,300-foot-long perennial, groundwater fed-off-channel area that has existing fish use, - Improve channel capacity and resilience along the re-meandered segment of Beaver Creek to accommodate spring high flows without increasing risk to adjacent infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alder Creek Floodplain Enhancement Project</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Methow River - Alder Creek</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Peripheral and Transitional Habitats (Side Channel and Wetland Conditions)</td>
<td>Channel Structure and Form (Instream Structural Complexity)</td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Steelhead</td>
<td>This project is a subset of a 1.5 mile long restoration action (three individual projects) that seeks to address the top priority ecological concerns in the Middle Methow Assessment Unit (Methow River - Alder Creek) by restoring side channel and floodplain connectivity, increasing instream complexity, and restoring habitat formation processes that will benefit salmon stocks in the long term. This 0.5 mile long project will re-establish perennial connectivity of relic side channels and floodplains in an area of the Methow with substantial groundwater connectivity which will provide year-round rearing habitat with thermal refuge for juvenile salmonids; promote floodplain inundation; and restore hydraulic complexity for ESA-listed salmonids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Subbasin</td>
<td>Assessment Unit(s) Affected</td>
<td>Project Category</td>
<td>Protection Priority (P ≥ highest)</td>
<td>Restoration Priority (P ≥ highest)</td>
<td>Primary Ecological Concern (EC)</td>
<td>Secondary ECs</td>
<td>Primary Species</td>
<td>Secondary Species</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loup Loup Creek Habitat Restoration Project</td>
<td>Okanogan</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riparian Condition (Riparian Condition)</td>
<td>Riparian Condition (LW Recruitment) Peripheral and Transitional Habitats (Side Channel and Wetland Conditions) Channel Structure and Form (Instream Structural Complexity) Sediment Conditions (increased Sediment Quantity) Water Quality (Temperature)</td>
<td>Steelhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within the Okanogan subbasin, Loup Loup Creek has been identified as the 4th highest priority for restoration. The proposed project area is associated with small residential parcels and would include approximately 185 meters of Loup Loup Creek, as well as 1.5 acres of riparian planting. Current bed condition is accumulated sand, with little to no gravel present. Restoration objectives for this project include spawning gravel augmentation and installation of in-stream structures to increase instream complexity and improve steelhead habitat quality and quantity. A 75’ buffer will be planted to improve the degraded riparian area to reduce further erosion, lower local stream temperature, and support continued habitat improvements through IWD recruitment. Preliminary designs and metrics for in-stream habitat improvements will be developed prior to submission of the final application; the Conservation District staff engineer is engaged in an active project and has not yet been able to visit the project site. If funded, final designs will be developed prior to project construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Creek Barrier 640015 Replacement</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Habitat Quality (Anthropogenic Barriers)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Steelhead, Bull Trout, Other</td>
<td>This project is intended to replace a 67% velocity barrier at Beaver Creek, RM 0.5 with a structure that provides unimpeded access to upstream habitats for all fish species at all life stages. This is the downstream-most anthropogenic barrier in Beaver Creek, and all other known barriers within the documented range of fish distribution for the stream have been removed or projects to remove them are in progress. As a result, this project is a critical component in a suite of work being performed to provide unimpeded access to habitats in Beaver Creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Derby Canyon Barrier Correction</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Wenatchee River - Derby Canyon</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Habitat Quality (Anthropogenic Barriers)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steelhead</td>
<td></td>
<td>This project will build upon on-going efforts to restore fish passage and connectivity to 10 miles of upstream habitat. Over the past four years, three fish barriers have been replaced on private lands in Derby Creek, and two more barriers are in progress. There are other partial fish passage barriers upstream from this barrier which may limit the full potential of habitat gain; however, this project work in concert with ongoing efforts to address fish passage limitations within the Wenatchee River-Derby Canyon sub-basin. Once implemented, the removal of fish barriers results in an immediate and permanent benefit for fish passage that will persist for the life of the replacement structure. This effort will increase spatial structure, abundance, and productivity of salmonids in the Wenatchee River-Derby Canyon watershed by providing year-round fish passage to all species at all life stages for the entire 20 miles of habitat in Derby Creek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chiwawa (RM 1.0 - 1.75) Floodplain Reconnect</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Lower Chiwawa River</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Peripheral and Transitional Habitats (Side Channel and Wetland Conditions) Peripheral and Transitional Habitats (Floodplain Condition) Channel Structure and Form (Instream Structural Complexity)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Steelhead, Bull Trout, Other</td>
<td>This project is the first phase of an effort with the biological objectives of improving in-stream conditions and floodplain function along an ~3.25 mile reach of the lower Chiwawa River. There are two desired outcomes of this phase: one is relative to an ~0.75 mile reach of the mainstem channel and an adjacent floodplain wetland complex (RM 1.0-1.75) and the second is relative to the remaining 2.5 mile reach of the mainstem channel upstream of the floodplain complex (RM 1.75-4.25). For the floodplain area, the desired outcome of this phase is a preliminary design set (with cost estimates) that will facilitate fundraising needed to develop construction-ready designs and implement the preferred restoration action during a subsequent phase. The proposed project also will explore opportunities to control invasive plant species and enhance native woody vegetation and floodplain large woody debris within the site. The desired outcome of proposed work from RM 1.75-4.25 is conceptual designs that identify the type, size and location of potential engineered large wood structures along this reach. The desired outcome of this effort is to identify a sufficient number of locations where wood structures can safely be constructed to achieve wood loading for this reach that approaches 274 pieces per mile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icicle Confluence Side Channel Habitat Improvement</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Peripheral and Transitional Habitats (Side Channel and Wetland Conditions) Channel Structure and Form (Instream Structural Complexity) Water Quality (Temperature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steelhead</td>
<td></td>
<td>The biological objectives of the project are to improve rearing habitat and juvenile survival in the important Icicle/Wenatchee confluence area. This will be achieved by adding instream complexity and cover, and increasing access to cold water refugia in ~2,000 linear feet of side channel and off-channel habitat and restoring ~6 acres of riparian habitat by installing 10 ELJs, deepening scour pools, and planting riparian and conifer species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Subbasin</td>
<td>Assessment Unit(s)</td>
<td>Project Category</td>
<td>Protection Priority (7 is highest)</td>
<td>Restoration Priority (7 is highest)</td>
<td>Primary Ecological Concern (EC)</td>
<td>Secondary ECs</td>
<td>Primary Species</td>
<td>Secondary Species</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merritt Oxbow Construction</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Lower Nason Creek</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Riparian Condition (Riparian Condition)</td>
<td>Peripherial and Transitional Habitats (Side Channel and Wetland Conditions)</td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Steelhead, Bull Trout</td>
<td>This project will excavate 836 feet of side channel habitat that will connect with relic oxbows of the mainstem and the upstream end of an existing (seasonally disconnected) side channel to create a total of over 1700 linear feet of perennial side channel. Compared to existing conditions, the project will provide an additional 0.43 acres of connected off channel habitat at low flow, and an additional 2.67 acres of off channel habitat at the 1.25 year event. Twenty-four wood structures will be installed to improve instream habitat complexity and cover. A total of 3750 willow, cottonwood and dogwood live stakes will be densely planted along the newly excavated side channel to provide shade, nutrients, structure, and enhance floodplain functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Meadow Creek Fish Passage Restoration</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Big Meadow Creek</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Habitat Quantity (Anthropogenic Barriers)</td>
<td>Spring Chinook, Steelhead, Bull Trout</td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Steelhead, Bull Trout</td>
<td>The replacement of a partially passable culvert with a structure that is fully passable to all species and life stages will provide unrestricted access to 4.7 miles of Intrinsic Potential (IP) for spring Chinook, 7.0 miles of IP for steelhead, and 10.7 miles of IP for bull trout (UC Barrier Prioritization Tool – Wenatchee Results, 2018).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nason Kahler Instream Complexity Project</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Lower Nason Creek</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Riparian Condition (Riparian Condition)</td>
<td>Channel Structure and Form (Bed and Channel Form)</td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Steelhead, Bull Trout</td>
<td>This project will result in Final project designs for the entire 1.6 mile Kahler project reach, and will support construction for Site 1. The desired outcomes of the 1.6 mile Kahler Reach project include: This project intends to improve instream complexity by reintroducing large wood to initiate habitat forming processes through the strategic placement and design of 8 ELJs from RM 7.2-7.6 of the Kahler Reach. Depending upon structure location, the ELJs will: force scour pools; reduce local flow-velocities to provide holding habitat for adults; locally sort bedload for substrate complexity; and elevate stage near areas of low-lying floodplain. The project will also decommission approximately 450 ft of road prism in the floodplain that currently blocks this outlet of 1,140 ft cold water wetland complex and off-channel rearing zone thereby providing complete flow through connection for this floodplain side channel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Life History Strategies and Migratory Pathways of Upper Columbia Spring Chinook as Inferred from Otolith Microchemistry</td>
<td>Wenatchee &amp; Entiat</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td></td>
<td>The core goal of this work is to improve upon our understanding of successful juvenile life-history strategies. This information will be used to inform population and habitat restoration efforts by contrasting both successful and unsuccessful life-history strategies against estimates of juvenile outmigrant timing and abundance. A major outcome of this study will include elucidating the relative contribution of fry outmigrants to spawning populations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Attachment D

UC CAC Committee Ranking Criteria
Chelan CAC Ranking Meeting Final Summary
Okanogan CAC Ranking Meeting Final Summary
Joint 2020 CAC Meeting Final Summary
Project Proposal Ranking Criteria
Total maximum score is 150 points

Criterion 1: Benefits to Fish and Certainty of Success (60 points as a weighted percentage based upon RTT score)
- How did the RTT rate this project?
- Does the project address documented habitat ecological concerns as outlined in the Draft Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Plan, Biological Strategy, or local Watershed Plan?
- Is the project consistent with the Recovery Plan Implementation Strategy?
- Is the project/assessment based on proven scientific methods that will meet objectives?
- Are there any obstacles that could delay the implementation of this project or study (permitting and or design)?

Criterion 2: Project Longevity (30 points)
- Who has the responsibility to manage and maintain the project? What is the responsibility of current or future landowners?
- Has the sponsor successfully implemented projects in the past?
- Are the benefits associated with the project in perpetuity?
- Will the project last only a few years?
- Is there a high risk of failure associated with this project?

Criterion 3: Project Scope (15 points)
- How much habitat is being protected or gained?
- Are threats imminent?
- Is the scale of the proposed action appropriate?

Criterion 4: Community Support (25 points)
- Has there been public outreach about this project to assess the level of community support?
- Is there any community outreach planned during and/or after implementation?
- Will the project create benefits or raise concerns for particular groups or the community at large?
- Does the project build community support for salmon recovery efforts?
- Has the project sponsor secured landowner participation or acceptance?
- Will there be public access? What is the breadth and strength of the partnership supporting the project (technical support, financial and in-kind contributions, labor)?

Criterion 5: Economics (20 points)
- Does the project represent an opportunity for economic benefit?
- Will this project help the region move closer to delisting or reduce regulatory intervention?
- Is the project budget clearly defined and reasonable?
- How much benefit does the project create for the dollars invested?
Chelan Project Ranking Meeting Summary  
Chelan County Citizen Advisory Committee  
Wednesday, July 8, 2020  
Webinar/Call

➢ Committee Members: Mike Deason (Chair), Dave Graybill, Bruce Merighi, Bob Whitehall, Alan Schmidt, and Keith Truscott  
➢ UCSRB Staff: Pete Teigen, Sarah Walker, Nicole Jordan

Mike Deason, CAC Chair, convened the meeting at 11:10 am.

Committee Logistics  
Individual CAC member scored and ranks the projects and submitted those to Pete prior to the meeting.

The initial Chelan CAC Ranked List:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Derby Canyon Barrier Correction</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chiwawa Floodplain Reconnection</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merritt Oxbow Construction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nason Kahler Instream Complexity Project</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDFW Migratory Pathways of UC Spring Chinook</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon initial review the group generally agreed with the list, though members discussed the challenges of ranking monitoring proposals (Migratory Pathways) along with other project categories because monitoring projects typically do not score as well with community support and economics. The CAC discussed the importance of this monitoring project and how it could be expanded to the other subbasins as well and all agreed they would like to see it funded. Based on looking on the list members thought it would have a good possibility of falling above the funding line if it were moved up the list.

Keith motioned to move Migratory Pathways to number three, above Lower Chiwawa because of the importance of this effort though not it did not rank as well base on the CAC criteria and the relatively low cost. Bob seconded the motion. All other members agreed to rank Migratory Pathways to three and Lower Chiwawa four.

After further review the group like the list as presented.
Final Chelan CAC Ranked List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Derby Canyon Barrier Correction</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Chiwawa Floodplain Reconnection</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merritt Oxbow Construction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nason Kahler Instream Complexity Project</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDFW Migratory Pathways of UC Spring Chinook</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no further discussion, and all agreed to approve the revised final project list.

The group agreed that the three members representing the full CAC would participate in the Joint meeting and work with the Okanogan CAC to develop the final regional list.

The Chelan CAC adjourned 11:55 am.
Meeting Summary
Okanogan Citizen Advisory Committee
Ranking Meeting
Wednesday, July 8, 2020 ~ 8:00-9:00
Webinar/Call

- Committee Members: Craig Nelson, Will Keller, Tom McCoy, Sam Israel, John Bartella. Absent member with rankings provided were Louis Sukovaty; and Bob Monetta did not submit rankings or attend the meeting.
- UCSRB Staff: Pete Teigen, Sarah Walker, Nicole Jordan

Okanogan Ranking Discussion
Craig Nelson, Okanogan CAC Chair and Executive Director of the Okanogan Conservation District, recused himself from discussion and scoring/ranking of the Loup Loup Creek Habitat Restoration Project. Other members evaluated, scored, and ranked that project.

The CAC discussed long-term operation and maintenance for projects and who bares the responsibility, especially on WDFW lands. The group thinks it would be useful for project sponsors to articulate in their applications in more detail who and how projects will be maintained because it could impact how the community at large may view recovery efforts.

There was discussion about the dynamics of the mainstem Methow and how that could impact the Alder Creek project. Members discussed the need to better understand how and why this historic channel was closed off and if it was a natural process, which led some to question the long-term efficacy of the project. If natural processes were the root cause of the historic side channel closing off, then the group thought it may not be wise to reverse natural processes. The group also discussed the dynamic nature of the Beaver Creek watershed and concern was shared that perhaps that project posed risk as well and some concern that nearby community members may be experiencing some salmon restoration fatigue. The irrigation component of the Beaver Creek project was a seen as a positive attribute along with reconnecting the side channel under the road to help disperse water into a historic floodplain and also improving fish access to the upper watershed.

The groups discussed moving Lower Methow Predation above Alder Creek because of the possibility that understanding predation could lead project sponsors and other partners to develop restoration actions to mitigate predation on listed salmonids. There were some concerns about if/how this would actually happen. They ultimately decided to keep Alder Creek ranked higher than Lower Methow Predation.

Final Okanogan CAC Project Rankings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chewuch River Mile 4 Fish Habitat Enhancement Project</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John motioned to approve the Okanogan CAC list, Will seconded. Without further discussion the group unanimously agreed.

The group agreed that the three members representing the full CAC would participate in the Joint meeting and work with the Chelan CAC to develop the final regional list.

The meeting ended at approximately 9:10 am.
UPPER COLUMBIA LEAD ENTITY
JOINT CITIZEN’S ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY
GoUSA, Wenatchee, WA
Wednesday, July 8, 2020 ~ 5:30 to 7:15 PM

➢ Joint Committee Members:
➢ Chelan CAC, Mike Deason, Dave Graybill, Alan Schmidt
➢ Okanogan CAC: Craig Nelson, Sam Israel, John Bartella
➢ UCSRB Staff: Pete Teigen, Sarah Walker, and Greer Maier

Agenda Review and Background
Pete convened the meeting at 5:37 pm. He welcomed everyone and did a round of introductions. Each county had their separate meetings this morning. This meeting will be shorter than previous meetings due to fewer projects.

Pete reminded the members of the process for the Joint Ranking. Joint CAC Meeting is for the two CACs to come together and develop a regional list to submit to the SRFB for funding. The committees will decide collectively on what projects to put forward to advance recovery throughout the region. Craig Nelson will be chairing the Joint CAC meeting.

Pete briefed the Okanogan CAC member on a discussion regarding scoring of monitoring proposals that the Chelan CAC had. It was noted that RTT monitoring scores are out of 30 versus 100 and often the CAC scores for monitoring proposals are a bit lower because of how they fare with community and economic criteria. Discussion from the Chelan Ranking meeting focused on community and economic support and power of CAC to move projects so, although monitoring and restoration proposals may be scored differently, there is the opportunity to advance it due to different criteria. Additionally, only 10% of the regional allocation can be used for monitoring out of approximately $1.85 million, so the max for monitoring is about $185,000.

For partially funded projects, the sponsor and RCO will work together to modify proposal and allocate partial funding. Pete noted the SRP is meeting this month to review projects, any project labeled project of concern (POC), would not be submitted for funding consideration because of regional policy.

The group reviewed the decision-making ground rules and finalizing the project list:

1. A Citizen Advisory Committee member may, at any time, make a motion to move a particular project up or down on the list.
2. The Citizen Advisory Committee member making such a request must include rationale based on the citizens’ review criteria.
3. The Joint Citizen Advisory Committee will then engage in discussion regarding the motion to move a project on the list.
4. After discussion, the Joint Citizen Advisory Committee will vote – approve, oppose, abstain – on the motion to move the project on the list.
5. The motion will carry upon unanimous approval by all Joint Citizen Advisory Committee Members (excluding “abstain” votes).

2020 Joint Ranking Discussion
Pete projected on the Chelan and Okanogan CACs scores and ranks and RTT scored. Under the current ordering based on CAC priority and then RTT score. Alder Creek would receive partial (~$200,000) funding. Lower Chiwawa, Lower Derby and Lower Methow Predation Assessment are below the funding line and will be submitted as alternates. The list shows each county will receive funding for its top three priority projects, with Alder Creek in Okanogan County receiving partial funding. The CAC discussed maybe reducing funding to one project to fully fund another, but members noted past negative feedback about recommending funding only a portion of a project above the funding line.

Pete projected the Okanogan CAC and Chelan CAC rankings from the morning. The group discussed whether to move Lower Chiwawa above Alder Creek to avoid the partial-funding conundrum. Pete showed the proposed Lower Chiwawa design proposal for the Joint CAC. Although it was noted the project was being proposed ahead of a reach assessment with limited opportunities for restoration the project was deemed worth pursuing (floodplain design with scoping on private versus FS ownership).

Alan asked how often funding was received from other sources like BPA could impact the list. Pete responded it happens on occasion but is not predictable and the group should develop the complete list regardless of other funding sources or projects being withdrawn. Craig commented on the LE process for returning funds to the region if things shift. The Joint CAC agreed to leave the list based on their priorities rather than attempt to predict the final project list and funding amounts.

Dave motioned for the initial list to be accepted, John seconded. All approved. After limited discussion, the group had no other changes or amendments to the list. Craig called for a vote to approve the final list. All voted to approve the list as final.

Planned Project Forecast List- Pete then showed the group the draft list and the group discussed the list, need for the list, and how to better refine the list. It was suggested that Pete work with project sponsors to better refine the budget numbers to reflect the potential SRFB request and not the potential project budget total. In addition to refining the SRFB request, the group suggested using highest priority areas to help filter and refine the list. Pete said he would distribute to the final PPFL to the full CAC for their reference.

Members all discussed their want for a better understanding of where previously funded SRFB projects are and what has been accomplished. Pete said UCSRB would work with sponsors to develop a brief summary of where project from the past five years of SRFB funding are (for example where they constructed, were designs complete, etc) and share that with the group.

There were no public comments.

The meeting adjourned at 7:16 pm
Attachment E

Final 2020 UC SRFB Ranked List
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prism/SRP Numbers</th>
<th>*Project Title</th>
<th>*Sponsor</th>
<th>*Project subbasin</th>
<th>*Project Category</th>
<th>*SRFB Request</th>
<th>Running SRFB Total</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>*Anticipated TOTAL Budget</th>
<th>RTT Scores</th>
<th>County CAC Rank</th>
<th>Joint CAC Rank</th>
<th>UC Funding allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-1468</td>
<td>Nason Kahler Instream Complexity Project</td>
<td>Chelan County Natural Resource Department</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>$513,845</td>
<td>$513,845</td>
<td>$149,020</td>
<td>$662,865</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1.85 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-1460</td>
<td>Chewuch River Mile 4 Fish Habitat Enhancement Project</td>
<td>Yakama Nation</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>$266,485</td>
<td>$270,330</td>
<td>$392,866</td>
<td>$659,351</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-1447</td>
<td>Merritt Osbowl Construction</td>
<td>Cascade Fisheries (formerly CCFEG)</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>$378,667</td>
<td>$1,158,997</td>
<td>$55,724</td>
<td>$434,391</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-1469</td>
<td>Loup Loup Creek Habitat Restoration Project</td>
<td>Okanogan Conservation District</td>
<td>Okanogan</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>$71,462</td>
<td>$1,230,459</td>
<td>$42,995</td>
<td>$114,457</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-1470</td>
<td>Juvenile Life History Strategies and Migratory Pathways of Upper River Restoration</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Entiat</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>$106,850</td>
<td>$1,337,309</td>
<td>$20,650</td>
<td>$127,500</td>
<td>26/30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-1457</td>
<td>MRBF Creek Floodplain Enhancement Project</td>
<td>Yakama Nation</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>$299,933</td>
<td>$1,973,277</td>
<td>$391,767</td>
<td>$691,700</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-1455</td>
<td>Lower Chiwawa (RM 1.0-1.75) Floodplain Reconnect</td>
<td>Chelan County Natural Resource Department</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$141,435</td>
<td>$2,114,712</td>
<td>$24,960</td>
<td>$166,395</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-1448</td>
<td>Lower Derby Canyon Barrier Correction</td>
<td>Chelan County Natural Resource Department</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$165,190</td>
<td>$2,279,902</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$165,190</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-1444</td>
<td>Lower Methow Predator Assessment</td>
<td>Cascade Fisheries (formerly CCFEG)</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>$106,705</td>
<td>$2,286,607</td>
<td>$18,470</td>
<td>$135,775</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total UC Funding allocation: $2,386,607**

**Total UC Funding allocation: $3,542,768**

*Pulled due to POC label*