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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 (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 2021 followed the shortened schedule adopted in 2020 because of changes to Manual 18 and state guidelines, regional changes, and the COVID-19 pandemic. In 2021, project sponsors finished their involvement in the process in June. Project sponsors gave technical presentations and received feedback early in the process and thus had the opportunity to modify and change proposals earlier in the grant round based on technical feedback within the Region. All site visits were virtual again in 2021, because of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. Virtual site visits were received positively by SRP, RTT and CAC members. In the future, there may be value in a mixed approach of virtual and in-person field visits.

The RTT updated their scoring criteria in 2021 to reflect the shift toward a pre-proposal and full proposal review and updated terminology and priorities used in the regional prioritization described in the Habitat Action Prioritization Strategy. The final ranking was completed by the Citizen Advisory Committees (CACs) using existing criteria to score and rank projects based on biological, social, economic, and community considerations.
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 and review criteria to rate projects based on the technical merits of each project and consistency with regional biological priorities. The Upper Columbia RTT 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) defined habitat action priorities, and 2) updated the technical appendices and the text within the main body of the strategy with new information regarding restoration strategies and priorities.

In 2021, the RTT completed its updated Habitat Action Prioritization, including: 1) refinement and prioritization of assessment units for restoration and protection; 2) identification of limiting life stages at the population and assessment unit scale; 3) identification and ranking of limiting factors and threats that cause certain life stages to be limiting; 4) identification and prioritization of reaches within AUs for restoration and protection; and 5) identification and prioritization of habitat action types to address limiting factors.

What criteria were used for the regional technical review?

RTT Project Scoring
The RTT Scoring Criteria for SRFB Proposals (January 2021) used for the 2020 funding cycle can be found in Attachment B. The RTT Comments on 2021 SRFB Proposals and results from the RTT’s June 10 scoring meeting are also included in Attachment B.

Monitoring Project Type
In April 2016, the RTT developed scoring criteria for monitoring projects that are aligned with RCO’s Manual 18 requirements and are the primary basis for UCSRB certification. In the Upper Columbia Region, 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 RTT’s Monitoring and Data Management Committee (MaDMC). The RTT scores monitoring projects out of a total 30 points versus 100 points used for other project types, to clearly differentiate monitoring projects from other projects when comparing scores.
The RTT scoring criteria for monitoring proposals are articulated in the *RTT Scoring Criteria for SRFB Proposals (January 2021)* and the *UCSRB SRFB Monitoring Process 2021* 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 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. Tables 3 and 4 identify the Upper Columbia RTT and CAC members who reviewed, scored, and ranked projects this year.
Table 3. 2021 Regional Technical Reviewers (Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
<th>Scored in 2021</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</td>
<td>BioAnalyysts, 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></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></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>
<tr>
<td>John Crandall</td>
<td>Methow Restoration Council</td>
<td>Aquatic ecology; water quality monitoring; habitat restoration and evaluation; fish population monitoring.</td>
<td>X</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 2021</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>Leah Hemberry (Interested Citizen)</td>
<td>Habitat Interests</td>
<td>Leavenworth</td>
<td>X</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 2021</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>X</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 (Recovery Plan Appendix H) 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 2021 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 using the “total project request” and the RTT biological benefit score. This cost effectiveness score is 5% of a project’s total score (see RTT Scoring Criteria for SRFB Proposals January 2021 in Attachment B).

The CACs include a detailed cost-effectiveness review through three separate criteria: project longevity, project scope, and economics (see CAC Project Proposal Ranking Criteria 2021 in Attachment D).
Preserves high quality habitat. Identify the projects on your list that will preserve high quality habitat.
See Attachment C: UC SRFB Project Information Sheet 2021.

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>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cascade Fisheries (formerly Cascade Columbia Fisheries Enhancement Group)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelan County Natural Resource Department</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakama Nation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanogan County</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia Conservation District</td>
<td>10</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 2021.

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 2021.

Provides for match above the minimum requirement percentage. Identify the project’s match percentage and the regional match total.
See Attachment E: Final 2021 UC SRFB Ranked 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 2021 SRFB Proposals). Okanogan and Chelan CACs each held separate ranking meetings and then met jointly to finalize the regional list. See table 5 and associated attachments for the 2021 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, Tom Slocum and Paul Schlenger, participated in the Upper Columbia process for the 2021 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 10 and 11. 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 and other video footage, Google Earth, photographs, site diagrams, and other visual aids to provide additional understanding for project reviewers. It also allowed reviewers to ask questions and 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 PRISM. After project sponsors received their comments, a one-hour call was scheduled for the Lead

---

### Table 5. 2021 Project Proposal Reviewer’s Documentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Technical Scoring</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTT Scoring Criteria for SRFB Proposals (January 2021)</td>
<td>Attachment B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTT Comments on 2021 SRFB Proposals</td>
<td>Attachment B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSRB SRFB Monitoring Process 2021</td>
<td>Attachment B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAC Ranking</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC Project Proposal Ranking Criteria 2021</td>
<td>Attachment D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelan CAC Ranking Meeting Final Summary 2021</td>
<td>Attachment D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okanagan CAC Ranking Meeting Final Summary 2021</td>
<td>Attachment D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Joint CAC Meeting Final Summary 2021</td>
<td>Attachment D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final List</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final 2021 UC SRFB Ranked Project 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 principal guiding document for identifying appropriate projects for implementation in the region is the *Recovery Plan*, a federally approved recovery plan for Upper Columbia spring Chinook salmon evolutionary significant units (ESU) and steelhead distinct population segment (DPS) 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*

The regional technical presentations were delivered on March 10 and 11, 2021. Project sponsors presented their project ideas to technical and citizen reviewers for early feedback about relative competitiveness and suggestions on project improvements. The RTT also reviewed draft proposals and provided input to project sponsors during the virtual site visits on May 10 and 11. Finally, the RTT reviewed and scored applications at its June 9 meeting, and a representative provided an overview of the biological scores and answered questions at the June 22 and 24 CAC meetings.

*Citizen’s Reviews & Ranking*

The CAC Committee Ranking Criteria can be found in Attachment D. The Okanogan CAC met on June 22 to hear presentations from project sponsors and formally ranked the projects on July 7. On June 24 the Chelan CAC heard presentations from the project sponsors and asked questions. Each CAC then met again on July 8 to formally rank the projects. See the *Okanogan CAC Ranking Meeting Final Summary 2021* and *Chelan CAC Ranking Meeting Final Summary 2021* in Attachment D.
**Joint Committee Approval of the Final Project List**

The UCSRB staff facilitated the Joint CAC on July 7, immediately 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, the joint committee members adopted a working list that combined the individual Chelan and Okanogan lists by using the 1-1 approach (e.g., the top-ranked project from each County was placed at the top of the list). This approach honors the sequence of the individual committee lists and ensures equal representation of projects from both counties. When combining the lists, the primary determinant in breaking the tie between a project in Chelan and Okanogan Counties was the RTT biological benefit score. That is, for each paired ranking, the project with the higher RTT score was ranked above the project with a lower RTT 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).

For details on how the decisions were carried out during the meetings, see the details in the *Joint CAC Meeting Final Summary 2021* in Attachment D and the *Final 2021 UC SRFB Ranked List* in Attachment E.
Citations
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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. 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 Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCSR) 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 UCSR 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 Recovery Plan’s Implementation Schedule and developed within each of the Watershed Action Teams (WATs) in the region. The UCSR currently facilitates two approaches to funding projects in the region: (1) targeted process of

---

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
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 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 and/or TRIB. 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. The funding cycle generally runs from February through August each year.

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.
Roles

- **Lead Entity**: coordinates and facilitates the UC SRFB grant process.
- **RCO Grant Manager**: help applicants navigate the RCO-SRFB grant application process, and if successful, then steer sponsors through the agreement and billing process.
- **Regional Technical Team**: the regional technical body that reviews, evaluates, scores and ranks projects based on their biological benefit as outlined in the Biological Strategy.
- **Citizens Advisory Committee**: a locally led group representing diverse interests who “provide a citizen-based evaluation of the projects proposed to promote salmon habitat” and is charged with developing and submitting for funding consideration a habitat project list.³
- **State Review Panel**: the SRFB’s technical review body that evaluates proposals to ensure they have high benefit to salmon, have a high likelihood of success, and costs do not outweigh benefits.⁴
- **Monitoring Review Panel**: SRFB panel that “coordinates and prioritizes the ongoing assessment of habitat restoration efforts.”⁵
- **Salmon Recovery Funding Board**: a ten-person board with five governor appointed members and five agency members that makes grants, develops procedures and guidance, approves funding, and tracks recovery progress.⁶
- **Tributary Committee (TRIB)**: reviews, evaluates and makes funding determination for projects seeking their funding.

Step One: **PRE-APPLICATION**

The first step in the process to seek funding from the SRFB and TRIB is to submit the first series of questions through the online Regional Application (referred to as ‘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 Scoring Criteria for SRFB Pre-proposals). It is important for project sponsors to understand the scoring criteria and ask either the LE or RTT for clarification if needed.

The pre-application is required from each project proponent wishing to pursue funds from both the SRFB and TRIB. The **Regional Application** includes questions that address the RTT scoring criteria (RTT Scoring Criteria for SRFB Proposals and the CAC ranking criteria (Citizen’s Advisory Committee (CAC) Ranking Criteria). The pre-application questions are a subset of the Regional Application and are indicated as such on the application. It is important to answer all the questions completely and thoroughly.

---

³ See RCW 77.85.050 for further explanation.
⁴ https://rcw.wa.gov/boards/salmon-recovery-funding-board/salmon-recovery-funding-board-review-panel/
⁵ https://rcw.wa.gov/boards/salmon-recovery-funding-board/monitoring-panel/
⁶ See RCW 77.85.110- RCW 77.85.140
The LE is here to help project sponsors through the process. If project sponsors need help developing the necessary forms throughout the application process and/or accessing data that may be available for use in the project proposal, they should reach out as early as possible.

The pre-application requirement helps project sponsor in several 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-application 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-application. 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.

**Step Two: PRESENTATIONS TO REGIONAL TECHNICAL TEAM**

After the pre-applications are submitted the LE will transmit those to the RTT Chair for distribution ahead of the technical presentations to the RTT. Project sponsors will provide project overviews to the RTT and other reviewers to discuss location, limiting factors, biological benefits and other technical aspects of the project proposal with the RTT. 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. The RTT may elect to develop a preliminary ranking of pre-applications based on their relative competitiveness.

**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, PDF format, and upload it to PRISM. Project sponsors need to reference Manual 18 and other guiding documents from RCO to ensure their applications meet the requirements of the state process (refer to Appendix C: Application Checklist in Manual 18 for requirements).

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 LE to create a “Funding Instrument” linkage between Salmon Recovery Portal 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:

- Sponsor name/acronym
• 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.

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 the UCSRB website and RCO’s website: https://rco.wa.gov/grant/salmon-recovery/.

**Step Four: PROJECT-SITE VISITS**

Project site visits to the Methow, Okanogan, Entiat and Wenatchee sub-basins will be scheduled. Project sponsors 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 locations. This is a key opportunity for project sponsors to discuss their project and receive feedback from reviewers about project elements.

Representatives from the RTT, 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 sponsors 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.

**Step Five: PROPOSAL REFINEMENT AND SUBMITTAL**

After the reviewers’ comment and provide feedback, project sponsors have the opportunity to refine and 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 sponsors 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 Application 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 one week prior to their 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 RTT uses the Upper Columbia Biological Strategy and associated updates as its primary framework for evaluating projects. The RTT has a robust and transparent scoring criteria based on the aforementioned framework and should be used when developing proposals for funding consideration.

The RTT has requested that the project scoring meeting be closed to non-RTT members, with exceptions for technical representatives from funding entities, other reviewers 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 sponsors 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 develop a ranked list. After individual CACs develop their ranked list, both committees will convene with a joint meeting to develop one regional list for funding consideration. The individual CACs and the Joint Citizens Advisory Committee (JCAC) use the same review criteria.

The individual lists from each of the CAC will be combined into one list for the JCAC meeting, which will be comprised of members from each CAC. The initial process for merging the individual lists for discussion at the JCAC 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 JCAC list in descending order based on RTT score).

The following ground rules for decision-making guide the JCAC in its deliberations to develop the final ranked list for the Upper Columbia.

1. A CAC member may, at any time, make a motion to move a particular project up or down on the list.
2. The CAC member making such a request must include rationale based on the citizens’ review criteria.
3. The JCAC will then engage in discussion regarding the motion to move a project on the list.
4. After discussion, the JCAC 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 JCAC 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 CAC by the date of their first meeting to provide time for discussion and/or response.

**SRFB/TRIB FUND REVIEW AND FUNDING**

The SRFB 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 22. Based on regional policy, proposals flagged as “Projects of Concern” by the SRP 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 Committees will also make internal decisions for funding, after release of the draft SRFB 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title/Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Information/Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prism #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Anticipated SRFB Request: $\_\_\_\_$
- Anticipated Trib Comm Request: $\_\_\_\_$
- Other Match: $\_\_\_\_$
- Anticipated TOTAL Project Budget: $\_\_\_\_$
# Upper Columbia SRFB/TRIB 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>February/March</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 10</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 (12:00 PM)</td>
<td><strong>Deadline:</strong> Regional Project Pre-application (JotForm) submitted to Lead Entity</td>
<td>Sponsors</td>
<td>Online/Email</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10-11</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><strong>April</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td><strong>Deadline:</strong> Complete applications due</td>
<td>Sponsors, LE, RCO</td>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10, 11, 12, &amp; 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>Methow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Okanogan</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 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>May 28</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>June 4</td>
<td>First Comment Form Received</td>
<td>SRP, LE, Sponsors</td>
<td>Email/Prism</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 9</td>
<td>Action: Technical review/scoring</td>
<td>RTT, CAC, LE, BOR</td>
<td>RTT Meeting</td>
<td>RTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 9 &amp; 10</td>
<td>Action: LE, Sponsors, RCO and SRFB Review Panel review</td>
<td>RCO, SRFB</td>
<td>Call</td>
<td>LE/RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 10</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>Action: TRIB Decisions</td>
<td>TRIB</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>TRIB Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22/24</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 28 (12:00 PM)</td>
<td><strong>Deadline:</strong> Sponsors PRISM upload</td>
<td>Sponsors, LE</td>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7</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 14</td>
<td>Action: SRFB Review Panel Meeting</td>
<td>SRFB, RCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>Action: SRFB Monitoring Panel will request clarification (if needed)</td>
<td>SRFB,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JULY**
## Upper Columbia SRFB/TRIB DRAFT 2021 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 22</td>
<td>Action: Final SRP and Monitoring Panel Comment Form</td>
<td>SRP, LE, Sponsors</td>
<td>Email/Prism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AUGUST

| August 9   | **Deadline:** Sponsors must accept conditions in writing | Sponsors             | Email/Prism  | LE/RCO                   |
| August 10  | **Deadline:** Regional List submitted to RCO           | LE                    | PRISM        | LE/RCO                   |
| August 16  | **Deadline:** Regional Submittal                        | LE                    | Email        | LE                       |

### SEPTEMBER

| Sept 1     | Final grant report available for public review         | RCO                   | Email        | RCO                      |
| Sept 22 & 23| Action: SRFB Decisions                                | SRFB                  | Olympia, WA  | RCO                      |

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

**Timeline Legend**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadlines</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2021 Upper Columbia Regional Proposal

* Pre-applications due March 1, 2021 at 12pm
* Complete applications due April 21, 2021
* Final applications due May 28, 2021

**Project Title**

Contact Information

**Sponsor**

Organization

**Primary Contact**

First and Last Name

**E-Mail Address**

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 Other Funding

*Anticipated TOTAL Budget

*Other Funding Source(s)

List Names

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")

*Latitude (decimal degrees)

*Longitude (decimal degrees)

*Project subbasin

○ Wenatchee
○ Entiat
○ Methow
*Wenatchee Assessment Unit(s)

Choose the primary AUs that the project directly targets. AUs can be found online at https://ucsrb.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/

*Entiat Assessment Unit(s)

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

*Methow Assessment Unit(s)

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

*Okanogan Assessment Unit(s)

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

Please explain why there are multiple subbasins

*Reach(es) Name

Reach names can be found online at https://ucsrb.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=af7b5caa1d4241eb99895883970cf393

Project Information

1. *In one or two sentences, what do you propose to do?
2. *What species will the project benefit?*

   - Spring Chinook
   - Steelhead
   - Bull Trout
   - Summer Chinook

3. *Select the project's objectives and the associated tracking metrics*

   - Design, Monitoring or Assessment
   - Acquisition, Easements, Leases
   - Fish Passage
   - Fish Screen
   - Instream Flow
   - Instream Habitat (Includes Floodplain & Off-Channel Reconnection)
   - Riparian Habitat
   - Upland Habitat
   - Water Quality
   - Wetlands

**Acquisition, Easements, Leases: Reporting Code**

   Acres of land, wetland or estuarine area protected from degradation or development
   Miles of stream bank or riparian protected

**Fish Passage: Reporting Code**

   Quantity of fish passage blockages removed or altered
Miles of upstream made accessible

Fish Screen: Reporting Code
Quantity of fish screens installed or modified

Instream Flow: Reporting Code
Miles of stream protected for adequate flow
Cubic feet per second of water conserved per year

Instream Habitat: Reporting Code
Acres of channel/off-channel connected or added
Miles of off-channel stream created
Miles of instream habitat treated

Riparian Habitat: Reporting Code
Miles of fencing installed
Acres of forestry practices/stand management
Acres planting
Acres of riparian area treated

Upland Habitat: Reporting Code
Acres of upland habitat treated

Water Quality: Reporting Code
Acres/Feet of water treated

Wetlands: Reporting Code
Acres of wetland improvement/enhancement

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

5. *Has this project been submitted previously for funding through the SRFB and/or Targeted process(es)?
Please explain which process(es) and how this proposal differs from the previous submission (e.g., different phase, modified scope, etc.)

6. *What category is the project?*

- [ ] Design
- [ ] Restoration
- [ ] Assessment
- [ ] Protection
- [ ] Monitoring

**Design and Restoration Proposals**

7. *What project phase(s) are proposed for completion?*

- Conceptual Design
- Preliminary Design
- Final Design
- Construction
8. 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

9. *Which limiting factors does the project propose to address?*

- Brook Trout
- Course Substrate
- Contaminants
- Cover - Boulder
- Cover - Undercut Banks
- Cover - Wood
- Entrainment/Stranding
- Flow - Scour
- Flow - Summer Base Flow
- Food - Food Web Resources
- Harassment
- Icing
- Off-Channel - Floodplain
- Off-Channel - Side-Channels
- Percent Fines/Embeddedness
- Pool Quantity & Quality
- Pools - Deep Pools
- Predators - Adults
- Predators - Juveniles
- Superimposition
- Temperature - Adult Holding
- Temperature - Adult Spawning
- Temperature - Rearing
10. *Which life stages will the proposed project address?
   - Adult Migration
   - Adult Non-Spawning (Bull Trout)
   - Natal Rearing (Bull Trout)
   - Subadult Rearing (Bull Trout)
   - Fry
   - Holding and Maturation
   - Smolt Outmigration
   - Spawning and Incubation
   - Summer Rearing
   - Winter Rearing

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 geomorphology?*

13. Temporal Effect - How long will it take for the benefits of the project to be realized?
   - >25 years
   - 10-25 years
   - 1-10 years

14. Temporal Effect - How long will the restoration action and its benefits persist?
   - >10 years
   - 20-50 years
15. Temporal Effect - What level and/or interval of maintenance is anticipated? What is the plan for any anticipated maintenance?

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

7. *What type of assessment are you proposing?

8.* Is the assessment identified on the MaDMC monitoring and data gaps list?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

9. *Describe how the assessment fills a regional priority and where that priority is identified.
10. *Methods - What methods will you use in your assessment and how will they achieve your stated objective(s)?

11. Will a design result from the project?
   - Yes
   - No

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

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

Protection Proposals

7. *What type of protection are you proposing?
   - NA
   - 
   - 

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

- Yes
- No
- Maybe

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


10. *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?*


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


12. Conditions - Briefly describe if there are any conditions regarding the protection of the property that could limit the protection benefits
13. Will there be public access?

- Yes
- No

Monitoring Proposals

7. *Information Need - Does this project address a Tier 1 data gap in the MaDMC Regional Data Gaps List?

List can be found at https://www.ucsrb.org/regional-technical-team-rtt-documents-and-resources/#

8. Information Need - To what extent does your project address a regional data gap?

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

- Site Scale
- Reach Scale
- Stream Scale
- Catchment (HUC 14)
- Assessment Unit (HUC 12)
- Population Scale
10. *Purpose - How will the monitoring complement, enhance, or leverage ongoing monitoring efforts?

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

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

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

Project Risk and Economic Benefits

1. *What is the landownership?
2. *Have you secured landowner participation in or acceptance for this project?*
   - Yes
   - No
   *Please explain*

3. 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

4. Will the project raise potential concerns for interest groups (e.g., recreational users) or the community at large (including upstream/ downstream/ adjacent landowners)?
5. Who will have the responsibility to manage and maintain the project? What is the responsibility of current or future landowners?

6. Please describe the risk of failure associated with this project.

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

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

9. Describe any partnerships, their experience, and types of contributions supporting the project.
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**SRFB Manual 18 (2021)**
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2021 Upper Columbia Regional (JotForm) Proposal Instructions
UCSRB created the online JotForm as a way to create greater efficiency to the Regional Application process.

The fields on the Regional Proposal (JotForm) marked with a grey asterisk provide the necessary information and fulfill the requirements for the Pre-application, due on March 1 at 12pm. The complete Upper Columbia Regional proposal is due April 21 and the final proposal is due on May 28.

After you enter information into the fields on a page you may select the “Next” or “Back” button at the bottom of each page to continue on or go back to a previous page. At any time you may save your application and come back to work on it. To save your work press the “Next” button until you come to the last page of the application. At the bottom of the page you will see a “Save/Submit” button. Once you complete this step, an email will be sent to the entered email address with a PDF copy of the application and a link “Edit Submission” that will allow the user to continue working on the form.

Each time you edit the JotForm you will receive an email confirmation for your projects updated changes or edits. You may use any of the “Edit Submission” links to continue updating your proposal.

When you are ready to submit your regional proposal please select the “Save/Submit” button on the last page of the application. You will receive an email confirmation (similar to when you save the form) with a PDF copy of the completed proposal and a link to “Edit Submission” if needed.

Important Notes:
- There is a link to an ArcGIS Web App to help identify Project Location, Assessment Unit, and Reach.
- There are many important links on the JotForm including: SRFB Manual 18 and RCO Application link.

Questions:
Can multiple email addresses be included?
No, the primary project sponsor will need to share the “Edit Submission” link with others from their organization that will want/need to edit the proposal.
How do I save my work in the JotForm?
All changes are saved when you click the “Save/Submit” button on the last page of the application.

How do I print a PDF copy of my proposal?
A PDF copy of your proposal will be emailed to the email address listed in the contact information portion of the proposal for you to print.

Can multiple people work on/edit the document?
Yes, multiple users 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. A Word document with the application questions is available to help sponsors.

Is there a question on the JotForm to indicate if a project has previously been funded or submitted?
Yes, it is located on the Project Information page of the application

How do sponsors handle the track changes component of the application?
UCSRB doesn’t need to see any tracked changes. This was eliminated prior to 2020.

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 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.
1. **Address Primary Limiting Factors**

   a) Does the proposed restoration project reduce the effects of **primary** limiting factors (as identified in Appendix D of the Biological Strategy, or other information that pertains to the project location; e.g., if limiting factors are identified for a tributary of an assessment unit) at the project\(^1\) scale? (**20% of total score**)

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

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

   - **Scoring:**
      
      - 0 = no (or little) improvement in limiting factor(s) at the project scale.
      - 1-6 = intermediate improvement (limiting factor(s) is/are partially addressed).
      - 7 = fully rectifies limiting factor(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.

\(^1\) In this document, “project-scale” refers to the area within and immediately surrounding the proposed project.
• Scoring:
  o Use this link to identify [AU Prioritization Scores](#) for restoration 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) 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:
  o 0 = scale and scope of project does not match project objectives.
  o 1-6 = intermediate (scale and scope is appropriate to meet some of the project objectives).
  o 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:
  o 0 = project does not promote watershed processes.
  o 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).
  o 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\(^2\) 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:**

\(^2\) 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**:
    
    o 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.

    o 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.

    o 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 Limiting Factors</strong></td>
<td>Does the proposed restoration project reduce the effects of <strong>primary</strong> limiting factors (as identified in Appendix D of the Biological Strategy, or other information that pertains to the project location; e.g., if LFs are identified for a tributary of an assessment unit) at the project(^3) 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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^3\) 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:**
        - Use this link to identify AU Prioritization Scores for protection 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) 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:**
        - 0 = Will not protect important (intact) habitat; site too small to achieve protection goal.
        - 1-6 = 40-60% of total project area is intact habitat with plans for restoration.
        - 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>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><strong>Placement of Protection Project</strong></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><strong>Threat</strong></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><strong>Benefits to Freshwater Survival or Capacity</strong></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><strong>Cost Effectiveness of Protection Project</strong></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><strong>Conditions Affecting the Project</strong></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>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grand Total                  | 49                                   | 100                          |
Assessment Projects

1. **Address Primary Limiting Factors**
   
a) Will the proposed assessment inform the development of projects that reduce the effects of primary limiting factors at the reach scale (as identified in Appendix D of the Biological Strategy, or the extent to which it identifies or validates limiting factors)? (25% of total score)

   - **Rationale:** All proposed assessments should link directly to restoration or protection actions addressing primary factors that limit freshwater production and/or distribution of fish species. Assessment projects that inform actions that address more than one primary limiting factor, or fully rectify a single limiting factor at the reach scale, will achieve the highest scores. Sequencing will also affect scores.

   - **Scoring:**
     - 0 = assessment will result in projects that lead to no (or little) improvement in limiting factor(s) at the reach scale.
     - 1-6 = intermediate change (limiting factor(s) will be partially addressed at the reach scale).
     - 7 = assessment will result in projects that fully rectify limiting factor(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 assessment units of high intrinsic potential (with consideration of other information), or provide access to such habitat, 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 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>Address Primary Limiting Factors</td>
<td>Will the proposed assessment inform the development of projects that reduce the effects of primary limiting factors at the reach scale (as identified in Appendix D of the Biological Strategy, or the extent to which it identifies or validates limiting factors)?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Covered by Assessment</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>Methods</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>Cost Effectiveness of Assessment Project</td>
<td>How cost effective is the proposed assessment project?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grand Total                            | 35             | 100               |        |                      |                 |
Design Projects

1. **Address Primary Limiting Factors**

   a) Will the proposed design lead to development of projects that will reduce the effects of primary limiting factors 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 LFs are identified for a tributary of an assessment unit)? *(25% of total score)*

   - **Rationale:** All designs proposed should link directly to restoration or protection actions addressing primary limiting factors 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 limiting factor, or fully rectifying a single limiting factor, achieve the highest scores. Sequencing also affects scores.

   - **Scoring:**
     
     - 0 = design will result in no (or little) change in limiting factor(s) at the project scale.
     - 1-6 = intermediate change (limiting factor(s) is/are partially addressed) at the project scale.
     - 7 = design will result in projects that address more than one primary limiting factor, or fully rectify a single limiting factor 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? *(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**). 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).
  - 7 = project fully restores watershed processes 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 (Attachment 1). Projects that have a high likelihood to reduce the effects of climate change will score higher than projects that do not.
• Scoring:
  o 0 = will not ameliorate the effects of climate change.
  o 1-6 = likely to ameliorate the effects of climate change.
  o 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? (25% 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:
     o 0 = no benefit to freshwater survival, capacity, and/or distribution of target species at the project scale.
     o 1-6 = intermediate increase in survival, capacity, and/or distribution of target species at the project scale.
     o 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.
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.

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><strong>Address Primary Limiting Factors</strong></td>
<td>Will the proposed design lead to development of projects that will reduce the effects of primary limiting factors 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 limiting factors 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><strong>Area Covered by Design</strong></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><strong>Temporal Effect of Proposed Restoration Action</strong></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><strong>Benefits to Freshwater Survival or Capacity</strong></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><strong>Methods</strong></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><strong>Cost Effectiveness</strong></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><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</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:**
     
     - 0 = monitoring project will not address an important data gap.
     - 1-6 = monitoring project will address a less important data gap or should be expanded to more fully address the Tier 1 data gap.
     - 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).
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>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  | **Grand Total** | 49               |                  | 30                           |                 |
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 9 June 2020 to score Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) proposals. What follows are the average benefit scores from 10 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, 2021. 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>Mystery and War Creek Reach Aquatic Restoration Project</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$366,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twisp Horseshoe Habitat Enhancement Project</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$199,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nason Kahler Instream Complexity Project Phase 2</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$421,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nason Creek RM 12 Floodplain Reconnection*</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$95,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Creek &amp; Silver Falls Project Areas Habitat Restoration Project*</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Little Bridge Creek Restoration Project</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$122,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteen Fish Passage Designs for Lower Chiwawa Tributaries</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$179,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Project (RM 41.75-42.25)*</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$401,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nason Creek RM 9.4 - Thermal Refuge Enhancement and Abutment Removal*</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$94,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Lower Peshastin Creek*</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$127,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entiat Prioritization Assessments*</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$187,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenatchee-Entiat Beaver-Powered Restoration</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$125,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby Canyon BNSF Fish Passage Project</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$165,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazama Bridge Habitat Acquisition</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$158,100</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, 2021. 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>Entiat River Fish Monitoring</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$45,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Restoration Projects**

**Nason Kahler Instream Complexity Project Phase 2 Project**

Average Score: 74  
Standard Deviation: 11.1  
RTT Rank: 3

This project addresses important ecological concerns in a high-priority assessment area 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 further address the large width:depth ratio in this reach of the stream. That said, the RTT is pleased that the sponsor considered our comments and modified the project to try to address temperature issues within the reach. Given the constraints within this reach, the proposed action appears appropriate and will have biological benefit. Importantly, this project continues the phased approach implemented in this reach.

**Wenatchee-Entiat Beaver-Powered Restoration Project**

Average Score: 65  
Standard Deviation: 8.6  
RTT Rank: 12

The use of beavers is a useful technique to restore natural processes and improve ecological structure and function in habitat-impaired streams. Unfortunately, estimating biological benefit is difficult because there is uncertainty as to whether beaver will remain in the area in which they were translocated. The use of BDAs and PALs provide a higher level of certainty and therefore gives the RTT more confidence that the proposed project will have biological benefit. The RTT scored the application under the assumption that established dams will not preclude passage of fish, will increase sediment and nutrient storage, and will raise the water table. This should improve water quality and quantity.
during low flow periods. This project would score higher if the actions occur within high-priority assessment units.

Fox Creek & Silver Falls Project Areas Habitat Restoration Project

Average Score: 73
Standard Deviation: 6.2
RTT Rank: 5

This is a good project in the sense that it increases channel complexity, increases side channel and floodplain connectivity, and where necessary uses helicopters and tree felling to place wood. The RTT was pleased to see that the sponsor modified the project to reduce excavation work. Nevertheless, it still includes a significant amount of excavation work (especially within the Fox Creek site), which can disturb existing habitat. There is also some concern regarding the long-term sustainability of the entrance to the side channel at the Fox Creek site. Although the project will have biological benefit, the cost of the project appears excessive. In addition, there is no cost estimate for operating the helicopter.

Lower Little Bridge Creek Restoration Project

Average Score: 72
Standard Deviation: 6.2
RTT Rank: 6

The RTT believes this is an important project that will restore habitat conditions for ESA-listed species. The approach will use a heavy-lift helicopter to place large wood in a stream mostly devoid of wood and habitat structure. The use of a helicopter to place wood will reduce disturbance to existing habitat and will achieve the stated goals of the project. Wood will be strategically placed to aid in floodplain reconnection and support riparian vegetation. Some level of maintenance may be needed to maintain the integrity of the project as it relates to floodplain connectivity, side channels, and creation of fish passage issues. This project should have a relatively large biological benefit. The RTT believes this project is a good candidate for effectiveness monitoring (can build upon the Douglas PUD efforts).

Mystery and War Creek Reach Aquatic Restoration Project

Average Score: 83
Standard Deviation: 6.2
RTT Rank: 1

This is an important project within a high priority reach for restoration. The proposed action addresses several of the factors currently limiting fish production within the Twisp River. The use of a heavy-lift helicopter to place wood will reduce disturbance to existing habitat and should achieve the stated goals of the project. Because of the extent of this project, and the fact the project targets primary limiting
factors, this project should have a relatively large biological benefit. The RTT is pleased to see projects of this type, as they address important factors within high priority areas using techniques that have minimal disturbance to existing habitat. There is some uncertainty regarding the number of wood pieces that should be placed in the reach. The RTT recommends using remote sensing (drones) to document changes in wood over time within the reaches capturing the Mystery and War Creek and Twisp Horseshoe projects.

Twisp Horseshoe Habitat Enhancement Project

Average Score: 80
Standard Deviation: 6.0
RTT Rank: 2

Like the Mystery and War Creek Reach project, this is an important project within a high prior reach for restoration. The proposed action addresses several of the factors currently limiting fish production within the Twisp River. The use of a heavy-lift helicopter to place wood will reduce disturbance to existing habitat and should achieve the stated goals of the project. There will be heavy-tracked equipment used in some locations, but the sponsor proposes to minimize the disturbance using this equipment. There appears to potential beyond what this project is designed to achieve. Because this project targets primary limiting factors, and it helps reconnect side channel and floodplains with minimal disturbance, this project should have a relatively large biological benefit. The RTT recommends using remote sensing (drones) to document changes in wood over time within the reaches capturing the Mystery and War Creek and Twisp Horseshoe projects.

Protection Projects

Mazama Bridge Habitat Acquisition Project

Average Score: 49
Standard Deviation: 12.1
RTT Rank: 14

Protecting high-quality floodplain/riparian habitat is an important goal of the RTT. Although the riparian habitat within the area proposed for protection appears to be of high quality and occurs within a priority area, it is not large (0.74 acres and 270 feet of shoreline) and is affected by the Lost River Road Bridge. Thus, even if the parcel is developed, it would not have a significant effect on fish within the area. There is also uncertainty as to what the County will do with the property if they acquire it. We assumed it would be managed for conservation purposes. Finally, this project would have scored higher if it was not adjacent to the bridge.
Design Projects

Thirteen Fish Passage Designs for Lower Chiwawa Tributaries Project

Average Score: 68
Standard Deviation: 6.4
RTT Rank: 7

This application does a good job of incorporating published literature to justify restoring connectivity within 13 tributaries to the Chiwawa River. In addition, the project is likely cost-effective because it intends to address a large number of potential barriers within a small geographic area. The RTT believes this work, if constructed, will restore connectivity primarily for steelhead and perhaps bull trout. Most importantly, it will improve the downstream distribution of wood, nutrients, and food subsidies, all of which are limiting in the lower Chiwawa River. The RTT believes this project will have a relatively small effect on steelhead and spring Chinook in the short-term (primarily because of recruitment limitations and few Chinook currently use these tributaries); however, it could have a larger long-term effect by providing thermal refugia as water temperatures warm under climate change. The project restores natural processes, which is always a good thing.

Restore Lower Peshastin Creek Project

Average Score: 66
Standard Deviation: 9.1
RTT Rank: 10

This project has undergone a large number of iterations in an attempt to implement the best project possible given the constraints. The RTT appreciates the perseverance of the sponsor and believes they are designing a project that fits within the constraints at the site. The RTT has stated previously that the project may be out of sequence. That is, stream flows are currently low in lower Peshastin Creek and flows should be addressed before other habitat actions are implemented within lower Peshastin Creek. However, the sponsor is designing a project that would provide benefits under current low flow conditions and under higher flows. Importantly, the project should not spread-out low flows (increase surface area), which would lead to warmer temperatures and less rearing and spawning habitat. As such, it is unlikely the project is out of sequence. The RTT also understands the risks of implementing restoration actions at the confluence of streams, mainly because these are dynamic areas and subject to frequent change. In this case, it appears the project is being designed with this in mind. Given the current temperature regime in Peshastin Creek and the lack of suitable rearing habitat in Peshastin Creek, this project will provide biological benefit. Importantly, Peshastin Creek is an important steelhead

stream and it provides cool-water refugia. The RTT also believes it is important to remove the contaminants at the site.

**Nason Creek RM 12 Floodplain Reconnection Project**

*Average Score: 73  
Standard Deviation: 5.8  
RTT Rank: 4*

This project intends to address important limiting factors within a high priority area. This project has the potential to provide a relatively large benefit to ESA-listed fish species by improving habitat structure, side channel and floodplain connectivity, and water temperatures. This should address factors limiting adult holding, spawning, and rearing habitat for salmonids. It will be important to make sure the results from the design do not negatively affect existing habitat conditions within the reach. The RTT is pleased that the sponsor is seriously considering using a soft-touch approach to reconnecting side channels and the floodplain. There is considerable uncertainty associated with evaluating the biological benefit associated with conceptual designs.

**Nason Creek RM 9.4 - Thermal Refuge Enhancement and Abutment Removal Project**

*Average Score: 67  
Standard Deviation: 9.3  
RTT Rank: 9*

The RTT sees value in removing the defunct bridge abutments (and the creosote-treated wood associated with the bridge) and expanding the influence of the cold-water plume. Removing the bridge abutments should improve natural channel migration characteristics. It is unclear at this time what effect the creosote-treated wood is having on fish behavior, survival, and habitat use, but removal of any toxic source is appropriate. There are techniques that can be implemented to help expand the influence of the cold-water plume; however, those techniques need to be balanced with existing constraints such as the coho acclimation site near the proposed project area and channel migration characteristics. That said, this project, once implemented, may not have a large biological benefit. Making sure fish have access to Butcher Creek may have a greater benefit, especially over time as water temperatures increase due to climate change. The RTT appreciates the sponsor submitting a project that was identified in the cold-water assessment.

**Derby Canyon BNSF Fish Passage Project**

*Average Score: 57  
Standard Deviation: 10.2*
RTT Rank: 13

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 questions the biological benefit associated with this work and therefore questions the cost-effectiveness of the project. There is limited habitat for steelhead in Derby Creek (~3 miles of IP for steelhead). In addition, habitat quality is mostly unknown throughout the system, although the RTT acknowledges the existence of different age classes of *O. mykiss* within the stream. The intermittency of the stream also limits the quantity and quality of habitat within the stream. The RTT recommends an analysis of the quantity and quality of habitat within Derby Creek before a lot of money is spent on addressing partial fish-passage barriers. A better understanding of habitat quality and capacity will help the RTT to determine if additional restoration work in Derby Creek is cost effective.

**Sugar Project (RM 41.75-42.25) Project**

Average Score: 67  
Standard Deviation: 5.8  
RTT Rank: 8

This project is located within an important reach and is a site in which the RTT sees value in restoration work. The RTT supports projects that intend to remove riprap and landfill in order to reactive floodplains, restore riparian habitat, and provide side channel habitat for fish. There is a dynamic tension, however, among constraints to implementation, cost of implementation, and biological benefit. Constraints at this site limit the project from achieving the full potential of the site. There is no doubt this project will have biological benefits, as several fish species will benefit from the proposed project, but the cost to achieve those benefits may be quite high. Thus, the RTT is uncertain about the cost effectiveness of the project. That said, levee setbacks have proven successful and beneficial in other locations (e.g., Okanagan River in Canada).

**Assessment Projects**

**Entiat Prioritization Assessments Project**

Average Score: 66  
Standard Deviation: 13.4  
RTT Rank: 11

This project intends to fill an important data gap in the prioritization tool being developed by the RTT and Board staff. As such, it is an important project. However, because of the requirements associated with assessment projects under the SRFB process (and the fact that the project does not fit the classification for monitoring), the sponsor had to limit the assessment to the Entiat River reach and drop
the tributaries to keep the project cost effective. Although the RTT understands the sponsor’s reasoning, it is unfortunate that the tributaries, which also lack data and are needed in the prioritization tool, are not included in the assessment. The RTT is more likely to fully support this project if it includes the tributaries, which were included in the draft application. This is a unique situation in which the goals of the project sponsor do not fit nicely within the SRFB process.

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.

Entiat River Fish Monitoring Project

Average Score: 22 (out of 30)
Standard Deviation: 2.9
RTT Rank: 1 out 1

This project will “piggyback” on the remote sensing study that will be conducted by Cramer Fish Sciences on the Entiat River. The remote sensing work will assess physical changes in habitat as a result of restoration work. The proposed fish monitoring work will provide the biological component of the evaluation. In addition, the proposed study will briefly continue a portion of the IMW work that was terminated a few years ago. As such, this project will compliment and leverage other studies within the Entiat River basin. In addition, the project partially fills a Tier 1 data gap identified by the Monitoring and Data Management Committee. Although there is a large body or research that documents the effects of large wood on fish at small spatial scales (e.g., project and reach scales), there is less information on the effects of restoration work at larger scales (e.g., population scales). Therefore, the RTT encourages the sponsor to do all they can to evaluate population-scale effects in addition to project and reach scale effects. Mark-recapture methods using PIT tags are useful approaches for assessing treatment effects at large spatial scales and was discussed in the proposal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| March | Call for sponsor monitoring project abstracts  
• Project eligibility screening  
• Staff coordinates with sponsors regarding SRFB Manual 18 requirements | Staff |
| March | RTT Evaluates Pre-Application to determine regional applicability. UCSRB certifies monitoring projects receiving a medium or high score on RTT criteria # 1-3 | RTT |
| July  | CAC ranks projects and determines award amount | CACs |
| August| SRFB Monitoring Panel reviews projects and submits final recommendation to the SRFB for funding | SRFB Monitoring Panel |

**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 $50,000 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**

A project sponsors needs to coordinate with MaDMC and RTT prior to submitting a proposal to use up to $50,000 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.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Subbasin</th>
<th>Assessed Unit(s) Affected</th>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th>Assessment Unit Restoration Priority (ranked 1-3 where 1 is highest priority)</th>
<th>Primary Species</th>
<th>Limiting Factors Addressed</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restore Lower Peshastin Creek Ph 2 Final Design</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Lower Peshastin Creek</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spring Chinook, Steelhead, Bull Trout</td>
<td>Contaminants, Cover - Boulder, Cover - Wood, Off-Channel - Floodplain, Off-Channel - Side-Channels, Pools - Deep Pools, Temperature - Adult Holding</td>
<td>This project addresses several needs within the area; the need for additional spawning habitat for Steelhead in Peshastin Creek and the Lower Wenatchee, the need for high quality rearing habitat for both species (slow velocity and complex) in Lower Peshastin, and the need for high quality, cool off-channel habitat for fish using the mainstem Wenatchee in this area. Lower Peshastin Creek is an important migration corridor, linking the Wenatchee River to the cooler waters of the upper Peshastin watershed and its tributaries, which serve as important spawning and early rearing areas for Chinook, Steelhead, and bull trout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenatchee-Entiat Beaver-Powered Restoration</td>
<td>Multiple Subbasins</td>
<td>Multiple potential Assessment Units</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spring Chinook, Steelhead, Bull Trout</td>
<td>Flow - Summer Base Flow, Food - Food Web Resources, Off-Channel - Floodplain, Off-Channel - Side-Channels, Pool Quantity &amp; Quality, Pools - Deep Pools</td>
<td>This project will address and reduce stream and habitat concerns in multiple tributary watersheds by harnessing beaver-powered restoration realized through landowner assistance, beaver relocations, and beaver dam analog (BOA) implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazama Bridge Habitat Acquisition</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Methow River-Fawn Creek</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spring Chinook, Steelhead, Bull Trout, Summer Chinook</td>
<td></td>
<td>Okanogan County seeks grant to purchase an intact riparian property located in a priority area on the Methow River near Mazama for Spring Chinook, Steelhead and Bull Trout being offered by Washington State Department of Transportation prior to WSDOT’s planned disposition by way of public auction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entiat Prioritization Assessments</td>
<td>Entiat</td>
<td>Entiat River-Potato Creek</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spring Chinook, Steelhead, Bull Trout, Summer Chinook</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assist the prioritization process by completing and updating missing data gaps by doing Level 2 surveys to assess the remaining sections of the Entiat River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Creek &amp; Silver Falls Project Areas Habitat Restoration Project</td>
<td>Entiat</td>
<td>Entiat River-Lake Creek</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spring Chinook, Steelhead, Bull Trout, Summer Chinook, Lamprey</td>
<td>Flow - Scour, Off-Channel - Floodplain, Off-Channel - Side-Channels, Pool Quantity &amp; Quality, Pools - Deep Pools, Temperature - Adult Holding</td>
<td>This project proposed creating perennial side channels and placing large wood structures throughout the Fox Creek and Silver Falls reaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entiat River Fish Monitoring</td>
<td>Entiat</td>
<td>Entiat River-Lake Creek</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spring Chinook, Steelhead, Bull Trout, Summer Chinook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Derby Canyon Barrier Final Design</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Wenatchee River- Derby Canyon</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Steelhead</td>
<td>This culvert barrier is a 33% passable slope barrier with a water surface drop off the apron of the culvert that leads to a 7% gradient cascade at the confluence of the Wenatchee River. This proposal includes conceptual design development, preliminary design development, permitting, and final designs to remove and replace the lowest fish passage barrier at RM 0.1 on Lower Derby Canyon and address the cascade barrier at the confluence with the Wenatchee River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Subbasin</td>
<td>Assessment Unit(s) Affected</td>
<td>Project Category</td>
<td>Assessment Unit Restoration Priority (ranked 1-3 where 1 is highest priority)</td>
<td>Assessment Unit Protection Priority (ranked 1-3 where 1 is highest priority)</td>
<td>Primary Species</td>
<td>Limiting Factors Addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nason Creek RM 12 Floodplain Reconnection</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Lower Nason Creek</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bull Trout</td>
<td>Cover - Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteen Fish Passage Designs for Lower Chiwawa Tributaries</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Lower Chiwawa River</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Steelhead</td>
<td>Off-Channel - Floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nason Kahler Instream Complexity Project</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Lower Nason Creek</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Steelhead</td>
<td>Off-Channel - Floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Project (RM 41.75-41.25)</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Methow River-Thompson Creek</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Cover - Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Little Bridge Creek Restoration Project</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Little Bridge Creek</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Steelhead</td>
<td>Off-Channel - Floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery and War Creek Reach Aquatic Restoration Project</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Middle Twisp River</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Cover - Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nason Creek RM 9.4 - Thermal Refuge Preliminary Design</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Lower Nason Creek</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spring Chinook</td>
<td>Contaminants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Subbasin</td>
<td>Assessment Unit(s) Affected</td>
<td>Project Category</td>
<td>Assessment Unit Restoration Priority (ranked 1-3 where 1 is highest priority)</td>
<td>Assessment Unit Protection Priority (ranked 1-3 where 1 is highest priority)</td>
<td>Primary Species</td>
<td>Limiting Factors Addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twisp Horseshoe Floodplain Restoration</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Lower Twisp River</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spring Chinook, Steelhead</td>
<td>Cover - Wood, Off-Channel - Floodplain, Off-Channel - Side-Channels, Percent - Fines/Embeddedness, Pool Quantity &amp; Quality, Pools - Deep Pools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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UC CAC Project Proposal Ranking Criteria 2021
Chelan CAC Ranking Meeting Final Summary 2021
Okanogan CAC Ranking Meeting Final Summary 2021
Joint Upper Columbia CAC Meeting Final Summary 2021
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 7, 2021 5:00-6:20 PM
Campbell’s Resort, Chelan WA

➢ Committee Members: Keith Truscott (Acting Chair), Dave Graybill, Bob Whitehall, Alan Schmidt, Leah Hemberry, Bruce Merighi (by phone)
➢ UCSRB Staff: Melody Kreimes, Tracy Bowerman

Keith Truscott, Acting CAC Chair, convened the meeting at 5:04 pm.

Chair Truscott provided overview of CAC ranking process and asked members to identify any conflicts of interests – none identified.

Prior to the meeting, individual CAC members had scored and ranked the projects and submitted those to Tracy. Tracy projected a table that showed total score and rank by project for each CAC member, with summary statistics that showed average score, standard deviation of score, and average rank for each project. The project list was ranked based on the average of all Citizen’s ranks.

Based on combined Citizen ranks, the initial project order was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nason Kahler Instream Complexity Project Ph 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNRD Entiat River Fish Monitoring</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nason Creek RM 12 Floodplain Reconnection</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Fish Passage Prelim Designs-Lower Chiwawa Tribs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Lower Peshastin Creek Ph 2 Final Design</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenatchee-Entiat Beaver-Powered Restoration</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nason Crk RM 9.4-Thermal Refuge Prelim Design</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entiat Habitat Prioritization Assessments</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Creek &amp; Silver Falls Project Areas Habitat Restoration Project</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group reviewed CAC rankings based on individual scores, discussed the various scores, and then looked at the rankings. They discussed each project in turn and asked members to comment.
on whether they felt like each project was ranked appropriately. The group looked at standard deviation of the scores to understand how well aligned the group was about a given project.

Upon initial review the group generally agreed with the list, though members discussed the challenges of ranking monitoring proposals (Entiat River Fish Monitoring) 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 monitoring projects in general and the importance of evaluating what is happening in the Entiat. All agreed that they should make sure the monitoring project stayed high on the list. Melody clarified that the CAC decides if they want to allocate up to $50,000 for monitoring and up to $200,000 for assessment projects this year. There is one of each type proposed this year and both have been certified by UCSRB, as required by RCO.

The group felt that in general, they want to support anything that can be done on Nason Creek to increase fish runs. The Nason Kahler project was supported by all. Nason Ck RM 12 was ranked low by some because it is already great spawning habitat, and they wanted to exercise caution using mechanical disturbance to alter a system that is already working well. The CAC discussed ways to evaluate how the sponsors enact the restoration once/if it is funded (e.g., via RTT participation or oversight from the RTO).

Lower Peshastin Project was discussed as important habitat for steelhead; fish always use the mouth as a cold-water refuge when there is water available. If this goes through it may increase chance of pump-back project going through later. The group reviewed RTT comments which said that as designed, the project is not out of sequence. There was some concern about how poor the habitat was upstream of the confluence, but this project will help increase habitat in the lower end of the stream and provide cold-water refugia for migrating steelhead.

Beaver Powered project: CAC members discussed that the RTT ranked this one low as specific locations were not clear and some locations were not in high priority areas. Some CAC members really liked this project because it has a lot of potential for beavers to do good work and provide cold-water refugia. Members liked the public outreach benefits: beavers are charismatic and a great way to engage kids’ groups and citizens to teach them about salmon. One concern with this project was the lack of specific location information for relocations into high priority subbasins of the Wenatchee and Entiat watersheds. Members reiterated a concern raised by RTT that beavers should be relocated higher in the watershed than what was currently proposed, and they voiced the hope that this work would be done in collaboration with the Forest Service to get access to areas high in the watershed. Another concern is whether beavers will stay where you put them and it would be nice to place beavers in the highest priority areas (although members recognized logistical constraints). The group was complimentary about the use of beaver dam analogues (BDAs) in the proposal.

Nason RM 9.4: members would like to see the creosote removed from this area but were concerned that it is not sufficient to just remove the wood; to truly clean the area, the contaminated soil would need to be removed as well. This should be the County’s obligation because the bridge was installed by Public Works. The sponsor should partner with Public Works to have them do the survey and some of the cleanup. CAC members discussed sending a letter to County Commissioners to identify the issues and ask them to participate in the cleanup. Lots of public work is done with salmon dollars but the responsibility should really lie with the County.
The group discussed moving Nason RM 9.4 above the Beaver Powered. **Alan motioned to move Nason 9.4 to 6 on the list above Beaver Powered Project.** Dave seconded, all approved the motion.

Entiat Assessment: the group liked the idea of continuing the assessment work but there was concern that the Entiat is so unstable, the assessment might not be valid for long. The location for this assessment is in the most hopeless part of river: there is no public access, and limited landowner willingness. Sponsors are unlikely to get one willing landowner in this stretch of river. As such, there is no reason to move this project up the list.

Fox Ck/Silver falls: this project has similar issues as Nason 9.4 regarding responsibility for this work, in this case it would be nice to see the Forest Service take on some of this restoration work. Okanogan-Wenatchee NF has lots of trees coming down but won’t use them in-stream habitat restoration so instead sponsors pay a lot of money to haul trees from CCT Reservation. This project also ranked low because there is already so much disturbance to this area and upstream of it due to recent fires; a lot is likely to change in this area naturally, active restoration in this area should take low priority right now. Another concern was the proximity of this project to active campgrounds and the lack of ongoing maintenance checks to help achieve the stated desired outcome over time. Campgrounds are subject to camper activity associated with streams and side channels that are not beneficial to fish (e.g., rock dam building) and without some level of maintenance to remove these structures the project is likely to not achieve the desired outcome.

After further review the group like the revised list. **Bob W. motioned to approve list as revised and appearing on the screen.** Alan S. seconded, all approved the motion.

**Final Chelan CAC Ranked List**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nason Kahler Instream Complexity Project Ph 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCNRD Entiat River Fish Monitoring</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nason Creek RM 12 Floodplain Reconnection</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Fish Passage Prelim Designs-Lower Chiwawa Tribs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Lower Peshastin Creek Ph 2 Final Design</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nason Crk RM 9.4-Thermal Refuge Prelim Design</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenatchee-Entiat Beaver-Powered Restoration</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entiat Habitat Prioritization Assessments</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Creek &amp; Silver Falls Project Areas Habitat Restoration Project</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The Chelan CAC adjourned 6:10 pm.
Meeting Summary
Okanogan Citizen Advisory Committee
Ranking Meeting
Wednesday, July 7, 2021 5:00-6:30 PM
Campbell’s Resort, Chelan WA

➢ Committee Members: Craig Nelson (Chair), Will Keller, Tom McCoy, Sam Israel, John Bartella, Louis Sukovaty, Bob Monetta (by phone).
➢ UCSRB Staff: Sarah Walker, Greer Maier

Okanogan Ranking Discussion

Craig Nelson, Okanogan CAC Chair, provided overview of CAC ranking process and asked members to identify any conflicts of interests – none identified.

Prior to the meeting, individual CAC members had scored and ranked the projects and submitted those to Tracy. Greer projected a table that showed total score and rank by project for each CAC member, with summary statistics that showed average score, standard deviation of score, and average rank for each project. The project list was ranked based on the average of all Citizen’s ranks.

Based on combined Citizen ranks, the initial project order was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mystery and War Creek Reach Aquatic Restoration Project</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Project (RM 41.75-42.25)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twisp Horseshoe Floodplain Restoration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Little Bridge Creek Restoration Project</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazama Bridge Habitat Acquisition</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CAC discussed each project in turn. For the Mazama Bridge Acquisition, there appears to be minimal risk of development because of the size of the lot and restrictions to it—County requires one acre lot for well and septic. The project scored lower because of this. Benefits include: the cost could be good value for acquisition since it is below market price, it is in a shoreline conservation zone and a Tier 1 protection area, it is right on the community trail and has good outreach and scenic recreation value. Redd maps show active spawning in the river adjacent to this property.
Little Bridge Creek: members discussed that Large Wood structures need to be designed to withstand 100-year flows. Some questioned whether structures were designed well enough to stay in place and create intended changes to stream geomorphology. There was some concern about whether logs placed by helicopter would be less permanent than something that was keyed in. These concerns will hopefully be addressed because a geomorphologist will be onsite during wood placement and there were no SRP concerns regarding longevity.

Sugar: there were some questions about why the RTT score was so much lower than other projects. Members recognized that it is a challenge to score a project that is early in the concept-design. It is also in a lower ranked assessment unit. There is a benefit to developing a plan now because it makes it more likely that future protection will occur. Several members expressed support for the project.

In general, there was some concern about biological effect of implementing multiple projects at same time. The time of year that construction takes place mitigates some of the potential negative effects.

**The group approved the list with current rankings.** They discussed a possible option to carve some funds from Sugar to get Mazama acquisition funded, depending on how the final list gets compiled.
UPPER COLUMBIA LEAD ENTITY
JOINT CITIZEN’S ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY
Campbell’s Resort, Chelan WA
Wednesday, July 7, 2021 ~ 6:30 to 8:00 PM

➢ Chelan CAC: Keith Truscott (Acting Chair), Dave Graybill, Bob Whitehall, Alan Schmidt, Leah Hemberry
➢ Okanogan CAC: Craig Nelson (Chair), Sam Israel, John Bartella, Will Keller, Louis Sukovaty, Bob Monetta (by phone).
➢ UCSRB Staff: Melody Kreimes, Tracy Bowerman, and Greer Maier

Agenda Review and Background
The meeting was held directly after the individual CAC ranking meetings, which occurred in separate rooms. All members present had participated in the ranking within their county. Melody convened the meeting at 6:40 pm, asked members to verify that there were no conflicts of interest, and reminded members of the decision-making ground rules for finalizing the project list.

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).

Craig Nelson reminded the members of the process for joining the lists form the two counties. 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., rank 1 from Okanogan County is matched with rank 1 from Chelan, and so on).
- To decide which project from within the matched ranking gets placed first, the secondary consideration is the relative RTT score. For each paired ranking (e.g., 1-1, 2-
2, etc.), the project with a higher RTT score will rank above the project with a lower RTT score.

Greer explained that because monitoring projects are scored differently by the RTT, she computed the given score out of the total possible score so that the number was comparable with the other RTT scores, which had a possible score of 1000. This year’s Entiat Monitoring project had a score of 22 out of 30, which yielded 73%. For this reason, Entiat Fish Monitoring was place above the Sugar project on the list: both were ranked #2 in their respective lists, the monitoring project had an RTT equivalent score of 73 and Sugar of 67. For partially funded projects, the sponsor and RCO will work together to modify the proposal and allocate partial funding. Melody clarified that the CAC decides if they want to allocate up to $50,000 for monitoring and up to $200,000 for assessment projects this year. There is one of each type proposed this year and both have been certified by UCSRB, as required by RCO.

2021 Joint Ranking Discussion

UCSRB projected the combined ranked list with the initial order based on CAC priority and then RTT score. The group discussed how the list is used: if a project gets picked up by BPA, the next on the list gets bumped up automatically, without input from the CAC. As such, the joint CAC should ensure that the entire list is ordered the way they want it, including projects that currently fall below the funding line. For reference, UCSRB informed the group that the three projects under consideration for funding from BPA were a partial allocation for the Sugar and Beaver-powered projects, and the Chiwawa 13 fish passage.

The group discussed whether to move the Nason Creek RM 9.4 thermal refuge above the Mazama Bridge habitat acquisition. Keith explained the Nason Creek thermal refuge design to the Okanogan group. The Chelan CAC expressed concerns with the creosote remaining in the soil: specifically, members identified that it is not sufficient to just remove the wood; to truly clean the area, the contaminated soil would need to be removed as well. Additionally, the cleanup portion of this project should be the County’s obligation because the bridge was installed by Public Works. The sponsor should partner with Public Works to have them do the survey and some of the cleanup. Okanogan members mentioned that the Mazama Bridge acquisition property was relatively inexpensive in this funding request, well below market price. If the county did not acquire the property, a private buyer could come in and even if they couldn’t build on the property, someone could put a temporary structure or RV on it and cut down the riparian vegetation. There was some discussion of whether this would be allowed by County laws, and some thought it would be possible. Most members thought that both projects had merit and hoped that they would be able to fund both.

Will Keller made a motion to move the Nason Creek RM 9.4 thermal refuge above the Mazama Bridge acquisition. John Bartella seconded. All approved the motion.

The group discussed whether there were any more projects that needed consideration or suggestions for moving anything else. The group was comfortable with how projects were currently ranked, both above and below the current funding line.

Tom M. made a motion to approve the list as it stood. Louis seconded. All approved the motion.
The final approved list combined from both counties was as follows (gray shading indicating those projects located in Okanogan County, those without shading are in Chelan County):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>UC Regional Projects</th>
<th>CAC Rank</th>
<th>RTT Score</th>
<th>SRFB Request</th>
<th>Running (SRFB) Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Mystery and War Creek Reach Aquatic Restoration Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>$366,770</td>
<td>$366,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Nason Kahler Instream Complexity Project Ph 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>$421,370</td>
<td>$788,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>CCN RD Entiat River Fish Monitoring</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22/30=</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>$45,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Sugar Project (RM 41.75-42.25)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$401,148</td>
<td>$1,234,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Twisp Horseshoe Floodplain Restoration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$199,500</td>
<td>$1,434,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Nason Creek RM 12 Floodplain Reconnection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$95,200</td>
<td>$1,529,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Lower Little Bridge Creek Restoration Project</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$122,500</td>
<td>$1,651,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>13 Fish Passage Prelim Designs-Lower Chiwawa Tribs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$179,867</td>
<td>$1,831,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Restore Lower Peshastin Creek Ph 2 Final Design</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$127,273</td>
<td>$1,959,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Nason Crk RM 9.4-Thermal Refuge Prelim Design</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$94,152</td>
<td>$2,053,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>Mazama Bridge Habitat Acquisition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$158,100</td>
<td>$2,211,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Wenatchee-Entiat Beaver-Powered Restoration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$125,490</td>
<td>$2,336,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Entiat Habitat Prioritization Assessments</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$187,383</td>
<td>$2,524,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>Fox Creek &amp; Silver Falls Project Areas Habitat Restoration Project</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$2,884,133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POTENTIAL ALLOCATION **$2,062,000**

There were no public comments.

The discussion was adjourned at 7:05 PM.

A debrief about the Citizen’s Advisory Committee’s role in the Salmon Recovery Funding Board process followed.
Attachment E
Final Ranked Project List

Final 2021 UC SRFB Ranked Project List
### 2021 Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board Final Project 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>Anticipated Total Budget</th>
<th>Running SRFB total</th>
<th>RTT Score</th>
<th>County CAC Rank</th>
<th>Joint CAC Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-1175</td>
<td>Mystery and War Creek Reach Aquatic Restoration Project</td>
<td>Yakama Nation</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>$366,770</td>
<td>$1,460,740</td>
<td>$366,770</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1180</td>
<td>Nason Kahler Instream Complexity Project Ph 2</td>
<td>Chelan County Natural Resource Department</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>$421,370</td>
<td>$585,294</td>
<td>$788,140</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1184</td>
<td>CCNRD Entiat River Fish Monitoring</td>
<td>Chelan County Natural Resource Department</td>
<td>Entiat</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>$45,380</td>
<td>$173,993</td>
<td>$833,520</td>
<td>22/30= 73%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1173</td>
<td>Sugar Project [RM 41.75-42.25]</td>
<td>Methow Salmon Recovery Foundation</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$401,148</td>
<td>$667,467</td>
<td>$1,234,668</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1174</td>
<td>Twisp Horseshoe floodplain Restoration</td>
<td>Yakama Nation</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>$199,500</td>
<td>$441,970</td>
<td>$1,434,168</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1171</td>
<td>Nason Creek RM 12 floodplain Reconnection</td>
<td>Chelan County Natural Resource Department</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$95,200</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>$1,529,368</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1176</td>
<td>Lower Little Bridge Creek Restoration Project</td>
<td>Yakama Nation</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>$122,500</td>
<td>$395,175</td>
<td>$1,651,868</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1166</td>
<td>12 Fish Passage Prelim Designs-Lower Chiwawa Tribe</td>
<td>Cascade Fisheries</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$179,867</td>
<td>$395,984</td>
<td>$1,960,864</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1179</td>
<td>Restore Lower Peshastin Creek Ph 2 Final Design</td>
<td>Cascade Fisheries</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$127,273</td>
<td>$127,273</td>
<td>$1,779,141</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1169</td>
<td>Nason Crk RM 9.4-Thermal Refuge Prelim Design</td>
<td>Chelan County Natural Resource Department</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$94,152</td>
<td>$94,152</td>
<td>$1,873,293</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1183</td>
<td>Mazama Bridge Habitat Acquisition</td>
<td>Okanogan County</td>
<td>Methow</td>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>$158,100</td>
<td>$186,000</td>
<td>$2,031,393</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1182</td>
<td>Wenatchee-Entiat Beaver-Powered Restoration</td>
<td>Trout Unlimited</td>
<td>Wenatchee &amp; Entiat</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>$125,490</td>
<td>$315,487</td>
<td>$2,156,883</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1165</td>
<td>Entiat Habitat Prioritization Assessments</td>
<td>Cascadia Conservation District</td>
<td>Entiat</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>$187,383</td>
<td>$220,455</td>
<td>$2,344,266</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1177</td>
<td>Fox Creek &amp; Silver Falls Project Areas Habitat Restoration Project</td>
<td>Yakama Nation</td>
<td>Entiat</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$1,097,500</td>
<td>$2,704,266</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-1194</td>
<td>Lower Derby Canyon Barrier Final Design</td>
<td>Chelan County Natural Resource Department</td>
<td>Wenatchee</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$165,100</td>
<td>$165,100</td>
<td>$165,100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Sponsor withdrew SRFB request (funding acquired elsewhere)**
- **UC funding allocation: $2,062,000**
- **Sponsor withdrew project**