

# 2015 Lead Entity SRFB Reporting (Appendix J)

Lead Entity name: *WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Board*

---

**Please provide the following (located on pg. 138-139 of Manual 18):**

4. Local review processes. (Lead entity provide response)
  - a. Provide project evaluation criteria and documentation (local technical reviewer and citizen committee score sheet or comment forms) of your local citizens' advisory group and technical advisory group ratings for each project, including explanations for differences between the two groups' ratings.

*The Project Review Sheet and priority strategies for reaches in the Nooksack River Forks, which are the geographic priorities for listed Chinook populations, are unchanged from 2014 (Attachment A- Ranking Session Documents). Also included in Attachment A, which is new in 2015, is a table of WRIA 1 habitat indicators that was prepared and agreed to for the 2015 grant process and was used by sponsors in defining their project objectives.*

*The Project Review Sheet is designed to reflect the local strategy for salmon recovery funds. This means that project proposals must be in priority geographic areas for early Chinook (North, Middle, and South Forks of the Nooksack River), and the project must address Tier 1 or Tier 2 strategies as identified in the Project Development Matrices (included in Attachment A). If a project does not address a Tier 1 or Tier 2 strategy, the project proponent needs to provide the rationale for the project strategy and include supporting technical information that supports their explanation.*

*The Project Review Sheet categories on which project proposals are evaluated include "Magnitude of Benefit", "Certainty of Benefit", "Timing", and "Project Sequencing". The project sponsors have questions that they respond to on the Project Review Sheet that correspond directly to the evaluation question that the WRIA 1 Combined Review Team (CRT) members use for ranking projects.*

*The WRIA 1 Combined Review Team (CRT), which is a combined review team of technical and community reviewers, uses the Project Review Sheet, Project Development Matrices, WRIA 1 habitat indicators table, and other technical documents including the WRIA 1 Salmonid Recovery Plan and habitat assessments for the Nooksack River Forks when reviewing the project proposals. Since the WRIA 1 CRT ranks as a single team that operate by consensus there are not separate team rankings to reconcile. Consensus for purposes of the CRT ranking means: a) all members can live with and fully support the decision; b) all members feel that the best solution has been reached; c) the position(s) of each member has been heard, respected, and seriously considered; and d) no member had to give in on any strongly held convictions, values, or needs.*

*The review process for the technical review team members began in April with reviewers participating in discussions with WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Staff Team (SRST), technical staff, and project sponsors to discuss and agree on habitat targets and indicators for use in the 2015 grant cycle (Attachment B- WRIA 1 Schedule for 2015 Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) Grant Cycle). In May, project sponsors presented their project concepts to technical review team members, SRST, and other technical staff for purposes of providing feedback to sponsors on project objectives. The full CRT is invited to participate in all of the technical discussions.*

*The full WRIA 1 CRT participates with the SRFB Review Panel in the site visits, which includes in-room presentations to orient local and SRFB reviewers to projects that will be visited in the field and full presentations for projects that are not part of the field itinerary. Both the WRIA 1 CRT and the SRFB Review Panel members receive the draft applications three weeks prior to the site visits as required in Manual 18.*

*Based on WRIA 1 policy direction, the 2014 alternate projects were “rolled up” for 2015-2017 Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration (PSAR) funds that went through local and SRFB review processes and that were queued up for the purpose of being considered for 2015-2017 PSAR funding.<sup>1</sup> In order for the project proposals to roll-up, they needed to 1) be listed as an alternate on the 2014 Project List; 2) they needed to be a component of a large reach project; and 3) they needed to be unchanged in scope and objectives. The criterion of whether they were unchanged was a determination to be made as part of the technical discussions in April and May. If a project was determined to have changed, it would be reviewed and evaluated along with other project proposals submitted in 2015. Through the discussions it was agreed that one of the 4 potential projects did not meet all three of the criteria. The project that would not automatically roll-up from 2014 was the North Fork Farmhouse Ph 2b, which had been scaled back from the 2014 project proposal. Therefore, this project was reviewed alongside the other five projects submitted for consideration.*

*Early review comments from the SRFB Review Panel members that attend the site visits are distributed to the full WRIA 1 CRT when they are distributed to the sponsors. CRT members are also invited to submit any questions or feedback to sponsors after the site visits if they have follow up questions or observations.*

*Final applications were distributed to the WRIA 1 CRT within two days of being completed in PRISM by the project sponsors. In addition to the final applications, the CRT members receive the Project Review Forms with the sponsor responses completed. The CRT members are asked to pre-rank the projects and email their pre-rankings to the Lead Entity Coordinator the evening prior to the ranking session. The Coordinator compiles the pre-rankings as a starting point for discussion at the ranking session. At the ranking meeting, a numerical value is provided to each rank assuming that a #1 ranked project would have the highest*

---

<sup>1</sup> The queuing up of projects in 2014 was done based on guidance from the Puget Sound Partnership for purposes of developing a 2015-2017 PSAR budget request.

numerical value and the lowest ranked project would have the lowest numerical value. The numerical values were applied to the pre-ranking in order to formulate a composite ranking (Table 1).

Table 1 Composite Pre-Ranking of WRIA 1 Projects

Rank	Project Name	Value
2014	South Fork Nessel Ph 1 Restoration	
2014	North Fork (Xwqélém) Farmhouse Ph 3 Design	
2014	Middle Fork Porter Reach Phase 1	
1	South Fork Acme Reach Acquisition	47
2	Skookum-Edfro Reach Restoration	35
3	NF (Xwqélém) Farmhouse Phase 2b	31
4	Upper Cavanaugh-Fobes Phase 2 Design	21
5	South Fork Camp 18 Restoration	19
6	Middle Fork Porter Reach Tributaries	15

The WRIA 1 CRT reviewed and discussed the composite of the preliminary rankings. A summary of the discussion points is as follows:

- The preliminary rankings submitted in advance of the meeting were very similar. One notable difference was in one CRT member's ranking of the Camp 18 Reach Restoration project proposal. The CRT member that preliminarily ranked the project much higher (#2) expressed the importance of the project in the South Fork and anticipated fish returns from previous years releases of South Fork Chinook. CRT members reviewed the technical basis for their rankings of the project as a lower priority as compared to the benefits and sequencing of the other proposed projects.
- Given available estimated grant funds for allocation in 2015, the North Fork Farmhouse Phase 2b project proposal as the third ranked project would only be partially funding. This would mean the sponsor would either need to scale back the project or the design projects would move up in the ranking. The project sponsor was asked if it was feasible to scale the restoration project to fit the available funding, which the sponsor indicated was possible.
- A CRT member raised the question of whether other CRT members had a greater interest in having restoration projects ranked above the design projects given that there may be other opportunities to fund designs, that there is already several designs queued up for construction, and that because of the river dynamics in some of the reaches it made sense to prioritize construction of the designs. This would minimize the potential of having to reconsider designs in later years because of changes to the river.
- In response to the question of whether all of the projects that are not within the funding threshold should be listed as alternates in the 2015

*project list, CRT members agreed that they did not support having the Middle Fork Porter Reach Tributaries project listed as an alternate because it may be out of sequence with the Middle Fork Porter Reach Phase 1 Project and could potentially be incorporated into a larger Middle Fork reach project.*

*The outcome of the WRIA 1 CRT recommendations to the WRIA 1 Management Team for a ranked project list for the 2015 grant cycle included:*

- 1. Submit the project ranking shown in Table 3 as the 2015 SRFB/PSAR grant cycle.*

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Notes for Ranked order of Projects</b>
1	South Fork Nessel Phase 1 Restoration	Nooksack Tribe	2014 Alternate Rolled Up for 2015 Funding
2	North Fork Farmhouse Phase 3 Design	Nooksack Tribe	2014 Alternate Rolled Up for 2015 Funding
3	Middle Fork Porter Reach Phase 1	Lummi Nation	2014 Alternate Rolled Up for 2015 Funding
4	South Fork Acme Reach Acquisition	Whatcom Land Trust	Important area for restoration not previously accessible; fills gap in restoration opportunity for the reach
5	Skookum-Edfro Reach Restoration	Lummi Nation	Previously funded design; reach important to South Fork Chinook; willing landowners
6	North Fork Farmhouse Phase 2b	Nooksack Tribe	Previously funded design; part of a larger reach restoration for the North Fork
7	South Fork Camp 18 Restoration	Lummi Nation	
8	Upper Cavanaugh-Fobes Phase 2	Lummi Nation	

- b. Identify your local technical review team (include expertise, names, and affiliations of members).

*The membership roster of the WRIA 1 Combined Review Team is provided below and is available at <http://salmon.wria1.org/resources/documents>. Since the WRIA 1 Combined Review Team is a combined team of technical and community reviewers that rank projects as a single team, Table 2 includes both categories of reviewers.*

**Table 2 WRIA 1 Combined Review Team Roster- 2015**

<b>Technical Members</b>		
Alan Chapman	Lummi Nation Natural Resources	Fisheries
Ned Currence	Nooksack Tribe Natural Resources	Fisheries
Leif Embertson	Natural Systems Design	River Systems/Restoration Engineer
Jeremy Gilman	U.S. Forest Service	Fisheries

<i>Jim Helfield</i>	<i>Western Washington University</i>	<i>Aquatic/Riparian Systems</i>
<i>Joel Ingram</i>	<i>Washington Fish and Wildlife</i>	<i>Fisheries/Permitting</i>
<i>John Thompson</i>	<i>Whatcom Co. Public Works</i>	<i>Geomorphology</i>
<b>Community Members</b>		
<i>Sue Blake</i>	<i>WSU Cooperative Extension/Washington Sea Grant</i>	<i>Water Resource Educator</i>
<i>Clare Fogelsong</i>	<i>City of Bellingham</i>	<i>Environmental Resource Manager</i>
<i>Brandi Hutton</i>	<i>Whatcom Conservation District</i>	<i>Botanist; CREP Program</i>
<i>Dave Klingbiel</i>	<i>Washington Dept. Natural Resources</i>	<i>Forester</i>
<i>Chris Luerkens</i>	<i>Washington Dept. of Ecology</i>	<i>Inspector</i>
<i>Ian Smith</i>	<i>Flood Control Zone Advisory Committee</i>	<i>Stream Restoration</i>
<i>Greg Young</i>	<i>City of Ferndale/Small Cities Rep.</i>	<i>Administration</i>

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

*Two members of the SRFB Review Panel (Steve Toth and Jennifer O’Neal) participated in our process for the 2015 grant round as follows: (1) review of draft applications for 9 projects, (2) attendance at the site visits and in-room presentations on June 5<sup>th</sup>, and (3) provide comments and feedback to individual sponsors using the standardized review panel comment forms. Project sponsors answered questions and received feedback during the site visits and in the early review comments provided by the SRFB Review Panel members after the site visits.*

5. Local evaluation process and project lists. (Lead entity provide response)
- a. Explain how multi-year implementation plans or Habitat Work Schedules were used to develop project lists. Appendix J: Regional Area Summary Information Page 139 Manual 18, Salmon Recovery Grants ☐ January 2015

*The solicitation for project proposals states the proposed projects must be consistent with the local priorities for salmon recovery, which are the early Chinook populations in the geographic priority areas of the North, Middle, and South Forks. The technical basis for the local priorities are the habitat assessments and associated restoration strategies, the Project Development Matrices that shows priorities strategies by reach, the WRIA 1 Salmonid Recovery Plan and the WRIA 1 3-Year Project Plan that is updated annually. The assessments and work plans are multi-year restoration strategies that build on each other to identify the local priorities. In addition, consistent with the local strategy of sequencing and phasing restoration projects, the Letter of Intent form solicits information from potential sponsors on status of proposed projects and anticipated future phases. This multiple layer approach provides a consistency check for ensuring that all applications submitted are consistent with local priorities. All of the proposed projects are entered into HWS as part of the application process and are made public once they are officially submitted to RCO.*

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

*Refer to the response under A, which outlines the local review process, points of discussion, and WRIA 1 CRT recommendations for the WRIA 1 Management Team review and approval.*

## **APPENDIX A**

### **2015 WRIA 1 Ranking Session Documents**

## 2014 Project Development Matrices were used in the 2015 SRFB/PSAR Grant Cycle

### 2014 WRIA 1 Project Development Matrices - North Fork Nooksack River

Level of Importance for Chinook

**Tier 1**  
**Tier 2**

Restoration Strategies and Level of Importance: North Fork Nooksack River

North Fork Reach Name (upstream RM)

	Pipeline	Rutsatz	Bell/ Kenny	Big Rock Canyon	Hatchery	Farmhouse	Maple Canyon	Maple Creek	Mahaffey Canyon	Below Boulder	Lone Tree	Wildcat/ Warnick	Canyon	Cornell	Horseshoe	Deadhorse
	38.3	40.6	42.9	43.7	46.7	49.4	49.8	50.6	51.1	52.3	53.3	54.8	55.8	57.8	61.9	65
<b>North Fork Mainstem</b>																
Construct/augment log jams to protect, encourage formation and growth of forested islands (especially upstream of tributary confluences)	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2		Tier 1	Tier 1		Tier 1		Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 2		Tier 1
Log jams to reconnect back channels (provide for flows during spawning/incubation, prevent major avulsion)					Tier 1	Tier 1		Tier 1		Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 2		Tier 1
Logs/log jams to increase habitat quality in braids and back channels.		Tier 2	Tier 2		Tier 2	Tier 2				Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2				Tier 2
Reforest historic channel migration zone and 300' buffer	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2		Tier 2	Tier 2		Tier 2		Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2		Tier 2
Promote floodplain forest encroachment on active channel area.	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2		Tier 2	Tier 1		Tier 2		Tier 2	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2		Tier 2
Promote channel-floodplain interaction to restore floodplain processes (e.g.wood recruitment, floodplain habitat formation)						Tier 2		Tier 2								
Acquire properties necessary to facilitate restoration			Tier 2					Tier 2				Tier 1				
Acquire properties at risk of degradation to protect high quality habitat, habitat-forming processes			Tier 2		Tier 2			Tier 1		High		Tier 2		Tier 1		
<i>Early chinook tribs (upstream to chinook extent)</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Racehorse</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Maple</i>		<i>Boulder</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>McDonald</i>	<i>Canyon</i>	<i>Cornell, Thompson, Hedrick &amp; Glacier</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Boyd, Deadhorse</i>
Restore riparian areas					Tier 2			Tier 2		Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2			
Restore habitat (diversity, stability)					Tier 2			Tier 2		Tier 2		Tier 2	Tier 2			
Restore fish passage													Tier 1	Tier 2 for Hedrick		
Acquire properties at risk of degradation to protect high quality habitat, habitat-forming processes or to					Tier 2								Tier 1	Tier 1 for Thompson		
<b>Watershed</b>																
Assess, treat orphaned roads	Tier 2															
Address chronic sediment sources	Tier 2															



2014 WRIA 1 Project Development Matrices - Middle Fork Nooksack River

Level of Importance for Chinook

Tier 1
Tier 2

Restoration Strategies and Level of Importance: Middle Fork Nooksack River

Middle Fork Reach Name (upstream RM)

	Kulshan	Welcome	Porter	MF Canyon	Clearwater	Galbraith	Warm	Rankin
	1.5	3.1	5.2	7.2	9.4	11.7	14.5	17.4
<b>Middle Fork Mainstem</b>								
Restore passage at Middle Fork Diversion Dam (RM 7.2)					Tier 1			
Install lwd/log jams throughout the active channel to increase flow impedance.								
Install log jams along maturing forested channel margins to improve channel stability and slow migration	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2				Tier 2	Tier 2
Reforest historic migration zone and 300-foot riparian buffer	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2					
Install lwd/log jams in unvegetated bar areas to provide sheltered areas that encourage vegetation encroachment	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2					
Install log jams to increase the stability of forested islands and their associated side-channel habitats.	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1					
Install log jams to reconnect side channels (provide for flows during spawning/ incubation)	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1					
Install log jams to increase pool depth and frequency	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 2					
Install lwd/logjams to increase woody cover along channel edges								
Acquire functioning habitat at risk of degradation	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2					
Acquire land to facilitate restoration	Tier 1	Tier 1						
Restore floodplain wetlands								
Restore floodplain connectivity								
<b>Early chinook tribs (upstream to chinook extent)</b>	<b>Canyon Lake</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>Porter, Peat Bog</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>Clearwater</b>	<b>Galbraith</b>	<b>Wallace, Warm, Sisters</b>	<b>Ridley</b>
Restore passage at barrier culverts								
Improve low-flow connectivity with tributaries								
Restore tributary riparian areas								
Restore habitat (diversity/stability)								
Acquire functioning habitat at risk of degradation								

## 2014 WRIA 1 Project Development Matrices - South Fork Nooksack River

Level of Importance for Chinook

Tier 1

Tier 2

## Restoration Strategies and Level of Importance: South Fork Nooksack River

South Fork Reach Name (upstream RM)

	VanZandt	Todd	Hardscrabble	Standard	BNSF	Acme	Hutchinson	Saxon	Skookum	Dye's Canyon	Cavanaugh	Larson's Bridge	Lyman Pass	Elk Flats	Howard
	1.8	3.7	5.1	7.2	8.6	9.6	10.9	12.8	14.3	16.1	18	20.6	22	25.4	31
<b>South Fork Mainstem</b>															
Log jams to form deep complex pools: cool-water inflow areas	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1		Tier 1		Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2
Log jams to form deep complex pools: other areas	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1		Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1		Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2
Replace riprap with wood bank structures	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2		Tier 2						
Reconnect and restore side-channels and restore historic channel pattern	Tier 2			Tier 2		Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2				Tier 2			
Setback or remove riprap embankments	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1		Tier 2						
Lower artificial levees to native bank/floodplain elevations	Tier 2			Tier 2	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 2								
Relocate river-adjacent infrastructure outside the 100-year erosion hazard area	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2					Tier 2	
Reforest historic channel migration zone and 300' buffer	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2		Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2		
Remove invasive species (knotweed and reed canarygrass)							Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2
Reconnect floodplains	Tier 2*	*	*	*	*	*	Tier 2*	Tier 2*	*	*	*	*	Tier 1	Tier 2	*
Improve in-channel woody debris loading in floodplain channels	Tier 2						Tier 2	Tier 2							
Improve riparian conditions along floodplain channels (outside HMZ and 300')	Tier 2						Tier 2	Tier 2							
Acquire properties necessary to facilitate restoration	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2
Acquire properties at risk of degradation to protect high quality habitat, habitat-forming processes	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2
<i>Early chinook tribes (upstream to chinook extent)</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Hutchinson</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Skookum</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Cavanaugh</i>	<i>Fobes, Deer, Roaring, Plumbago</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>
Restore riparian areas							Tier 2		Tier 2		Tier 2	Tier 2			
Restore habitat (diversity, stability)							Tier 2								
Acquire properties at risk of degradation to protect high quality habitat, habitat-forming processes											Tier 1	Tier 1			
<b>Watershed</b>															
Assess, treat orphaned roads	Tier 2														
Address chronic sediment sources** (stream adjacent large inputs)				Tier 2								Tier 2		Tier 1	Tier 1

\*The reach was not re-evaluated for this strategy. If a project is proposed in a reach that is not at least a Tier 2, the biological justification for the reach and strategy must be presented to the WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Staff Team for the change to occur.

\*\*Strategy is to address the large sediment streamside contributions (not intended for small)

## WRIA 1 Habitat Indicator Table for 2015 SRFB Grant Cycle

In WRIA 1, sponsors for SRFB and PSAR grant funds will use the table below to identify and quantify the habitat objectives relevant to their project proposals. Note: Not all projects will have all of the indicators listed.

CATEGORY	INDICATOR	Methods
Instream Habitat- Large Wood Restoration	Number of pools formed per mile	Overlay structure locations with wetted low-flow channel (from relevant aerial photo or field mapping; including primary and secondary channels within the active channel).
	Number of deep (>1m residual depth) primary <sup>1</sup> pools formed	Overlay structure locations with <u>primary</u> wetted low-flow channel (see above). Primary pools expected to form where structures engage the thalweg of the primary wetted channel; pools in secondary channels not counted as primary.
	Length of wood engaged at low flow and high flow	Length is the perimeter length of wood engaged at low or high flow. For low flow area: use low flow wetted edge field data and/or wetted channel from relevant aerial photo. For high flow area: use active channel from relevant aerial photo or field mapping and floodplain channels expected to be wetted at up to 2-year flows (i.e. floodplain channels available at rearing flows, see “wetted length of side channels” below).
	Number of cold-water refuges <sup>2</sup> (cooler pools, tributary confluence, groundwater seeps) formed or enhanced	Overlay Structure locations with documented seeps, cool water tributaries <2 Deg C cooler (FLIR or field data) in a reach with temperature as a limiting factor
	Stable log jams/mile	Number of proposed ELJs divided by project reach length.
	Number key large wood pieces/100 m channel (for smaller tributary and side channels)	
	Wetted length of side channels available during spawning and rearing flows	Wetted length of floodplain channels expected to be available at spawning and rearing flows (based on interpreted channel response). Spawning = available during low flow (perennially connected) and focus on side channels (i.e. separated from main channel by well-vegetated island). Rearing may also include other floodplain channels; benefit may be presented at low to

		2- year flow. Reference proposed condition hydraulic model depth if available.
Fish Passage	Length of chinook habitat connected	Length of suitable habitat upstream of barrier.
	Number of barriers removed	Count of partial or complete barriers; note extent of passability in documentation if available.
Riparian Restoration	Area in and within 300 feet of Historic Migration Zone vegetated and on trajectory to PFC <sup>3</sup> includes forest island area.	
	For tributaries- the proportion of the site potential buffer vegetated and on trajectory to PFC	
Sediment Reduction	Length of forest road treated	
	Area of sediment point sources, such as stream-adjacent landslides, stabilized.	
Removal of hydromodifications	Edge habitat length by type (bar, bank <sup>5</sup> , hydromodified). at low and high flows (question for sponsors will be how it is defined or will be defined) bank flow width, length of channel at low flow length of channel at mid flow and produce the ratio per unit length per river mile.	
	Area of floodplain/ erosion hazard area reconnected by hydromodification setback/removal	Also calculate % of HMZ reconnected
Acquisition	Out of the area protected, how much of the HMZ+300' is protected? How much the area is already protected? How much is threatened? How much of the land area has mature trees?	
	Barriers to implementation that will be addressed	
Design	Potential barriers to implementation in the design reach. How will design get you to the next stage for reach restoration (i.e., anticipated benefits)?	
	Current and potential habitat conditions characterized (need for restoration/ enhancement demonstrated)	

<sup>1</sup> Primary pools are defined as pools that span at least 50% of the low flow main channel width.

<sup>2</sup> Cold-water refuges are defined as areas that are at least 2°C cooler than ambient temperature.

<sup>3</sup> PFC is properly functioning conditions and, in this context, relates to ability of vegetation to provide large wood and shade the stream.

<sup>4</sup> Floodplain is defined as the mapped 100-year floodplain.

<sup>5</sup> Bank condition can be divided into forested and unforested.

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

### WRIA 1 SRFB/PSAR Project Review – Acquisition Projects

Reviewer:	Date:	Project Strength (1=Very Strong and 5= Very Weak )
Project:	Sponsor:	

#### Reviewer Instructions:

This form includes three categories for considering proposals- Project Benefits, Timing, and Project Sequencing/Staging- and one category that is information only- Scaling of Project.

Under each of the categories are criteria to support your review. The criteria is supportive and is used by you to determine the strength of the technical arguments being made for the project benefits (1= Very Strong and 5 = Very Weak). Not all categories have multiple criteria or subcategories. There is a space to record the reasoning behind your rating. In reviewing all projects the key consideration for **all** project types is benefit to Nooksack early chinook- projects that have the greatest benefit to Nooksack early chinook are priorities. Projects with the greatest benefit to Chinook should demonstrate the strongest technical argument to support the stated habitat objectives.

#### Project Sponsor Instructions:

Project sponsors are required to complete the identified sections under each category. Your responses need to be clearly and succinctly written. It is the information that the Technical Review Team members will use to review your project and report out on the technical merits/strengths of your project in achieving habitat benefits. **Your response should clearly reference the section and subsection of the SRFB application where the information pertaining to the question is found. When referencing assessments, restoration strategies, Salmon Recovery Plan, etc., provide the citation including pages where the information can be found.** For example, you should cite the section and subsection of the SRFB Project Proposal where you identify the strategies that your project addresses (e.g., Tier 1 or Tier 2). If you are citing the WRIA 1 Salmonid Recovery Plan, a completed habitat assessment, or other technical document, you must include the citation and page number in your response so that the Technical Review Team member can locate the information you are referencing. Citing the location for the information will allow you to provide clear, concise, and succinct responses to the questions in this review form. Additionally, you must include a response to the scaling question at the end of the review form. Please consider both how you will scale if funding is limited and how you could scale the project if additional funds were available. As information, your worksite budget and overall budget information from your SRFB application will be attached to the review and ranking form. Therefore, it is in your best interest to make sure your budget information is complete.

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Category - Project Benefits		
	Rating Weak (5) → Strong (1)	Comments/Rationale for Rating
<b>Magnitude of Benefit Relative to Project Cost Overall Rating</b>	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
All Projects: To what extent does the project implement tier 1 actions? – (low to high depending on how many of the actions in the reach that are tier 1 are being implemented with the proposed project)  To what extent are the tier 2 actions being implemented in the proposed project?	○ ○ ○ ○ ○  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
<i>Sponsor Completes:</i> Describe the extent to which you are implementing Tier 1 strategies as part of the proposed project. Describe the extent to which you are implementing Tier 2 strategies.		
<i>Technical Evaluation:</i>		
Acquisition Projects: (a) To what extent is the acquisition creating restoration opportunity? (i.e. what are the anticipated effects on habitat targets) (b) To what extent is the risk or magnitude of degradation eliminated if the acquisition occurs? (i.e. what are the anticipated effects on habitat targets)	○ ○ ○ ○ ○  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○	

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

(c) Given (a) and (b), how cost effective is the project?		
<b>Sponsor Completes:</b> (a) <i>What is the current and/or future restoration opportunity that the acquisition will provide (i.e., what limiting factor will be addressed, what priority strategies are anticipated, restoration at the site or in proximity to the site is identified in the 2014 Project Development matrices as Tier 1)? Explain the expected magnitude of degradation if the acquisition does not occur.</i> (b) <i>Please attach your project budget.</i>		
<b>Technical Evaluation:</b>		
<b>Certainty of Benefit Overall Rating</b>	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
<b>Acquisition Projects:</b> (a) How likely is it that the sponsor will complete the project (i.e., landowner willingness to sell)?		
<b>Sponsor Completes:</b> <i>What is in place that demonstrates the acquisition is ready to proceed?</i>		
<b>Technical Evaluation:</b>		
<b>Category - Timing</b>		
	<b>Rating</b> Weak (5) → Strong (1)	Comments/Rationale for Rating

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Immediacy of Benefit</b> To what extent will the project quickly result in benefits to spring Chinook? <i>(Refer to attached Table 1 for guidance on immediacy of benefit)</i>		<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	
<i>Sponsor Completes:</i> <i>What is the immediacy of benefit of your project to spring Chinook? If you divert from the Table 1 guidance, provide the basis for the diversion.</i>			
<i>Technical Evaluation:</i>			
<b>Lifespan of Project</b> To what extent will the project persist and provide key habitat functions while natural habitat forming and maintaining processes are recovering? <i>(Refer to attached Table 1 for guidance on lifespan of project)</i>		<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	
<i>Sponsor Completes:</i> <i>What is the lifespan of your project? If you divert from the Table 1 guidance, provide the basis for the diversion.</i>			
<i>Technical Evaluation:</i>			
<b>Category - Project Sequencing/Staging</b>			
	Rating Weak (5) → Strong (1)	Comments/Rationale for Rating	
<b>Linkage or Relationship to Other Projects Overall Rating</b>		<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	
All Projects: (a) To what extent is the proposed project part of a sequence for a reach restoration strategy? (e.g., have other stages been funded, will		<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	



Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

acquiring the property facilitate future restoration, is this stage needed for other stages to move forward?) (b) To what extent is this project in a reach that addresses similar strategies? To what degree does it positively interact with other projects in the reach?	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	
<i>Sponsors Complete:</i> (a) How does this project relate to other projects in the reach? (b) To what degree does the project positively interact with other projects in the reach or the immediate area and how does it do that? (c) Have other stages of this project been funded? What stages remain to be funded? Will that complete restoration in the reach? (d) Will the acquisition facilitate Tier 1 or Tier 2 restoration strategies at or near the acquisition site?		
Technical Evaluation:		
Consequence of Delay/Urgency for the Project Overall Rating <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>		
All Projects: (a) To what extent are recovery efforts impeded if the project is not funded?	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	
<i>Sponsors Complete:</i> If the project is not funded, what opportunity is being lost? Is funding for this project a key step in a restoration strategy in the reach?		
Technical Evaluation:		
Scaling of Project (This is not a ranked question. It is information in the event that projects need to be scaled to meet funding allocations.)		

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Sponsors Complete: Explain how your project can be scaled, and if it cannot be scaled, provide an explanation as to why.

***Other Technical Review Comments:***

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**Table 1.** Typical response time, duration, variability of success, and probability of success for common restoration techniques (Beechie et al. 2003, modified from Roni et al. 2002).

Restoration type <sup>a</sup>	Specific action	Years to achieve response	Longevity of action (years)	Variability of success among projects	Probability of success
<i>Reconnect habitats</i>	Culverts	1-5	10-50+	Low	High
	Off channel	1-5	10-50+	Low	High
	Estuarine	5-20	10-50+	Moderate	Moderate to high
	Instream flows	1-5	10-50+	Low	High
<i>Roads and land use</i>	Road removal	5-20	Decades to centuries	Low	High
	Road alteration	5-20	Decades to centuries	Moderate	Moderate to high
	Change in land use	10+	Decades to centuries	Unknown	Unknown
<i>Riparian restoration</i>	Fencing	5-20	10-50+	Low	Moderate to high
	Riparian replanting	5-20	10-50+	Low	Moderate to high
	Rest-rotation or grazing strategy	5-20	10-50+	Moderate	Moderate
	Conifer conversion	10-100	Centuries	High	Low to moderate
<i>Instream habitat restoration</i>	Artificial log structures	1-5	5-20	High	Low to high <sup>b</sup>
	Natural LWD placement	1-5	5-20	High	Low to high <sup>b</sup>
	Artificial log jams	1-5	10-50+	Moderate	Low to high <sup>b</sup>
	Boulder placement	1-5	5-20	Moderate	Low to high <sup>b</sup>
	Gabions	1-5	10	Moderate	Low to high <sup>b</sup>
<i>Nutrient enrichment</i>	Carcass placement	1-5	Unknown	Low	Moderate to high
	Stream fertilization	1-5	Unknown	Moderate	Moderate to high
<i>Habitat creation</i>	Off channel	1-5	10-50+	High	Moderate
	Estuarine	5-10	10-50+	High	Low
	Instream	See various instream restoration techniques above			

<sup>a</sup> The first three categories of restoration (reconnect isolated habitats, roads and land use, and riparian restoration) are considered process-based or passive restoration, the last three (instream, nutrient enrichment, and habitat creation) are considered enhancement or active restoration.

<sup>b</sup> Depends on species and project design.

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

### WRIA 1 SRFB/PSAR Project Review – Design Projects

Reviewer:	Date:	Project Strength (1=Strong technical arguments)
Project:	Sponsor:	

#### Reviewer Instructions:

This form includes three categories for considering proposals- Project Benefits, Timing, and Project Sequencing/Staging- and one category that is information only- Scaling of Project.

Under each of the categories are criteria to support your review. The criteria is supportive and is used by you to determine the strength of the technical arguments being made for the project benefits (1= Very Strong and 5 = Very Weak). Not all categories have multiple criteria or subcategories. There is a space to record the reasoning behind your rating. In reviewing all projects the key consideration for **all** project types is benefit to Nooksack early chinook- projects that have the greatest benefit to Nooksack early chinook are priorities. Projects with the greatest benefit to Chinook should demonstrate the strongest technical argument to support the stated habitat objectives.

#### Project Sponsor Instructions:

Project sponsors are required to complete the identified sections under each category. Your responses need to be clearly and succinctly written. It is the information that the Technical Review Team members will use to review your project and report out on the technical merits/strengths of your project in achieving habitat benefits. **Your response should clearly reference the section and subsection of the SRFB application where the information pertaining to the question is found. When referencing assessments, restoration strategies, Salmon Recovery Plan, etc., provide the citation including pages where the information can be found.** For example, you should cite the section and subsection of the SRFB Project Proposal where you identify the strategies that your project addresses (e.g., Tier 1 or Tier 2). If you are citing the WRIA 1 Salmonid Recovery Plan, a completed habitat assessment, or other technical document, you must include the citation and page number in your response so that the Technical Review Team member can locate the information you are referencing. Citing the location for the information will allow you to provide clear, concise, and succinct responses to the questions in this review form. Additionally, you must include a response to the scaling question at the end of the review form. Please consider both how you will scale if funding is limited and how you could scale the project if additional funds were available. As information, your worksite budget and overall budget information from your SRFB application will be attached to the review and ranking form. Therefore, it is in your best interest to make sure your budget information is complete

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Category - Project Benefits		
	Rating Weak → Strong (5)                      (1)	Comments/Rationale for Rating
<b>Magnitude of Benefit Relative to Project Cost Overall Rating</b>	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
All Projects: To what extent does the project implement tier 1 actions? – (low to high depending on how many of the actions in the reach that are tier 1 are being implemented with the proposed project)	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
To what extent are the tier 2 actions being implemented in the proposed project?	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
<i>Sponsor Completes:</i> Describe the extent to which you are implementing Tier 1 strategies as part of the proposed project. Describe the extent to which you are implementing Tier 2 strategies.		
<i>Technical Evaluation:</i>		
Design Projects: (a) To what extent will design address the limiting factors and priority actions in the reach?	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
(b) To what extent has the sponsor justified the design project cost relative to the tasks proposed? (e.g., does it include feasibility report, modeling of alternatives, is it a preliminary design or a final design).	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**Sponsor Completes:**

- (a) *What are the habitat objectives? What are the primary limiting factor(s) and priority actions in the reach that the project will address?*
- (b) *Provide a justification of the design cost relative to tasks proposed.*
- (c) *Please attach your project budget*

**Technical Evaluation:**

**Certainty of Benefit Overall Rating**

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

**Design Projects:**

- (a) *To what extent has the sponsor identified the current design stage for the proposed project site?*

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

**Sponsor Completes:**

- (a) *What is the current stage of design for your project (e.g., conceptual, preliminary)?*
- (b) *What are the project deliverables for the proposed project, and if they are not consistent with Appendix D: Design and Restoration project Deliverables in RCO Manual 18 what are the differences?*

**Technical Evaluation:**

**Category - Timing**

	Rating Low → High (5) (1)	Comments/Rationale for Rating
<b>Immediacy of Benefit</b> (a) <i>In so far as design leads to construction, to what extent will the project quickly result in benefits to spring Chinook? (Refer to attached Table 1 for guidance on immediacy of benefit)</i>	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

(b) To what extent has the sponsor provided information on the sequencing of the design to construction, and their anticipated timeline for obtaining funding for construction?		
<p><i>Sponsor Completes:</i>  <i>What is the immediacy of benefit of your project to spring Chinook? If you divert from the Table 1 guidance, provide the basis for the diversion. Identify the current stage of design, the sequence from the current design stage to final design, permitting, and construction. Please include the anticipated timeline for obtaining funding for final design and construction.</i></p>		
<p><i>Technical Evaluation:</i></p>		
<p><b>Lifespan of Project</b>          In so far as design leads to construction, to what extent will the project persist and provide key habitat functions while natural habitat forming and maintaining processes are recovering? (Refer to attached Table 1 for guidance on lifespan of project)</p>	<p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>	
<p><i>Sponsor Completes:</i>  <i>What is the lifespan of your project? If you divert from the Table 1 guidance, provide the basis for the diversion.</i></p>		
<p><i>Technical Evaluation:</i></p>		
<p><b>Category - Project Sequencing/Staging</b></p>		
	<p>Rating            Weak (5)      Strong (1)</p>	<p>Comments/Rationale for Rating</p>
<p><b>Linkage or Relationship to Other Projects Overall Rating</b></p>	<p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>	
<p>All Projects:          (c) To what extent is the proposed project part of a sequence for a reach</p>	<p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>	

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

<p>restoration strategy? (e.g., have other stages been funded? Is this stage needed for other stages to move forward?)</p> <p>(d) To what extent is this project in a reach that addresses similar strategies? To what degree does it positively interact with other projects in the reach?</p>		
<p><i>Sponsors Complete:</i></p> <p>(e) <i>How does this project relate to other projects in the reach?</i></p> <p>(f) <i>To what degree does the project positively interact with other projects in the reach or the immediate area and how does it do that? Have other stages of this project been funded? What stages remain to be funded? Will that complete restoration in the reach?</i></p> <p>(g) <i>Please attach a map that shows the proposed project in relation to other projects.</i></p>		
<p><i>Technical Evaluation:</i></p>		
<p><b>Consequence of Delay/Urgency for the Project Overall Rating</b></p>	<p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>	
<p>All Projects:</p> <p>(b) To what extent are recovery efforts impeded if the project s not funded?</p>	<p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>	
<p><i>Sponsors Complete:</i></p> <p><i>If the project is not funded, what opportunity is being lost? Is funding for this project a key step in a restoration strategy in the reach?</i></p>		
<p><i>Technical Evaluation:</i></p>		
<p><b>Scaling of Project (This is not a ranked question. It is information in the event that projects need to be scaled to meet funding allocations.)</b></p>		



Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Sponsors Complete: Explain how your project can be scaled, and if it cannot be scaled, provide an explanation as to why.

***Other Technical Review Comments:***

**Table 1.** Typical response time, duration, variability of success, and probability of success for common restoration techniques (Beechie et al. 2003, modified from Roni et al. 2002).

Restoration type <sup>a</sup>	Specific action	Years to achieve response	Longevity of action (years)	Variability of success among projects	Probability of success
<i>Reconnect habitats</i>	Culverts	1-5	10-50+	Low	High
	Off channel	1-5	10-50+	Low	High
	Estuarine	5-20	10-50+	Moderate	Moderate to high
	Instream flows	1-5	10-50+	Low	High
<i>Roads and land use</i>	Road removal	5-20	Decades to centuries	Low	High
	Road alteration	5-20	Decades to centuries	Moderate	Moderate to high
	Change in land use	10+	Decades to centuries	Unknown	Unknown
<i>Riparian restoration</i>	Fencing	5-20	10-50+	Low	Moderate to high
	Riparian replanting	5-20	10-50+	Low	Moderate to high
	Rest-rotation or grazing strategy	5-20	10-50+	Moderate	Moderate
	Conifer conversion	10-100	Centuries	High	Low to moderate
<i>Instream habitat restoration</i>	Artificial log structures	1-5	5-20	High	Low to high <sup>b</sup>
	Natural LWD placement	1-5	5-20	High	Low to high <sup>b</sup>
	Artificial log jams	1-5	10-50+	Moderate	Low to high <sup>b</sup>
	Boulder placement	1-5	5-20	Moderate	Low to high <sup>b</sup>
	Gabions	1-5	10	Moderate	Low to high <sup>b</sup>
<i>Nutrient enrichment</i>	Carcass placement	1-5	Unknown	Low	Moderate to high
	Stream fertilization	1-5	Unknown	Moderate	Moderate to high
<i>Habitat creation</i>	Off channel	1-5	10-50+	High	Moderate
	Estuarine	5-10	10-50+	High	Low
	Instream	See various instream restoration techniques above			

<sup>a</sup> The first three categories of restoration (reconnect isolated habitats, roads and land use, and riparian restoration) are considered process-based or passive restoration, the last three (instream, nutrient enrichment, and habitat creation) are considered enhancement or active restoration.

<sup>b</sup> Depends on species and project design.

## WRIA 1 SRFB/PSAR Project Review – Restoration Projects

Reviewer:	Date:	Project Strength (1=Very Strong and 5= Very Weak )
Project:	Sponsor:	

### Reviewer Instructions:

This form includes three categories for considering proposals- Project Benefits, Timing, and Project Sequencing/Staging- and one category that is information only- Scaling of Project.

Under each of the categories are criteria to support your review. The criteria is supportive and is used by you to determine the strength of the technical arguments being made for the project benefits (1= Very Strong and 5 = Very Weak). Not all categories have multiple criteria or subcategories. There is a space to record the reasoning behind your rating. In reviewing all projects the key consideration for **all** project types is benefit to Nooksack early chinook- projects that have the greatest benefit to Nooksack early chinook are priorities. Projects with the greatest benefit to Chinook should demonstrate the strongest technical argument to support the stated habitat objectives.

### Project Sponsor Instructions:

Project sponsors are required to complete the identified sections under each category. Your responses need to be clearly and succinctly written. It is the information that the Technical Review Team members will use to review your project and report out on the technical merits/strengths of your project in achieving habitat benefits. **Your response should clearly reference the section and subsection of the SRFB application where the information pertaining to the question is found. When referencing assessments, restoration strategies, Salmon Recovery Plan, etc., provide the citation including pages where the information can be found.** For example, you should cite the section and subsection of the SRFB Project Proposal where you identify the strategies that your project addresses (e.g., Tier 1 or Tier 2). If you are citing the WRIA 1 Salmonid Recovery Plan, a completed habitat assessment, or other technical document, you must include the citation and page number in your response so that the Technical Review Team member can locate the information you are referencing. Citing the location for the information will allow you to provide clear, concise, and succinct responses to the questions in this review form. Additionally, you must include a response to the scaling question at the end of the review form. Please consider both how you will scale if funding is limited and how you could scale the project if additional funds were available. As information, your worksite budget and overall budget information from your SRFB application will be attached to the review and ranking form. Therefore, it is in your best interest to make sure your budget information is complete.

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Category - Project Benefits		
	Rating Weak (5) → Strong (1)	Rationale for Rating
<b>Magnitude of Benefit Relative to Project Cost Overall Rating</b>	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
All Projects: To what extent does the project implement tier 1 actions? – (low to high depending on how many of the actions in the reach that are tier 1 are being implemented with the proposed project)	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
To what extent are the tier 2 actions being implemented in the proposed project?	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
<i>Sponsor Completes:</i> Describe the extent to which you are implementing Tier 1 strategies as part of the proposed project. Describe the extent to which you are implementing Tier 2 strategies.		
<i>Technical Evaluation:</i>		
Restoration Projects: (a) How much habitat (expressed in habitat targets) will be created? (b) To what extent will the project address priority strategies in the reach? (c) To what degree has the sponsor justified the project cost relative to the amount of habitat created	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
<i>Sponsor Completes:</i> (a) Using the table of Habitat Target Indicators, quantify habitat created by implementing the project. (b) Using the project development matrices, identify the priority strategies in the reach that the project addresses. Identify the primary limiting factor(s) addressed by the project. (c) Provide a justification of the project cost in terms of habitat created.		

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

*Technical Evaluation:*

**Certainty of Benefit Overall Rating**

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

**Restoration Projects:**

(a) To what extent has the sponsor demonstrated that the restoration methods proposed are proven to achieve the expected restoration outcomes?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

(b) To what degree, are the methods proposed effective?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

*Sponsor Completes:*

*(a) Are the restoration methods being used proven to achieve the anticipated habitat restoration, and why are they the best methods for the project site? Where have the restoration methods been used before (i.e., what other projects)? Has there been project effectiveness monitoring at those other sites that show the methods are effective?*

*Technical Evaluation:*

**Category - Timing**

**Immediacy of Benefit**

To what extent will the project quickly result in benefits to spring Chinook?  
(Refer to attached Table 1 for guidance on immediacy of benefit)

Rating  
Weak Strong  
(5) → (1)

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Rationale for Rating

*Sponsor Completes:*

*What is the immediacy of benefit of your project to spring Chinook? If you divert from the Table 1 guidance, provide the basis for the diversion.*

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

*Technical Evaluation:*

**Lifespan of Project**

To what extent will the project persist and provide key habitat functions while natural habitat forming and maintaining processes are recovering?  
(Refer to attached Table 1 for guidance on lifespan of project)

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

*Sponsor Completes:*

*What is the lifespan of your project? If you divert from the Table 1 guidance, provide the basis for the diversion.*

*Technical Evaluation:*

**Category - Project Sequencing/Staging**

	Rating Weak (5) → Strong (1)	Rationale for Rating
<b>Linkage or Relationship to Other Projects Overall Rating</b>	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
All Projects: (e) To what extent is the proposed project part of a sequence for a reach restoration strategy? (e.g., have other stages been funded? Is this stage needed for other stages to move forward?) (f) To what extent is this project in a reach that addresses similar strategies? To what degree does it positively interact with other projects in the reach?	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○	

*Sponsors Complete:*

- (h) *How does this project relate to other projects in the reach?*  
 (i) *To what degree does the project positively interact with other projects in the reach or the immediate area and how does it do that? Have other stages of this project been funded? What stages remain to be funded? Will that complete restoration in the reach?*  
 (j) *Please attach a map that shows the proposed project in relation to other projects.*

Project Name or Number: \_\_\_\_\_

<i>Technical Evaluation:</i>		
<b>Consequence of Delay/Urgency for the Project Overall Rating</b>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	
All Projects: (c) To what extent are recovery efforts impeded if the project is not funded?	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	
<i>Sponsors Complete:</i> <i>If the project is not funded, what opportunity is being lost? Is funding for this project a key step in a restoration strategy in the reach?</i>		
<i>Technical Evaluation:</i>		
<b>Scaling of Project (This is not a ranked question. It is information in the event that projects need to be scaled to meet funding allocations.)</b>		
Sponsors Complete: Explain how your project can be scaled, and if it cannot be scaled, provide an explanation as to why.		
<i>Other Technical Review Comments:</i>		



**Table 1.** Typical response time, duration, variability of success, and probability of success for common restoration techniques (Beechie et al. 2003, modified from Roni et al. 2002).

Restoration type <sup>a</sup>	Specific action	Years to achieve response	Longevity of action (years)	Variability of success among projects	Probability of success
<i>Reconnect habitats</i>	Culverts	1-5	10-50+	Low	High
	Off channel	1-5	10-50+	Low	High
	Estuarine	5-20	10-50+	Moderate	Moderate to high
	Instream flows	1-5	10-50+	Low	High
<i>Roads and land use</i>	Road removal	5-20	Decades to centuries	Low	High
	Road alteration	5-20	Decades to centuries	Moderate	Moderate to high
	Change in land use	10+	Decades to centuries	Unknown	Unknown
<i>Riparian restoration</i>	Fencing	5-20	10-50+	Low	Moderate to high
	Riparian replanting	5-20	10-50+	Low	Moderate to high
	Rest-rotation or grazing strategy	5-20	10-50+	Moderate	Moderate
	Conifer conversion	10-100	Centuries	High	Low to moderate
<i>Instream habitat restoration</i>	Artificial log structures	1-5	5-20	High	Low to high <sup>b</sup>
	Natural LWD placement	1-5	5-20	High	Low to high <sup>b</sup>
	Artificial log jams	1-5	10-50+	Moderate	Low to high <sup>b</sup>
	Boulder placement	1-5	5-20	Moderate	Low to high <sup>b</sup>
	Gabions	1-5	10	Moderate	Low to high <sup>b</sup>
<i>Nutrient enrichment</i>	Carcass placement	1-5	Unknown	Low	Moderate to high
	Stream fertilization	1-5	Unknown	Moderate	Moderate to high
<i>Habitat creation</i>	Off channel	1-5	10-50+	High	Moderate
	Estuarine	5-10	10-50+	High	Low
	Instream	See various instream restoration techniques above			

<sup>a</sup> The first three categories of restoration (reconnect isolated habitats, roads and land use, and riparian restoration) are considered process-based or passive restoration, the last three (instream, nutrient enrichment, and habitat creation) are considered enhancement or active restoration.

<sup>b</sup> Depends on species and project design.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **WRIA 1 Schedule for 2015 SRFB/PSAR Grant Cycle**

## **WRIA 1 Schedule for 2015 Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) Grant Cycle**

March 17	WRIA 1 Salmon Staff Team- Finish review of restoration implementation status in the Nooksack River Forks, gaps, and changes in strategies, if any. Review/modify habitat indicators for use by project sponsors in preparing proposals.
March 31	Project Sponsors- Letters of Intent are required for projects to be considered for funding, and are due by March 31 to <a href="mailto:genevaconsulting@comcast.net">genevaconsulting@comcast.net</a> . A PRISM number will be provided to the sponsors by the Lead Entity Coordinator after March 31 <sup>st</sup>
April 1	Project Sponsors- If there is interest in pursuing early SRFB project approval (refer to Manual 18, Appendix B), sponsors must notify the Lead Entity Coordinator and RCO by this date.
April 2	Technical Reviewers- Review and discuss habitat indicators and targets from 2013 process and modify as appropriate. Letters of intent will be used to identify range of potential benefits and technical concerns.
April 16	Technical Reviewers- Finalize discussion of habitat targets and indicators, including appropriate methods to estimate habitat benefits that will be a basis for later evaluating the technical elements of project proposals.
<del>May 5</del>	Project Sponsors/Technical Reviewers – Project sponsors present their fleshed out proposal to the technical reviewers with a focus on the objectives anticipated, how the proposal will achieve the objectives, and how they estimated habitat benefits. Technical reviewers will provide feedback on estimate of benefit. This is occurring at this point so sponsors can incorporate feedback into draft applications due May 14 <sup>th</sup> .
May 6	
May 14	Project Sponsors – Draft applications in PRISM. Information identified in the Draft Application Checklist in Manual 18 must be entered in PRISM by this date in order for the site visits to occur as scheduled on June 4th.
May 31	WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Staff Team – Letter due to Puget Sound Partnership for project additions to the WRIA 1 3-Year Work Plan.
June 4	Project Sponsors, CRT, SRST, SRFB Review Panel Members – Project Site Visits
June 18	SRFB Review Panel- Review Panel Comments to Sponsors
June 25	Project Sponsors/Technical Committee – Technical discussion and feedback to projects based on site visits and SRFB Review Panel Comments.
July 2	Project Sponsors - Final Draft Applications due in PRISM. All applications must be complete at this point. The changes anticipated after this date is limited to those recommended by the CRT, Management Team, and/or WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Board. As part of the final draft application, project sponsors will also complete the project sponsor sections of the WRIA 1 Project Evaluation Criteria including identifying options for project scaling including if funding requested was reduced or if the project scale would change if more funding is available.
July 9	Technical Reviewers- Meet to discuss technical elements of project proposals and develop technical evaluation of projects to share with the WRIA 1 Combined Review Team as part of the ranking session. Technical evaluation will include both: (1) review of quantitative estimates of habitat benefit; and (2) general comments on benefit.
7/13-17	CRT Ranking Session- The CRT will meet to rank project proposals the week of July 13 <sup>th</sup> . A recommended ranked list and any other recommendations relevant to the ranking will be forwarded to the WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Board or, if designated, the WRIA 1 Management Team. Project sponsors are invited to attend the ranking.
July 30	WRIA 1 Policy Meeting- Meeting to review CRT recommendations and approval final ranked list for funding.
August 7	Approved Ranked List to PSP; all project information in PRISM
August 14	Project Sponsors - Applications must be submitted by August 14 <sup>th</sup> .