

2016 Lead Entity SRFB Reporting (Appendix M)

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 primarily unchanged from 2015 (Attachment A- Ranking Session Documents). Generally the changes made to the priority strategies was a) increase the level of importance of the restoration strategy "acquisition to facilitate restoration" in some reaches of the Nooksack Forks where instream restoration strategies were identified as a high or moderate level of importance for early Chinook populations and b) increase the level of importance of reconnecting floodplains as a restoration strategy in select reaches. As part of the discussion, it was recognized that technical assessments need to begin for the Mainstem Nooksack River. Once the habitat assessments are completed, restoration strategies for reaches of the Mainstem can be developed. Recognizing this need, the Letter of Intent and the Request for Proposals for the 2016 Salmon Recovery Funding Board identified habitat assessments for the Mainstem Nooksack River as locally eligible project.

Also included in Attachment A is a table of WRIA 1 habitat indicators that was prepared and agreed to for the 2015 grant process and continued with unchanged for 2016. The habitat indicators are used by sponsors and reviewers as part of the local review process.

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.

In reviewing the restoration strategies for changes, the WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Staff Team and technical reviewers

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 March with review of the restoration strategies for each of the reaches in the Nooksack River Forks (North, Middle and South). Invited participants, in addition to the WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Staff Team, included technical reviewers, technical staff of organizations, and project sponsors. The technical reviewers, Salmon Staff Team, and project sponsors also met in April and May for the purpose of providing feedback to sponsors on project objectives. The full CRT is invited to participate in all of the technical discussions.

Due to the number of applications, site visits were conducted on two days. 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.

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 full 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. Technical reviewers met first to discuss and evaluate project objectives; comments from the technical reviewers were added to the evaluation forms that included sponsors responses and submitted to the full WRIA 1 CRT in advance of the ranking session.

The CRT members were asked to pre-rank the projects, excluding the three large capital PSAR project proposals, and email their pre-rankings to the Lead Entity Coordinator the evening prior to the ranking session. The large capital project proposals were reviewed for local importance for early Chinook and The

Coordinator compiles the pre-rankings as a starting point for discussion at the ranking session. A numerical value is provided to each rank assuming that a #1 ranked project would have the highest numerical value and the lowest ranked project would have the lowest numerical value. Table 1 is a composite of pre-rankings received in advance of the meeting. 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
1	North Fork Farmhouse Phase 3	87
2	South Fork Nessel Phase 2	85
3	South Fork Nessel Phase 3	79
4	Lower Middle Fork Acquisition	74
5	North Fork Boyd Reach Design	71
6	South Fork Fish Camp Design	63
7	North Fork Maple Reach Design	50
8	Lower Mainstem Habitat Assessment	49
9	South Fork Skookum-Edfro Phase 2	48
10	Middle Fork Porter Reach Phase 4	40
11	North Fork Acquisition	35
12	South Fork Elk Flats Design	20

Pre-rankings of the WRIA 1 CRT members that did not submit their rankings in advance were entered into the pre-ranking spreadsheet. The WRIA 1 CRT reviewed and discussed the composite of the preliminary rankings. The projects that had the greatest variance in individual rankings were selected for further discussion and included Skookum-Edfro, Lower Middle Fork Acquisition, Middle Fork Porter Reach, North Fork Boyd Design, and Lower Nooksack Mainstem Habitat Assessment. A summary of the discussion points is as follows:

- *Skookum-Edfro Proposal:* The reviewer that ranked it high noted that the area where the project is proposed is a high priority for restoration because of future returning captive brood production. The reviewers that ranked it low identified outstanding technical questions about the design, impact to riparian areas from construction, and costs associated with access.
- *Lower Middle Fork Acquisition:* Several reviewers commented that they ranked it higher due to the relatively low cost as compared to the permanency of the benefit and it was leveraging a grant proposal that was acquiring downstream properties. Reviewers ranking it low indicated they thought it had a lower benefit to Chinook.
- *Middle Fork Porter Reach:* Questions about potential impact to infrastructure were raised, site characteristics and constraints were discussed (alluvial fan flow, river dynamics), and interest in waiting until the Middle Fork Porter Reach Phase 1 project is completed expressed.

- *North Fork Boyd Cr Design: Reviewers that ranked it on the higher end of the spectrum indicated that it had a relatively low cost as compared to the benefit that will be gained.*
- *The Lower Mainstem Habitat Assessment: Discussion comments included that the proposal was not a good fit to the priority areas and strategies that are part of the overall review and ranking process for the salmon recovery funds and that the assessment will not directly lead to projects. In response to the concerns, it was noted that the assessment is needed in order to fill data gaps that will result in the ability to identify priority strategies for restoration in the Nooksack Mainstem similar to those that have been developed for the Nooksack Forks. It was also noted that the timing is critical to do the assessment because of planning updates that will be occurring that would benefit from the assessment (e.g., Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan, Watershed Improvement District Plans).*

After discussing the project proposals, some CRT members adjusted their ranking and the new composite ranking reviewed. There was some shifting in the project order as a result of the adjustments. The outcome of the WRIA 1 CRT recommendations to the WRIA 1 Management Team for a ranked project list for the 2016 grant cycle included:

1. Submit the project ranking shown below for the 2016 SRFB/PSAR grant cycle.

Rank	Project	Sponsor
1	North Fork Farmhouse Phase 3 Restoration	Nooksack Tribe
2	South Fork Nessel Phase 2 Restoration	Nooksack Tribe
3	Lower Middle Fork Nooksack Acquisition	Whatcom Land Trust
4	South Fork Nessel Phase 3 Restoration	Nooksack Tribe
5	North Fork Boyd Reach Design	Nooksack Tribe
6	South Fork Fish Camp Design	Nooksack Tribe
7	Lower Mainstem Habitat Assessment	Whatcom County
8	South Fork Skookum-Edfro Phase 2	Lummi Nation
9	North Fork Maple Reach Design	Nooksack Tribe
10	Middle Fork Porter Reach Phase 4	Lummi Nation
11	North Fork Reach Acquisitions	Whatcom Land Trust
12	South Fork Elk Flats Design	Lummi Nation

2. Although the three large capital project proposals for PSAR funds were not locally ranked, they were all discussed for their importance to the early Chinook populations. The reason for not ranking them locally along with the 12 regular capital projects is because they are being ranked regionally in terms of achieving VSP parameters. The recommendation of the CRT was to advance all three large capital project proposals. As part of the discussion, the recommendation included noting that the Middle Fork Fish Passage Project is identified as a key action in the WRIA 1 Salmonid Recovery Plan ten-year actions, and that this project will result in the largest habitat gain of a single project.

- 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. 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

Technical Members		
Alan Chapman	Lummi Nation Natural Resources	Fisheries
Ned Currence	Nooksack Tribe Natural Resources	Fisheries
Leif Embertson	Natural Systems Design	River Systems/Restoration Engineer
Andy Ross	Salix Environmental	Habitat/Hydrology
Jeremy Gilman	U.S. Forest Service	Fisheries
Jim Helfield	Western Washington University	Aquatic/Riparian Systems
Joel Ingram	Washington Fish and Wildlife Dept.	Fisheries/Permitting
Bill House	Washington Natural Resources Dept.	Aquatic Resources/Permitting
John Thompson	Whatcom Co. Public Works	Geomorphology
Community Members		
Analiene Burns	City of Bellingham	Wetlands
Henry Bierlink	Ag Water Board	Agriculture
Dave Beatty	NSEA	RFEG; habitat
Rich Bowers	Whatcom Land Trust	Land Acquisition
Chris Johnson	Citizen	Sport fishing interest
Greg Young	City of Ferndale/Small Cities Rep.	Administration

- 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 Marnie Tyler) participated in our process for the 2016 grant round as follows: (1) review of draft applications for 12 regular capital projects and 3 large capital PSAR projects, (2) attendance at the site visits and in-room presentations on June 5th, 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.

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 exception to this was including habitat assessments for the Lower Nooksack River Mainstem as part of the Request for Proposals issued in March 2016. 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 4-Year Project Plan. The assessments and work plan 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 finalized project lists address the comments of technical, citizen, and policy reviews.

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

2016 WRIA 1 Ranking Session Documents

2016 Project Development Matrices

March 7, 2016

Project Development Matrix

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
North Fork Mainstem																
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 side 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 side channels.	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2		Tier 2	Tier 2	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 2		Tier 2*	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 1		High		Tier 2		Tier 1		
Early chinook tribs (upstream to chinook extent)																
	None	None	Kenny Cr	None	Racehorse	None	None	Maple			Lone Tree Reach	McDonald	Canyon	Cornell, Thompson, Hedrick & Glacier	None	Boyd, Deadhorse
Restore riparian areas			Tier 2		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 2		Tier 1			
Acquire properties at risk of degradation to protect high quality habitat, habitat-forming processes or to					Tier 2								Tier 1	Tier 1 for Thompson		
Watershed																
Assess, treat forest roads	Tier 2**															
Address chronic sediment sources	Tier 2**															

*Acquisition for restoration may be a Tier 1 if the acquisition is facilitating a Tier 1 restoration strategy.

**Proponent of a project addressing this strategy must demonstrate benefits to Chinook.

2016 Project Development Matrices

March 7, 2016

Project Development Matrix

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
Middle Fork Mainstem								
Restore passage at Middle Fork Diversion Dam					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					
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*	Tier 1*					
Restore floodplain wetlands								
Restore floodplain connectivity								
Early chinook tribs (upstream to chinook extent)	<i>Canyon Lake</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Porter, Peat Bog</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Clearwater</i>	<i>Galbraith</i>	<i>Wallace, Warm, Sisters</i>	<i>Ridley</i>
Improve low-flow connectivity with tributaries								
Restore tributary riparian areas	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2				
Restore habitat (diversity/stability)								
Acquire functioning habitat at risk of degradation								
Watershed								
Assess, treat forest roads	Tier 2**							
Address chronic sediment sources	Tier 2**							

*Acquisition for restoration may be a Tier 1 if the acquisition is facilitating a Tier 1 restoration strategy.

**Proponent of a project addressing this strategy must demonstrate benefits to Chinook.

2016 Project Development Matrices

March 7, 2016

Project Development Matrix

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	Handscrabble	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	
South Fork Mainstem																
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 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 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	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 1	Tier 1							
Lower artificial levees to native bank elevations	Tier 1			Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1	Tier 1									
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 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2		Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	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	
Early chinook tribs (upstream to chinook extent)	None	None	None	None	None	None	Hutchinson	None	Skookum	None	Cavanaugh	Fobes, Deer, Roaring, Plumbago	None	None	None	
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 2		Tier 2		Tier 2	Tier 2				
Watershed																
Assess, treat forest roads	Tier 2															
Address chronic sediment sources*** (South Fork adjacent large inputs)				Tier 2									Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2	Tier 2

*If project is establishing a buffer where there currently isn't one, the strategy is a Tier 1.
 ** Proponent of a project addressing this strategy must demonstrate benefits to Chinook.
 *** Strategy is to address the large sediment streamside contributions (not intended for small)

WRIA 1 Habitat Indicator Table for 2016 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 ¹ 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 ² (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 ³ 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 ⁵ , 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)	

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

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

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

⁴ Floodplain is defined as the mapped 100-year floodplain.

⁵ 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
Magnitude of Benefit Relative to Project Cost Overall Rating	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
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: _____

<p>(c) Given (a) and (b), how cost effective is the project?</p>		
<p><i>Sponsor Completes:</i></p> <p>(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></p> <p>(b) <i>Please attach your project budget.</i></p>		
<p><i>Technical Evaluation:</i></p>		
<p>Certainty of Benefit Overall Rating</p>	<p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>	
<p>Acquisition Projects:</p> <p>(a) How likely is it that the sponsor will complete the project (i.e., landowner willingness to sell)?</p>		
<p><i>Sponsor Completes:</i></p> <p><i>What is in place that demonstrates the acquisition is ready to proceed?</i></p>		
<p><i>Technical Evaluation:</i></p>		
<p>Category - Timing</p>		
	<p>Rating</p> <p>Weak (5) → Strong (1)</p>	<p>Comments/Rationale for Rating</p>

Project Name or Number: _____

<p>Immediacy of Benefit 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></p>	<p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>	
<p><i>Sponsor Completes:</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.</p>		
<p><i>Technical Evaluation:</i></p>		
<p>Lifespan of Project 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></p>	<p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>	
<p><i>Sponsor Completes:</i> What is the lifespan of your project? If you divert from the Table 1 guidance, provide the basis for the diversion.</p>		
<p><i>Technical Evaluation:</i></p>		
<p>Category - Project Sequencing/Staging</p>		
	<p>Rating Weak → Strong (5) (1)</p>	<p>Comments/Rationale for Rating</p>
<p>Linkage or Relationship to Other Projects Overall Rating</p>		
<p>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</p>	<p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>	

Project Name or Number: _____

<p>acquiring the property facilitate future restoration, is this stage needed for other stages to move forward?)</p> <p>(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?</p>	<p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>	
<p><i>Sponsors Complete:</i></p> <p>(a) How does this project relate to other projects in the reach?</p> <p>(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?</p> <p>(c) Have other stages of this project been funded? What stages remain to be funded? Will that complete restoration in the reach?</p> <p>(d) Will the acquisition facilitate Tier 1 or Tier 2 restoration strategies at or near the acquisition site?</p>		
<p><i>Technical Evaluation:</i></p>		
<p>Consequence of Delay/Urgency for the Project Overall Rating</p>		
<p>All Projects:</p> <p>(a) To what extent are recovery efforts impeded if the project s not funded?</p>	<p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>	
<p><i>Sponsors Complete:</i></p> <p>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?</p>		
<p><i>Technical Evaluation:</i></p>		
<p>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.)</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:

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 ^a	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 ^b
	Natural LWD placement	1-5	5-20	High	Low to high ^b
	Artificial log jams	1-5	10-50+	Moderate	Low to high ^b
	Boulder placement	1-5	5-20	Moderate	Low to high ^b
	Gabions	1-5	10	Moderate	Low to high ^b
<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			

^a 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.

^b 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
Magnitude of Benefit Relative to Project Cost Overall Rating	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
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
Immediacy of Benefit (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>	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	

Project Name or Number: _____

<p>(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>		
<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>Lifespan of Project 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>Category - Project Sequencing/Staging</p>		
	<p style="text-align: center;">Rating</p> <p>Weak (5) Strong (1)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comments/Rationale for Rating</p>
<p>Linkage or Relationship to Other Projects Overall Rating</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) How does this project relate to other projects in the reach?</p> <p>(f) 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?</p> <p>(g) Please attach a map that shows the proposed project in relation to other projects.</p>		
<p><i>Technical Evaluation:</i></p>		
<p>Consequence of Delay/Urgency for the Project Overall Rating</p>		
<p>All Projects:</p> <p>(b) To what extent are recovery efforts impeded if the project s not funded?</p>	<p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p> <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>	
<p><i>Sponsors Complete:</i></p> <p>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?</p>		
<p><i>Technical Evaluation:</i></p>		
<p>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.)</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 ^a	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 ^b
	Natural LWD placement	1-5	5-20	High	Low to high ^b
	Artificial log jams	1-5	10-50+	Moderate	Low to high ^b
	Boulder placement	1-5	5-20	Moderate	Low to high ^b
	Gabions	1-5	10	Moderate	Low to high ^b
<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			

^a 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.

^b 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
Magnitude of Benefit Relative to Project Cost Overall Rating	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
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?	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
Sponsor Completes: 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.		
Technical Evaluation:		
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	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
Sponsor Completes: (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: _____

<i>Technical Evaluation:</i>		
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?	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
<i>Sponsor Completes:</i> (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?		
<i>Technical Evaluation:</i>		
Category - Timing		
	Rating Weak (5) Strong (1) ← →	Rationale for Rating
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)	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	
<i>Sponsor Completes:</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.		

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 → Strong (5) (1)	Rationale for Rating
Linkage or Relationship to Other Projects Overall Rating	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	
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?)	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	
(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?	<input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	

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: _____

Technical Evaluation:

Consequence of Delay/Urgency for the Project Overall Rating

All Projects:

(c) To what extent are recovery efforts impeded if the project is not funded?

Sponsors Complete:

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.)

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 ^a	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 ^b
	Natural LWD placement	1-5	5-20	High	Low to high ^b
	Artificial log jams	1-5	10-50+	Moderate	Low to high ^b
	Boulder placement	1-5	5-20	Moderate	Low to high ^b
	Gabions	1-5	10	Moderate	Low to high ^b
<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			

^a 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.

^b Depends on species and project design.

APPENDIX B

WRIA 1 Schedule for 2016 SRFB/PSAR Grant Cycle

	Date	Action	Description	Who
✓	February 12	Request site visits	Submit three options for SRFB Review Panel site visits. SRFB confirms by March 22	Lead Entity
✓	March 7	Restoration Strategy Workshop	Workshop to review any new science or data to support modifications to the 2014 Restoration Strategy matrices, if applicable.	Lead Entity SRST Technical Staff
	March 16	Draft WRIA 1 4-Year Work Plan List	Lead Entity completes draft WRIA 1 4-Year Work Plan Project List	Lead Entity
	March 31	WRIA 1 4-Year Work Plan List	Lead Entity completes WRIA 1 4-Year Work Plan Project List	Lead Entity
	April 1- April 15	Letters of Intent	Sponsor completes required Letters of Intent due no later than April 15.	Sponsors
	April 1- April 15	Provide PRISM number to sponsor	The Lead Entity uses Letter of Intent to set up HWS to obtain a PRISM number. Sponsors use the number provided to enter draft application in PRISM.	Lead Entity Sponsors
	April 18	Review Project Objectives	Project sponsors present developed project objectives and limiting factors addressed to Technical Reviewers. Intent is for technical discussion and feedback to strengthen proposals.	Sponsors Technical Reviewers SRST
	February-May	Optional online application workshops	RCO staff holds online application workshop. <u>RCO can provide additional in-person trainings to lead entities upon request.</u>	RCO
	May 2	Technical Workshop	Project sponsors present project approach to Technical Reviewers. The intent is that reviewers provide technical input and suggestions for strengthening projects.	Sponsors Technical Reviewers SRST
	May 16	Draft applications due in PRISM	Sponsors enter draft applications materials into PRISM (Draft Application Checklist attached). **Draft applications should be nearly complete. **	Sponsors
	June 6-7	Conduct site visits	RCO grant manager, SRFB Review Panel members, sponsors, and WRIA 1 CRT participate in pre-application review and site visits. Sponsors are required to participate; Technical Reviewers are requested to participate; full WRIA 1 CRT is encouraged to participate.	Sponsors RCO/SRFB WRIA 1 CRT Technical Reviewers
	June 20	Receive and review SRFB Review Panel comments	RCO grant manager provides review panel comment forms to lead entity and sponsors. Lead entity distributes comments to WRIA 1 CRT. Sponsors address review panel comments using track changes (see Manual 18).	Lead Entity Sponsor WRIA 1 CRT
	July 11	Final Applications in PRISM; Sponsor presentation of final proposal to technical reviewers	Sponsors enter final applications in PRISM for ranking by WRIA 1 CRT. Sponsors present final proposal to Technical Reviewers. Lead Entity distributes links to WRIA 1 CRT for application review.	Sponsors; WRIA 1 CRT Lead Entity Technical Reviewers
	TBD July 12-14	Technical Reviewer Ranking Session	Technical reviewers provide evaluate project applications; outcomes for CRT	Technical Reviewers
	TBD July 18-26	WRIA 1 CRT Ranking	Lead Entity convenes WRIA 1 CRT ranking session	WRIA 1 CRT
	July 28- SRB Aug 3- MT	Approve final ranked list	WRIA 1 Lead Entity reviews WRIA 1 CRT recommendation for 2016 SRFB Project List and approves ranked list for submittal.	Lead Entity
	August 12	Applications Submitted	Sponsors submit final applications in PRISM including attachments.	Sponsors
	August 15	Lead Entity submittals	Lead entities submit draft ranked lists via PRISM online.	Lead Entity