

# 2018 Lead Entity SRFB Reporting (Appendix M)

Lead Entity name: *WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Board*

---

## **Lead Entity Responses to Questions 4-5 of Manual 18, Appendix M.**

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 mostly unchanged from 2017. A change made to the Project Review Sheet was for 2018 was to include an opportunity for sponsors to outline any additional funding sources they are leveraging, if applicable. A change to the priority strategy reaches was to include a cover letter providing context for the strategies. (Attachment A - Ranking Session Documents).*

*Included in Attachment A, in addition to the ranking session documents, is a table of WRIA 1 habitat indicators that was prepared and agreed to for the 2015 grant process and has continues to be used for the grant process 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 fund with the greatest benefit to the listed early Chinook populations. This means that project proposals should be in priority geographic areas for early Chinook (North, Middle, and South Forks of the Nooksack River), and the project should address Tier 1 or Tier 2 strategies as identified in the Project Development Matrices (included in Attachment A). If a project is not in a priority geographic area and/or does not address Tier 1 or Tier 2 strategies, the project proponent must provide the rationale for the location and/or project strategy with technical information and data 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.

The review process for the technical review team members began in February 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. No new data was presented that would result in changes to the Tier structure of the restoration strategies. The discussion did lead to including a cover to the restoration strategies that provides context for the restoration strategies as part of the larger WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery program.

Project presentations and site visits were scheduled and conducted on May 31 and June 1. The full WRIA 1 CRT participates with the SRFB Review Panel members in the site visits. 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.

Sponsors were scheduled to present their final application proposals on July 9 to the technical members of the WRIA 1 CRT. The community members of the CRT were invited to attend and all but two attended.

Final applications were due on July 11. As part of the final application, sponsors also are required through the LE process to complete their portion of the Project Review Sheet. The final application materials were distributed to the full WRIA 1 CRT within two days of being completed in PRISM by the project sponsors.

Technical reviewers met July 19 to discuss and evaluate the 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 July 27 ranking session.

As part of the ranking process, 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. A simple mathematical computation is applied to the pre-rankings to establish a composite ranked order.<sup>1</sup> Table 1 is a composite of pre-rankings received in advance of the meeting.

Table 1 Composite Pre-Ranking of WRIA 1 Projects

| Rank | Project Name                             | Sum of Ranks | Value |
|------|--|--------------|-------|
| 1    | North Fork Farmhouse Phase 4 Restoration | 27           | 73    |
| 2    | Middle Fork Porter Ph 2 Design           | 43           | 57    |

<sup>1</sup> The sum of the individual rankings is subtracted from 100 to provide a numerical value.

|   |  |    |    |
|---|--|----|----|
| 3 | South Fork Camp 18 Restoration         | 45 | 55 |
| 4 | South Fork Homesteader Reach Design    | 60 | 40 |
| 5 | Upper South Fork/Tributary Acquisition | 66 | 34 |
| 6 | South Fork Elk Flats Restoration       | 70 | 30 |
| 7 | Mainstem Deming Acquisition            | 81 | 19 |

The WRIA 1 CRT reviewed the composite of the preliminary rankings and discussed the different projects and some of the considerations that went into their ranking. A summary of the discussion points is as follows:

- North Fork Farmhouse Phase 4 Restoration:
  - Key project in the reach.
  - Final phase of a multi-phase restoration project; previous phases have been successful.
  - Primarily Tier 1 project with some Tier 2 aspects.
- Middle Fork Porter Ph 2 Design:
  - Major component of project is preservation of Bear and Peat Bog creek outflow channel. Important spawning area.
  - Well coordinated with other phases of Porter Reach; fills important gap.
- South Fork Camp 18 Restoration:
  - Project with proven effectiveness and relates to other projects.
  - Lot of potential to restore floodplain connectivity and channels along a large stretch of river.
- South Fork Homesteader Reach Design:
  - Important area given the migration of brood stock and natural origin stock Chinook.
  - Appropriate planning and coordination will be important to create a multi-benefit project. Builds on success of previous South Fork project in the near vicinity, and includes agricultural willing landowner.
  - Fills a restoration gap in the lower South Fork.
- Upper South Fork/Tributary Acquisition
  - Unique opportunity that may not be available in the future.
  - No known Chinook use above RM 0.2 (hatchery intake). Not a Tier 1 strategy and partially addresses Tier 2.
  - Mostly harvested already or already protected. Acquisition is more of a watershed/water quality enhancement opportunity than Chinook recovery project.
- South Fork Elk Flats Restoration
  - Concerns regarding over-estimation of the kind of success this restoration project may have; proposed log riffles are experimental.
  - Primary sediment sources are higher in South Fork, and channel spanning jams are still experimental. Side channels created are unlikely to support spawning due to low discharge in September.

- *Mainstem Deming Acquisition*
  - *Unique opportunity that may not be available in the future; addresses known past impairments related to forest practices.*
  - *Not Tier 1 or Tier 2. Reach is not known to support spawning by either Chinook population.*
  - *Priorities need to be determined for this reach prior to project funding; other projects within this area may rank higher once priorities are set.*

*After discussing the project proposals CRT members were asked if anyone wanted to adjust their pre-scores; there were no adjustments.*

*The CRT then discussed the potential funding available for the grant round. The potential funding sources are the 2018 SRFB allocation, the proposed 2019-2021 PSAR allocation, and remaining 2015-2017 funds. The CRT members reviewed that the total potential funding from all sources would fully fund the top two ranked projects and most of the third ranked project. Discussion points that followed included:*

- *The 2015-2017 PSAR funds will have an earlier expiration date requiring sponsors to be able to commit to expending the funds by June 30, 2019 or requesting an extension from the Puget Sound Partnership.*
- *The fifth ranked project, which is the Upper South Fork/Tributary Acquisition, is requesting a relatively small amount of grant funds to leverage a much larger acquisition and whether to fund the acquisition. There were CRT members that were not willing to jump the ranking to fund a lower ranked project that did not provide the same benefits to Chinook as the higher ranked projects.*
- *The first ranked project is requesting a significant amount of the potential funding (approximately 80%).*
- *Whether scaling the third ranked project to the point of being able to be completed with available funding would reduce the overall benefit and effectiveness since the project is relatively small in scale compared to the first ranked project. The sponsors for the first and third ranked projects participated in the CRT discussion of scaling, and agreed that the first ranked project had more opportunity in the design to scale than the third ranked project.*

*The CRT agreed that the third ranked project, South Fork Camp 18 Restoration, should be fully funded. In order to fully fund it, the CRT recommended that the first ranked project, North Fork Farmhouse Reach Phase 4, receive less than the sponsor's requested grant allocation. The sponsor, which is the Nooksack Indian Tribe, agreed with the recommendation and will explore options for additional funding to cover the funding gap and will also work with the engineer to consider implications of scaling the number of log jams. With that agreement, the CRT's final recommendation and ranking to the WRIA 1 Watershed Management Board (Lead Entity), went forward as shown in Table 2. The final grant request for North Fork Farmhouse Phase 4 in the final application submitted August 9 was reduced by the sponsor to reflect the recommended allocation.*

Table 2. WRIA 1 Combined Review Team Recommendation

| Project                                | Sponsor            | Project Type | Grant Request | CRT Recommended Allocation |
|--|--------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| North Fork Farmhouse Ph 4              | Nooksack Tribe     | Restoration  | \$2,779,495   | \$2,586,970                |
| Middle Fork Porter Ph 2                | Lummi Nation       | Design       | \$141,067     | \$141,067                  |
| South Fork Camp 18                     | Lummi Nation       | Restoration  | \$754,322     | \$754,322                  |
| South Fork Homesteader                 | Nooksack Tribe     | Design       | \$199,701     |                            |
| Upper South Fork/Tributary Acquisition | Whatcom Land Trust | Acquisition  | \$98,782      |                            |
| South Fork Elk Flats                   | Lummi Nation       | Restoration  | \$830,333     |                            |
| Mainstem Deming Acquisition            | Whatcom Land Trust | Acquisition  | \$511,955     |                            |
| Total Grant Request                    |                    |              | \$5,315,655   |                            |
| Funding Available for 2018 (Estimated) |                    |              |               | \$3,482,359                |

- 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 3 includes both categories of reviewers.

Table 3 WRIA 1 Combined Review Team Roster- 2018

| <b>Technical Members</b> |   |                                    |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| Gregg Dunphy             | Lummi Nation Natural Resources                      | Fisheries                          |
| Ned Currence             | Nooksack Tribe Natural Resources                    | Fisheries                          |
| Leif Embertson           | Nooksack Salmon Enhancement Assn.                   | River Systems/Restoration Engineer |
| 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                      |
| Analiese Burns           | City of Bellingham                                  | Wetlands/Restoration               |
| <b>Community Members</b> |   |                                    |
| Dave Beatty              | Citizen   | RFEG; habitat                      |
| Rich Bowers              | Whatcom Land Trust                                  | Land Acquisition                   |
| Pete Granger             | Citizen   | Commercial fishing interest        |
| Jim Hansen               | Marine Resources Committee                          | Former Restoration Grant Manager   |
| Cindy Fabbri             | Acme/VanZandt Flood Control Zone Advisory Committee | Community Member                   |
| 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 (Marnie Tyler and Paul Schlenger) participated in our process for the 2018 grant round as follows: (1) review of draft applications for restoration, design, and acquisition projects 2) attendance at the site visits and in-room presentations on May 31 and June 1, 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 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.

*The discussion outlined under 4a outlines how the Combined Review Team's final ranked project list addressed comments of the local review team. The WRIA 1 Watershed Management Board (Lead Entity) accepted the recommendation as presented with ranked projects 4-7 remaining on the approved habitat project list as alternates.*

*The final project ranking, therefore, will be submitted as shown in Table 4.*

**Table 4. WRIA 1 Ranked List and Funding Recommendation**

| #                                  | Project                          | Sponsor            | Project Type | Grant Request | Funding Source    |                |                |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
|                                    |                                  |                    |              |               | SRFB 2018         | PSAR 2015-2017 | PSAR 2019-2021 |
| 1                                  | North Fork Farmhouse Ph 4        | Nooksack Tribe     | Restoration  | \$2,779,495   | \$335,131         |                | \$2,251,839    |
| 2                                  | Middle Fork Porter Cr Reach Ph 2 | Lummi Nation       | Design       | \$141,067     |                   |                | \$141,067      |
| 3                                  | South Fork Camp 18 Ph 1          | Lummi Nation       | Restoration  | \$754,322     | \$307,972         | \$446,350      |                |
| <i>Potential funding available</i> |                                  |                    |              |               | \$643,103         | \$446,350      | \$2,392,906    |
| 4                                  | South Fork Homesteader Reach     | Nooksack Tribe     | Design       | \$199,701     | Alternate Project |                |                |
| 5                                  | Upper South Fork/Tributaries     | Whatcom Land Trust | Acquisition  | \$98,782      | Alternate Project |                |                |
| 6                                  | South Fork Elk Flats             | Lummi Nation       | Restoration  | \$830,333     | Alternate Project |                |                |
| 7                                  | Nooksack Mainstem Deming         | Whatcom Land Trust | Acquisition  | \$511,955     | Alternate Project |                |                |

## **APPENDIX A**

### **2018 WRIA 1 Ranking Session Documents**

## 2018 Project Development Matrices

# WRIA 1 Watershed Management Board

### 2018 SRFB/PSAR Grant Restoration and Protection Strategy Matrices

#### Background

The WRIA 1 Watershed Management Board is the lead entity for the WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Program. The 2005 *WRIA 1 Salmonid Recovery Plan* and associated assessments and studies provide the foundation for the WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Program. Whereas the WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Program is inclusive of all salmon populations, the current focus is on recovery of the North Fork/Middle Fork and South Fork early Chinook populations. Adaptive management of these matrices over time, including potential expansion to other geographic areas, will be informed by new studies, chinook and habitat viability monitoring, and project effectiveness monitoring.

#### 2018 SRFB/PSAR Grant Cycle

The current focus for this grant source is recovery of Nooksack early chinook, and grant proposals for the 2018 SRFB and regular PSAR grant round must have a primary benefit to Nooksack early chinook. Projects considered for the 2018 SRFB and regular PSAR grant round will be reviewed and ranked based on level of importance for Nooksack early Chinook, the sequencing and phasing of projects and/or project actions, and readiness to proceed.

Based on the *WRIA 1 Salmonid Recovery Plan*, previously completed habitat assessments/restoration plans in the Nooksack River Forks, and project effectiveness monitoring, this document presents the best available science on importance of geographic areas and restoration strategies to Nooksack early chinook. Strategies that are not highlighted in the attached matrices are either not applicable in a reach or they are of low importance in terms of benefitting Chinook. Project sponsors may present a science-based rationale for how projects that do not fit within the matrices benefit Nooksack early Chinook (e.g., change in priority tier, different strategy, different location, etc.).

# 2018 Project Development Matrices

2018 SRFB/PSAR Grant Restoration and Protection Matrices

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 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      |                 |               |                 | Tier 2           |         | Tier 1                               |           |                 |
| <b>Early chinook tribs (upstream to chinook extent)</b>  | None     | None    | Kenney Cr   | None            | Racehorse | None      | None         | Maple       |                 | Boulder       | 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                  |           |                 |
| <b>Watershed</b>   |          |         |             |                 |           |           |              |             |                 |               |                 |                  |         |                                      |           |                 |
| 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.

## 2018 Project Development Matrices

2018 SRFB/PSAR Grant Restoration and Protection Matrices

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  |                    |             |                         |             | 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   |                    |             |                         |             |                   |                  |                               |               |
| <b>Early chinook tribs (upstream to chinook extent)</b>   | <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  |                    |             |                         |             |                   |                  |                               |               |
| <b>Watershed</b>  |                    |             |                         |             |                   |                  |                               |               |
| 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.

# 2018 Project Development Matrices

2018 SRF8/PSAR Grant Restoration and Protection Matrices

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    | Hardcrabble | Standard | BNSF    | Acme    | Hutchinson | Sason   | 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 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 |
|  |                                     |         |             |          |         |         |            |         |         |              |           |                                |            |           |        |
| <b>Early chinook tribe (upstream to chinook extent)</b>  | None                                | None    | None        | None     | None    | None    | Hutchinson | None    | Skookum | None         | Cavanaugh | Fabes, 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                         |            |           |        |
| <b>Watershed</b>   |                                     |         |             |          |         |         |            |         |         |              |           |                                |            |           |        |
| 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-<br>Large Wood<br>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?<br>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.<br>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.

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

|           |          |   |
|-----------|----------|---|
| Reviewer: | Date:    | Project Strength<br>(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 or that lead to projects benefitting 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. 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<br>V. Strong (5) → V. Weak (1) | Comments/Rationale for Rating |
| <b>1. Magnitude of Benefit Relative to Project Cost Overall Rating</b>  | ○ ○ ○ ○ ○                             |                               |
| <p>All Projects:</p> <p>(a) 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)</p> <p>(b) To what extent are the tier 2 actions being implemented in the proposed project?</p>                                       | <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p> <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>     |                               |
| <p><b>Sponsor Completes:</b><br/>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.</p>  |                                       |                               |
| <p><b>Technical Evaluation:</b></p>   |                                       |                               |
| <p>Design Projects:</p> <p>(a) To what extent will design address the limiting factors and priority actions in the reach?</p> <p>(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).</p> | <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p> <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>     |                               |
| <p><b>Sponsor Completes:</b><br/>           (a) What are the habitat objectives? What are the primary limiting factor(s) and priority actions in the reach that the project will address?<br/>           (b) Provide a justification of the design cost relative to tasks proposed.<br/>           (c) Please attach your project budget</p>                  |                                       |                               |

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

|   |                                       |                               |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Technical Evaluation:</b>  |                                       |                               |
| <b>2. Certainty of Benefit Overall Rating</b>   | ○ ○ ○ ○ ○                             |                               |
| Design Projects:<br>(a) To what extent has the sponsor identified the current design stage for the proposed project site?   | ○ ○ ○ ○ ○                             |                               |
| <b>Sponsor Completes:</b><br>(a) What is the current stage of design for your project (e.g., conceptual, preliminary)?<br>(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?  |                                       |                               |
| <b>Technical Evaluation:</b>  |                                       |                               |
| <b>Category - Timing</b>  |                                       |                               |
|   | Rating<br>V. Strong (5) → V. Weak (1) | Comments/Rationale for Rating |
| <b>Immediacy of Benefit</b><br>(a) 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)<br>(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? | ○ ○ ○ ○ ○<br><br>○ ○ ○ ○ ○            |                               |
| <b>Sponsor Completes:</b><br>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. |                                       |                               |

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

**Technical Evaluation:**

**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)

**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<br>V. Strong (5) → V. Weak (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:<br>(a) 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?)<br>(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"/><br><input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> |                               |

**Sponsors Complete:**

- (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? Have other stages of this project been funded? What stages remain to be funded? Will that complete restoration in the reach?
- (c) Please attach a map that shows the proposed project in relation to other projects.

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

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Technical Evaluation:</b>   |  |  |
| <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:<br>(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"/>  |  |
| <b>Sponsors Complete:</b><br><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>   |  |  |
| <b>Technical Evaluation:</b>   |  |  |
| <b>Readiness to Proceed Overall Rating</b>   | <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>  |  |
| All Projects:<br>(a) Current landowner acknowledgement form is signed and has been uploaded to PRISM by draft application due date.<br>(b) To what extent to which Manual 18 requirements for project type are in PRISM by the draft application due date (excluding current landowner acknowledgement form, which is yes or no above).  | Yes = V. Strong (1)<br>No = V. Weak (5)<br><br><input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> |  |
| <b>Sponsors Complete:</b><br><i>(a) No response needed from sponsor since this is yes or no and current signed landowner acknowledgment form needs to be in PRISM by draft application date.<br/>(b) Use Manual 18 checklists for requirements for final applications and identify what is not included in your draft application that will be added by the date for final submittal, excluding a current signed landowner acknowledgement form that is a separate question.</i> |  |  |
| <b>Technical Evaluation:</b>   |  |  |
| <b>Leveraging of Funds (This is not a ranked question. It recognizes that the grant application may not reflect the total project cost because of the nuances associated with local match and billings for RCO grants. This provides sponsors an opportunity to explain or provide additional information about the total cost of the project and other funding sources and amounts that may be leveraging the SRFB/PSAR grant request,</b>                                      |  |  |

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

**which potentially may increase or affect the overall value, benefit, timing, etc of your project.)**

**Sponsors Complete:** Provide information on other funds that are not reflected in your grant application but that are part of the total project cost.

**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 <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<br>(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 or that lead to projects benefitting 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. 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<br>V. Strong (5) → V. Weak (1)              | Rationale for Rating |
| <b>Magnitude of Benefit Relative to Project Cost Overall Rating</b>   | ○ ○ ○ ○ ○  |                      |
| <p>All Projects:</p> <p>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)</p> <p>To what extent are the tier 2 actions being implemented in the proposed project?</p>   | <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p> <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>                  |                      |
| <p><b>Sponsor Completes:</b><br/> <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></p>  |  |                      |
| <p><b>Technical Evaluation:</b></p>   |  |                      |
| <p>Restoration Projects:</p> <p>(a) How much habitat (expressed in habitat targets) will be created?</p> <p>(b) To what extent will the project address priority strategies in the reach?</p> <p>(c) To what degree has the sponsor justified the project cost relative to the amount of habitat created</p>  | <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p> <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p> <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p> |                      |
| <p><b>Sponsor Completes:</b></p> <p>(a) <i>Using the table of Habitat Target Indicators, quantify habitat created by implementing the project.</i></p> <p>(b) <i>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.</i></p> <p>(c) <i>Provide a justification of the project cost in terms of habitat created.</i></p> |  |                      |

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

**Technical Evaluation:**

|  |           |  |
|--|-----------|--|
| <b>Certainty of Benefit Overall Rating</b> | ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ |  |
|--|-----------|--|

|  |                            |  |
|--|----------------------------|--|
| Restoration Projects:<br>(a) To what extent has the sponsor demonstrated that the restoration methods proposed are proven to achieve the expected restoration outcomes?<br>(b) To what degree, are the methods proposed effective? | ○ ○ ○ ○ ○<br><br>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ |  |
|--|----------------------------|--|

**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**

|  | Rating<br>V. Strong (5) → V. Weak (1) | Rationale for Rating |
|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------|

|   |           |  |
|---|-----------|--|
| <b>Immediacy of Benefit</b><br>To what extent will the project quickly result in benefits to spring Chinook?<br><i>(Refer to attached Table 1 for guidance on immediacy of benefit)</i> | ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ |  |
|---|-----------|--|

**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.*

**Technical Evaluation:**

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

|  |                  |  |
|--|------------------|--|
| <p><b>Lifespan of Project</b><br/>         To what extent will the project persist and provide key habitat functions while natural habitat forming and maintaining processes are recovering?<br/> <i>(Refer to attached Table 1 for guidance on lifespan of project)</i></p> | <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p> |  |
|--|------------------|--|

**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<br>V. Strong (5) → V. Weak (1) | Rationale for Rating |
|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------|

|   |           |  |
|---|-----------|--|
| <b>Linkage or Relationship to Other Projects Overall Rating</b> | ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ |  |
|---|-----------|--|

|  |                                   |  |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| <p>All Projects:</p> <p>(c) 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?)</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>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p> <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p> |  |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|

**Sponsors Complete:**

(d) *How does this project relate to other projects in the reach?*

(e) *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?*

(f) *Please attach a map that shows the proposed project in relation to other projects.*

**Technical Evaluation:**

|  |           |  |
|--|-----------|--|
| <b>Consequence of Delay/Urgency for the Project Overall Rating</b> | ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ |  |
|--|-----------|--|

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

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| All Projects:<br>(b) 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"/> |  |
|--|---|--|

**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:**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Readiness to Proceed Overall Rating</b> | <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> |  |
|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| All Projects:<br>(c) Current landowner acknowledgement form is signed and has been uploaded to PRISM by draft application due date.<br>(d) To what extent to which Manual 18 requirements for project type are in PRISM by the draft application due date (excluding current landowner acknowledgment form, which is yes or no above). | Yes = V. Strong (1)<br>No = V. Weak (5)<br><br><input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> |  |
|--|--|--|

**Sponsors Complete:**  
*(a) No response needed from sponsor since this is yes or no and current signed landowner acknowledgment form needs to be in PRISM by draft application date.  
(b) Use Manual 18 checklists for requirements for final applications and identify what is not included in your draft application that will be added by the date for final submittal, excluding a current signed landowner acknowledgement form that is a separate question.*

**Technical Evaluation:**

**Leveraging of Funds (This is not a ranked question. It recognizes that the grant application may not reflect the total project cost because of the nuances associated with local match and billings for RCO grants. This provides sponsors an opportunity to explain or provide additional information about the total cost of the project and other funding sources and amounts that may be leveraging the SRFB/PSAR grant request, which potentially may increase or affect the overall value, benefit, timing, etc of your project.)**

**Sponsors Complete:** Provide information on other funds that are not reflected in your grant application but that are part of the total project cost.

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

**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 <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 – Acquisition Projects

|           |          |   |
|-----------|----------|---|
| Reviewer: | Date:    | Project Strength<br>(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. 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<br>V. Strong (5) → V. Weak (1)              | Comments/Rationale for Rating |
| <b>Magnitude of Benefit Relative to Project Cost Overall Rating</b>   | ○ ○ ○ ○ ○  |                               |
| <p>All Projects:</p> <p>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)</p> <p>To what extent are the tier 2 actions being implemented in the proposed project?</p>   | <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p> <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p>                  |                               |
| <p><b>Sponsor Completes:</b><br/>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.</p>  |  |                               |
| <p><b>Technical Evaluation:</b></p>   |  |                               |
| <p>Acquisition Projects:</p> <p>(a) To what extent is the acquisition creating restoration opportunity? (i.e. what are the anticipated effects on habitat targets)</p> <p>(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)</p> <p>(c) Given (a) and (b), how cost effective is the project?</p>                            | <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p> <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p> <p>○ ○ ○ ○ ○</p> |                               |
| <p><b>Sponsor Completes:</b><br/>(a) 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.</p> |  |                               |

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

(b) *Please attach your project budget.*

**Technical Evaluation:**

**Certainty of Benefit Overall Rating**

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

**Acquisition Projects:**

(a) How likely is it that the sponsor will complete the project (i.e., landowner willingness to sell)?

**Sponsor Completes:**

*What is in place that demonstrates the acquisition is ready to proceed?*

**Technical Evaluation:**

**Category - Timing**

|  | Rating<br>V. Strong (5) → V. Weak (1) | Comments/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)*

○ ○ ○ ○ ○

**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.*

**Technical Evaluation:**

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

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Lifespan of Project</b><br>To what extent will the project persist and provide key habitat functions while natural habitat forming and maintaining processes are recovering?<br><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"/> |  |
|---|---|--|

**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<br>V. Strong (5) → V. Weak (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:<br>(e) To what extent is the proposed project part of a sequence for a reach restoration strategy? (e.g., have other stages been funded, will acquiring the property facilitate future restoration, is this stage needed for other stages to move forward?)<br>(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"/><br><br><input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> |  |
|--|--|--|

**Sponsors Complete:**  
 (g) *How does this project relate to other projects in the reach?*  
 (h) *To what degree does the project positively interact with other projects in the reach or the immediate area and how does it do that?*  
 (i) *Have other stages of this project been funded? What stages remain to be funded? Will that complete restoration in the reach?*  
 (j) *Will the acquisition facilitate Tier 1 or Tier 2 restoration strategies at or near the acquisition site?*

**Technical Evaluation:**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <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"/> |  |
|--|---|--|

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

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| All Projects:<br>(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"/> |  |
|--|---|--|

**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:**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Readiness to Proceed Overall Rating</b> | <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> |  |
|--|---|--|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| All Projects:<br>(e) Current landowner acknowledgement form is signed and has been uploaded to PRISM by draft application due date.<br>(f) To what extent to which Manual 18 requirements for project type are in PRISM by the draft application due date (excluding current landowner acknowledgment form, which is yes or no above). | Yes = V. Strong (1)<br>No = V. Weak (5)<br><br><input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> |  |
|--|--|--|

**Sponsors Complete:**

*(a) No response needed from sponsor since this is yes or no and current signed landowner acknowledgment form needs to be in PRISM by draft application date.  
(b) Use Manual 18 checklists for requirements for final applications and identify what is not included in your draft application that will be added by the date for final submittal, excluding a current signed landowner acknowledgment form that is a separate question.*

**Technical Evaluation:**

**Leveraging of Funds (This is not a ranked question. It recognizes that the grant application may not reflect the total project cost because of the nuances associated with local match and billings for RCO grants. This provides sponsors an opportunity to explain or provide additional information about the total cost of the project and other funding sources and amounts that may be leveraging the SRFB/PSAR grant request, which potentially may increase or affect the overall value, benefit, timing, etc of your project.)**

**Sponsors Complete:** Provide information on other funds that are not reflected in your grant application but that are part of the total project cost.

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

**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 <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 2018 SRFB Grant Cycle**

**2018 WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Funding Board and Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration Fund Grant Cycle Schedule**

| Date         | Action  | Description  | Who  |
|--------------|---|--|--|
| Feb 26       | Technical Workshop  | Review data provided by sponsors requesting change(s) in the Project Development Matrices that identifies Tiers of Priority  | Sponsors, Technical Reviewers and Staff                              |
| Mar 30       | <b>Letters of Intent (Requirement)</b>  | <b>All sponsors complete</b> required Letters of Intent due no later than March 30.  | All Sponsors   |
| Apr 2- Apr6  | Provide PRISM number to <b>all sponsors</b>   | 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  |
| Apr 5        | <b>PSAR Large Capital Project Draft Pre-Proposal Material in PRISM (Requirement)</b>  | The Lead Entity is required to provide a clear link to a recovery plan strategy or demonstrate a benefit to treaty rights populations for each PSAR Large Capital Project pre-proposal submitted April 30 <sup>th</sup> in PRISM. In order for the Lead Entity to have time to provide this review and, if necessary, obtain policy guidance from the Lead Entity at an April 11 <sup>th</sup> meeting, this is a necessary step.  | Sponsors of PSAR Large Capital Projects                              |
| Apr 9        | Review Letters of Intent;<br>Present concept (optional);<br><b>Align Large Capital Projects to Strategy in Local Plan</b>   | The <b>WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Staff Team and Technical Reviewers</b> will review the concepts presented in the Letters of Intent for the purpose of providing big picture feedback to sponsors on key information needs, flags, etc. for the sponsor to consider in their application. <b>Sponsors are invited to present their concept</b> for early feedback prior to submitting a draft application. <b>Sponsors notify Becky Peterson by April 1 if interested in this option (genevaconsulting@comcast.net).</b> <b>WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Staff Team and Technical Reviewers</b> align large capital project proposals to local recovery plan and prepare recommendations, if any, for the WRIA 1 Management Team regarding PSAR Large Capital Projects. | Sponsors<br>Lead Entity<br>Technical Reviewers                       |
| Apr 11       | WRIA 1 Management Team direction regarding large capital project proposals, if needed.  | An update on the PSAR Large Capital Project pre-proposals will be provided to WRIA 1 Management Team along with any recommendations developed on April 9 <sup>th</sup> by WRIA 1 Salmon Recovery Staff Team and Technical Reviewers.   | Lead Entity  |
| April 30     | <b>PSAR Large Capital Project Pre-Proposal Material in PRISM (Requirement)</b>  | <b>Sponsors of PSAR Large Capital Projects</b> submit application materials, Salmon Project Proposal questions, and alignment information from Lead Entity in PRISM (refer to PSAR Large Capital Project RFP V.1.29.18)  | Sponsors of PSAR Large Capital Projects                              |
| May 11       | <b>Regular PSAR and SRFB projects draft applications due in PRISM (Requirement)</b>   | <b>Sponsors enter draft applications materials into PRISM</b> (Refer to Manual 18 for checklist of materials required). <b>**Draft applications reflect the level of detail and specificity necessary to understand the project's unique objectives, habitat indicators, metrics, and limiting factors. The project sponsor should not plan to make substantive changes to the draft application after this date except to address early review comments from the June 8 site visits or to adjust the project scope if requested so as to accommodate available funding or unanticipated changes such as withdrawal of landowner willingness.**</b>  | Sponsors   |
| June 22      | <b>Full proposal in PRISM for PSAR Large Capital Project Sponsors that are invited to submit full proposals (Requirement).</b>  | By May 25 <sup>th</sup> , the <b>Puget Sound Partnership will invite sponsors of PSAR Large Capital Project pre-proposals to submit a full application</b> based on outcomes of preliminary tiering review.  | Sponsors of PSAR Large Capital Projects                              |
| May 31/Jun 1 | <b>All sponsors present projects and/or conduct site visits (Requirement)</b>   | RCO grant manager, SRFB Review Panel members, sponsors, and WRIA 1 CRT participate in pre-application review and site visits. <b>Sponsors are required to participate; Technical Reviewers are requested to participate; full WRIA 1 CRT is encouraged to participate.</b>   | All sponsors<br>RCO/SRFB<br>WRIA 1 CRT<br>Technical Reviewers        |
| June 15      | Receive and review SRFB Review Panel comments two weeks after site visits on <b>regular PSAR and SRFB project proposals</b>   | 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<br>Sponsor<br>WRIA 1 CRT                                 |
| July 5-15    | <b>PSAR Large Capital Project sponsors receive feedback from regional reviews and respond within ten days.</b>  | Sponsors of PSAR Large Capital Projects will receive feedback from reviewers on July 5 <sup>th</sup> . Sponsors will then have 10 days to modify and resubmit proposals before final scoring. Final rankings will be announced on July 27 <sup>th</sup> .  | Sponsors of PSAR Large Capital Projects                              |
| July 9       | <b>Regular PSAR and SRFB sponsors present final proposal to technical reviewers (Requirement)</b>   | <b>Regular PSAR and SRFB sponsors present final proposal to Technical Reviewers. Lead Entity distributes links to WRIA 1 CRT for application review.</b>   | Regular Sponsors<br>Lead Entity<br>WRIA 1 CRT<br>Technical Reviewers |
| July 11      | 1. Summary Memo and Completed Evaluation Form for Technical and CRT review submitted to Lead Entity.<br>2. Final Application in PRISM for <b>Regular SRFB and PSAR projects (Requirement)</b> | <b>Sponsors provide the following information to Lead Entity for local reviewers:</b><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sponsor completed section of project evaluation form.</li> <li>Memo that concisely summarizes and/or clarifies information or adjustments made to the final application since the site visits.</li> <li>Overview map that shows the proposed project and relationship to all completed or planned projects in the reach.</li> </ul> <b>Complete final application in PRISM by end of the day.</b>  | Sponsors<br>WRIA 1 CRT<br>Technical Reviewers                        |
| July 17      | Technical Reviewer Ranking Session  | Technical reviewers provide evaluate project applications; outcomes for CRT  | Technical Reviewers  |
| July 27      | WRIA 1 CRT Ranking  | Lead Entity convenes WRIA 1 CRT ranking session. Sponsors encouraged to attend to respond to questions, if any.  | WRIA 1 CRT<br>Sponsors   |
| Aug 1        | Approve final ranked list   | The WRIA 1 Watershed Management Board, or its Management Team, as the WRIA 1 Lead Entity reviews WRIA 1 CRT recommendation for 2017 SRFB Project List and approves ranked list.  | Lead Entity  |
| Aug 9        | <b>Applications Submitted</b>   | <b>Sponsors submit final applications in PRISM including attachments.</b>  | Sponsors   |
| Aug 15       | Lead Entity submittals  | <b>Lead entities submit draft ranked lists via PRISM online.</b>   | Lead Entity  |